

**2012 Platform Committee Questionnaire Results
Summary Results of All Questions**

Question #	Question Description	Support Percentage		# of Comments	% Commenting
		All Respondents 2095	Commenters		
1.0	Personal Liberty	86.6%	57.3%	229	10.9%
2.1	Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment - Prefer Original	41.3%	41.6%	185	8.8%
2.2	Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment - Prefer Amendment	38.6%	26.7%	119	5.7%
2.3	Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment - Prefer Either	12.3%	10.3%	46	2.2%
2.4	Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment - Prefer Neither	7.8%	21.3%	95	4.5%
	Subtotal	100.0%	100.0%	445	21.2%
3.0	Personal Privacy	81.0%	50.8%	220	10.5%
4.0	Personal Privacy - Pending Amendment	73.8%	43.0%	195	9.3%
5.0	Abortion - Proposal 1	73.4%	39.6%	230	11.0%
6.0	Abortion - Proposal 2	74.9%	43.8%	238	11.4%
7.0	Crime and Justice	96.8%	77.0%	151	7.2%
8.0	Self-Defense	75.9%	40.5%	226	10.8%
9.0	Government Finance and Spending	78.2%	50.5%	293	14.0%
10.0	Money and Financial Markets	85.1%	55.3%	230	11.0%
11.0	Labor Markets	86.0%	53.1%	187	8.9%
12.0	Education	87.2%	56.1%	193	9.2%
13.0	Health Care	92.5%	71.4%	235	11.2%
14.0	Free Trade and Migration	80.6%	44.9%	196	9.4%
15.0	Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 1	90.6%	67.8%	234	11.2%
16.0	Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 2	81.6%	54.4%	239	11.4%
17.0	Representative Government - Proposal 1	93.3%	64.4%	141	6.7%
18.0	Representative Government - Proposal 2	89.1%	55.7%	142	6.8%

*** Except for Questions 2.x, Percentages for General Comments are not classified as either in support or in opposition.

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We have the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The sole job of our government is to protect that right.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The principle of non-initiation of force is not limited to foreign policy, and it is so important that it ought to be at the very start of the Platform.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Government should never be allowed to limit our choices,
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe the reason the "No individual, group, or government may initiate force against any other individual, group, or government" has little to do with foreign policy--at least in this context. Instead, the reason the non-initiation of force principle was included is to distinguish between one's right to liberty and how often those rights are infringed upon due to coercion by others. Certainly, the health care individual mandate is an attack on personal liberty. The explicit language in what you wrongly call the "foreign policy content of the second sentence" expressly prohibits that kind of coercion against one's personal liberty. By removing the language that prohibits coercion, you're effectively castrating the personal liberty plank of the party platform. Please reconsider and make the necessary adjustments so that the Personal Liberty plank includes language that makes clear our party is against coercion which so often and regularly undermines personal liberty.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This needs elaboration on the Last Sentence of Governemnt's Proper Role. Does this principle apply to just this right, or all rights that we, as human beings, have?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It leaves open what a "personal" choice is and gives argument room that "business," "economic," and "community" choices are not "personal" enough. It also insinuates that you should not be free until you comprehend your freedom.

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Too focused on "accepting consequences", needs to address the concept that so long as an action/choice does not infringe on the rights of another individual then gov't should not be involved.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would not include the phrase "depends on both understanding that it has consequences and accepting responsibility for them" that is assuming too much. Very few will accept either ownership of their choices or responsibility for them. Freedom of choice is all that is guaranteed. there can be no "dependant". Don't assume anything. The original statement is clearer.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Sounds less moralizing than the previous version.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Consequences dictated by laws can in certain circumstances be an injustice.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Although, I don't see where it is stating that it only applies to adults. In your commentary it mentions "protection against accusations that we think 3-year-olds can choose. . .", but I don't see where that is implied.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Libertarians believe that each individual has the right to his or her own life, liberty, property and the pursuit of happiness. It is the function of government to protect those rights.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While I like the "Language to Be Added", it's getting a bit too "DemoRepubWordy"

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I was thinking that a " draft" of a plan to be submitted to the american people for a plebiscite. I believe that if we were to present " a contract" to each presdiential candidate that they must sign and acknowledge that says ipso facto that once they are in office and do not honor their word their contract with the american people they must resign within 6 months of accepting office. It would give the american people leverage and a mandate to fire the president like any employee in any company. All cndidates must presnet a detailed itemized plan of excatly whjat intiatives they intend to enact once in office. It must be clearly and legally preented by a committee prior to the elction.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What is meant by "self-ownership" in the proposed sentence is not as clear (for as wide an audience) as the language it would replace. This first sentence however should be changed. The main issue I have with the proposal is that there are times (perhaps every time) when choices are made which have unknown consequences. With the new reading it sounds as if future interpreters could limit individual rights by saying that we as individuals can't have perfect understanding of all of the consequences for our actions. I would support a section though that would deal with children's rights. I believe that there should be an age of legal accountability transferred officially from parents to their children as a default (or granted or refused by court order) in which all children can decide their own personal choices. As far as the redundancy goes with respect to the inclusion of "...group, or government" I welcome the redundancy here because it is a natural extension of libertarian philosophy and the redundant elements would be harder for future interpreters to misconstrue.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Rights to their individual bodies is overdue to be inserted

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You need to re-affirm the innate rights of humans so people do not forget. Libertarians recognize all individuals inherent self-ownership and therefor the Right to live their life in anyway they see fit and live with the consequences of those choices.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This would read better as: "With individual rights come individual responsibilities and consequences; therefore, the right to make a choice is contingent upon each person's ability to legally understand and accept the consequences inherent to that choice."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't like the statement "the right to make a choice depends on..." I think this could be misconstrued by someone to try and take away your right to choose based on their criteria.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Self-ownership? How about; Libertarians recognize individuality and respect your right to personal choices. Our support of an individual's freedom to make personal choices does not mean that we approve or disapprove of those choices, with rights come responsibilities. The freedom to choose requires both the understanding of the consequences and accepting responsibility for them. Government's proper role is to protect the freedoms of every individual.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Should read "adult individuals self-ownership" , no? Wouldn't "self-directed behavior" be better than "self ownership"? Sounds like a small business. Maybe I'm just nit picking, but language is important.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	It should be stressed that individual self-ownership and the right to make personal choices are a natural, unalienable right. The government is there to protect individual rights but it does not grant or create these rights.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	For all ammendments: "K.I.S.S." (Old Army Rule) "Keep It Simple, Stupid" Try for plain English. Don't fancy it up with Lawyer talk. Easier to read, less confusion possible. Tnx.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	love the phrase "with rights come responsibilities"

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	<p>Libertarians recognize the rights of citizens to pursue personal happiness without judgment, to make personal choices without fear, to self-determination and to the complete ownership of such freedoms: We recognize that broad individual rights carry the broader burden of personal responsibility for them. We acknowledge the consequences inherit of our choices and the liability of our conduct; we strive to be both civil and ethical in our pursuits and expect mutual observation of these basic tenants. We believe our individual roles are to support the liberty of each person, therefore we believe the proper role of government is to ensure both our collective and individual access to the liberties set forth in the U.S. Constitution.</p>
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	<p>We must also stress that this applies to criminal acts. An Individual that chooses to embark on a criminal activity must assume ALL responsibility for the consequences of that initial action. The idea that a criminal can sue the object of his criminal act because he was hurt during the commission of that act is ludicrous at best and criminal in itself.</p>
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	<p>I do not believe that "the right to make a choice depends on both understanding that it has consequences and accepting responsibility for them." I believe that an individual has the right to make a choice even if they do not understand that the choice has consequences, and even if they do not wish to take responsibility. The right of choice is, I believe, unalienable; and if not, the next logical question is who will determine when my right to make choices is not predicated on understanding, and who determines when my rights are taken from me because I lack understanding. Rights are rights, and consequences are consequences; individuals face the consequences of thier choices, even if they did not previously understand the consequences.</p>

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I would support it if the last sentence was changed as follows: "If government has a legitimate role in society, it would be limited to protecting individual rights."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The last sentence, "Government's proper role" could be read (interpreted) as giving "permission" to control the people. We know how big government can easily twist words. So, maybe change the wording to "Government's ONLY role (my caps, only) is to protect and GUARD..."
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I prefer keeping language opposing the initiation of force.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This plank is excellent. It is defensive in nature to counter to the naysayers who charge us with being akin to anarchist's. By stating that with liberty comes responsibility we are showing a more balanced approach to potential voters.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Sounds cleaner
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This one is concise.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The non-initiation of force part of the plank was gutted by this change. Your alleged purpose for this change wasn't really addressed by the proposed gutting of the non-initiation clause.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	We all must include the the oppositiion to force
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Maybe Government's role should be described in a different way. I am concerned about framing "government's proper role" outside a reference to the constitution or a constitutional reference.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	my right to make my own choices is absolute and does not depend on anything imposed by society
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"Libertarians recognize an individual's right to make personal choices and the responsibility to accept the resulting consequences. Recognition of this right constitutes neither approval nor disapproval of specific choices made by an individual. Government's proper role is to protect the rights of every individual."
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Weakens the plank considerably.

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There is a clarification that would be advisable in the penultimate sentence: "... it has consequences and accepting responsibility for those consequences"; otherwise, one has to read it a couple of times to figure out what "them" refers to at the end of that sentence.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	(Add to the statement above) . . . who is capable of taking responsibility for the use of the right. (I have in mind children and guns as an example)
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do support this idea of protecting the rights of every individual except that the individual should have primary responsibility of their rights and if need be government.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We acknowledge both the right to and consequence of personal choice. Our support of this liberty is based neither on approval nor disapproval, but on our fundamental and collective right to self-determination. It is more the role of government to facilitate and insure this freedom for every citizen.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Proper.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is a much better way to express the same thought. It is concise, yet clearly states the Libertarian view of self ownership.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the NAP being in the first plank.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You are saying that ignorance trumps rights. This is incorrect. Even the most ignorant person has the right to do anything that does not infringe upon another's rights.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	An individual makes the personal choice that drugs are bad and no one should be allowed to use them. He has the right to that choice, but Government should not allow the imposition of laws supporting that. Does the platform need to say something about when rights are in conflict, which take precedence?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The old version is a stament of position. The new wording reads like an apology for holding that position. Keep the original!

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	The right to make a choice does not depend upon anything, neither understanding or accepting responsibility. Consequences naturally result from making a choice whether we understand or want those consequences. If a "right" depends upon understanding or willingness to accept responsibility, then it's no longer a right, but is conditional. I ask that we strike the second sentence from Plank 1.0
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	not crazy about the word "recognize" but it's okay.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would like to see something added that somewhat clarifies the age we're talking about. For example, the second sentence might say... Our support of an individual's right to make choices assumes that the individual has reached an age of accountability but does not imply our approval or disapproval of specific choices.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Excellent improvement!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think that you should get rid of "With rights come responsibilities, and the right to make a choice depends on both understanding that it has consequences and accepting responsibility for them." as it does not add anything and doesn't sound good mix in with the other sentences.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think the initiation of force statement is important, especially now. All the other statements are fine, but we need to make it clear that preserving liberty requires no initiation of force against another.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Our government shall not be our masters; we should recover ownership of ourselves, our nation, and our future. Big Government should be scrapped in favour of a government that is at the service of the people.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would phrase it "Libertarians recognize that each individual owns their own body and has the right to make personal choices."

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	In this sentence, "With rights come responsibilities, and the right to make a choice depends on both understanding that it has consequences and accepting responsibility for them. " I feel it should say "it MAY have consequences instead of it has consequences. This makes more sense and does not come off as negative sounding.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Personally I feel we believe in the personal liberty of every individual and their right to make deep meaningful choices in their lives. It is our belief that the proper role of Government is to protect this right of personal liberty for each and every citizen.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"Libertarians recognize" - This is redundant, remove, it is the Libertarian party platform, obviously it is us making this statement, or more to the point, I think the paragraph (or all paragraphs) should be structured in such a way that anyone could "steal" it and use it. It should be a general statement of fact rather than "so and so believes in this general statement of fact" "individual self-ownership AND the right to make personal choices" - I agree, but there is no causal link here, someone on the outside reading this would have no understanding as to why these things are related. We understand it, but we're trying to appeal to outsiders to draw them to our way of thinking so we should make it easy for them to grasp the logic behind our positions. So, I would suggest the following: "OWNERSHIP OF ONE'S SELF IS A NATURAL RIGHT. OWNERSHIP CONFERS RIGHTS, OBLIGATIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES. THE RIGHT TO FREELY MAKE CHOICES ABOUT THAT WHICH IS OWNED IS LIMITED ONLY BY THE OBLIGATION TO NOT VIOLATE THE OWNERSHIP RIGHTS OF ANOTHER AND THE RESPONSIBILITY TO SOLELY ACCEP'
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the original plank. The new wording seems like too much to be "pc" and the original was just fine.

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Stating it is the GOVERNMENT'S role to protect the rights of every individual is dangerous wording!!! Individual liberty is (as the country was founded) unalienable and to be neither granted or restricted by government. AFTER noting this, stating government should insure this remains the case is fine.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"Self-ownership" is a bizarre word, especially in the opening clause of the platform; "self-determination" would be better. Also, in the new 3rd sentence, "accountability" is better than "accepting responsibility".
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"accountability" The proposal is to long-winded and sounds like it contains an apology. By including "personal responsibility", it sounds like it might be proposing misc insurance, health insurance, or anything that might be construed as "personal responsibility". The proposal is backing off the personal liberty platform. Liberty means the right to choose to not have insurance, or live up to the vague "personal responsibility" standard. A suggested alternative: Libertarians recognize the right to make personal choices. Our support of an individual's right to make choices does not mean that we approve or disapprove of those choices. Government's proper role is to protect the rights of every individual.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Sort of awkward sounding. "With rights come responsibilities, and the right to make a choice depends on both understanding that it has consequences and accepting responsibility for them. Government's proper role is to protect the rights of every individual." Maybe: With rights come responsibilities. The right to make choice's depends on the understanding that each choice has consequences and that the freedom to make them depends on our willingness to accept responsibility for them. Government's proper role is to protect the rights of every individual.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The original wording is far superior in my opinion.

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	However< I don't find any problem with the previous wording.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The problem/ gray area is with the final line, "Government's proper role is to protect the rights of every individual." In this context alone, it's ambiguous whether the asserted role of government is protect the rights of an individual through non-action (by not impairing the rights of the actor); through action (by facilitating the rights of the actor); through non-action (by not impairing the rights of those who are aggrieved by the action of another and wish to redress their grievance); or through action (by facilitating the redress of such a grievance). Popularly, the criminal and civil court system (and various administrative courts and arbitration schemes) settle such grievances when two sets of actions or "rights" come into conflict. In that sense, the government's current role with regard to "protect[ing] the rights" of individuals is usually to facilitate the rights of the aggrieved party to find redress. Sometimes the government itself (especially through the criminal law but also through environmental and securities regulation, etc) opposes individual and corporate actions out
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The prior statement that no one "may initiate force" against another is obviously false. And I can even initiate force justly in self defense if I see armed militants gathering outside my door with the clear intent to use force against me. I will not wait until they have gathered so much force that my resistance will be futile before I initiate my defensive use of force for self-preservation.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	"constitutional rights of every individual
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Following the style of the preamble to our Constitution, I would start with "We" rather than "Libertarians."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	a little wordy...I'll look at the next one...
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the original better

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I oppose the use of the word "responsibility" unless it is modified as follows, "All transactions with other individuals should be of a voluntary nature, and it is the responsibility of the individual to live up to contracts made voluntarily with other individuals" So, I propose the following statement, "Libertarians recognize the complete freedom of the individual to engage in any behavior of their choice so long as it does not negatively impact the freedoms of other individuals. Individuals also recognize that individuals need to collaborate with each other to survive, and that - even though all transactions between individuals should be of a voluntary nature, Libertarians believe that individual rights go hand in hand with the responsibility to uphold voluntary contracts that individuals have made with other individuals"
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Still would like to see some explicit language about the "initiation of force" like the original stated. Since this is exactly one of the serious problems we have today with government taking force against citizens.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The proposal presupposes the existence of government. That gives away the store. Government has NO "proper role."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"Government's proper role is to protect [this right for] every individual"
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Not an improvement
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	adding:The Libertarian Party's position on individual rights will be to stand with the individual when constitutionally inalienable rights are violated.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	much improved

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Possibly an emphasis towards how this Republic was conceived in Liberty and that freedom of individuals was paramount in the Revolution. Back to basics of the Founder's approach may appeal to a more broad based electorate. A government's role should be minimal, and that the rights, liberties, and responsibilities of us as individuals have been constantly degraded by interference, over zealotness, and intrusion for far too long.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The last sentence does not fit as well with the other sentences and sort of stops the flow. Is there another section of the platform where the role of government is addressed?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	One of the main reasons that the Libertarian Party hasn't grown is the belief no individual, etc would initiate force against the same. The founding members of the party were obviously college educated and not "street-wise" by making this a party principle. When someone threatening is allowed to throw you the first punch, chances are you're going to get your butt kicked. I'll wager that our founders were never exposed to this reality.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Too wordy. It should read: Libertarians recognize individual self ownership and the right to make personal choices and accept the responsibility of those choices. Governments proper role is to insure the right of the individual to persue personal choices not limit them.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would support, however I prefer the second proposal below.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The original wording sounded like a rebuttal. The new wording gives the impression that we are stating a platform. Good change.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i oppose all druges
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Very well said.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	like the old one better
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	kind of convoluted
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Being allowed those choices for the individual MUST include the safety of those who do not choose these behaviors.

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the passage stating "no individual, group or government may initiate force against another ..." That's because I believe in the right to life.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The old statement sounds as if an individual CANNOT use force to protect THEIR OWN person or property. Ergo, I think this clarifies that the government cannot do so, but I still think that the right of an individual to defend their person or property should be made clearer.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Love it, this should be the creed of every American(!) and the perfect place for government.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Role-of-govt language in proposal is more on-point than the wording it replaces.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If we disapprove of a person's choices, meaning we legitimately think they are immoral and/or harmful to others, then that means we think those choices should be illegal or at least discouraged. Laws reflect what we believe to be right and wrong, so if someone is making choices we disapprove of, we think those choices are wrong and that laws should be made against such choices.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I think a crucial aspect is the original statement about Never initiate force or violence. That original sentence is important. "No individual, group, or government may initiate force" but I would add the words " or violence", since force and violence are not identical.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The last sentence sounds like we think the government should provide a lawyer and body guard for each person. Government should strive to ensure maximum freedom!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The first version is much more direct.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This a good update and makes a stronger, less clinical statement than the original.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I approve the change, but I would like to keep the stance against government force.

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Adding Consequences assumes 'bad' choices. And it opens the path for government to decide what th consequences may be.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It's too wordy and clunky. The original is better worded.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	that is great
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Better worded but language is simple bordering on elementary level reading
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The sentence "With rights come responsibilities, and the right to make a choice depends on both understanding that it has consequences and accepting responsibility for them" suggests that the right is contingent upon acceptance of responsibility or an understanding that exercising the right has consequences. I would argue that rights, generally, are not contingent either upon an understanding that their exercise has consequences or a willingness to take responsibility for those consequences. One has the right regardless.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Consider adding some form of the nonaggression principle.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I would suggest keeping only the first sentence and change 'should be' to 'are'.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"Libertarians" or the Libertarian Party in the first sentence
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Wording of sentence 2 seems a little awkward, with 2 pronouns ("it" & "them"). I suggest: "With rights come responsibilities. The right to make a choice depends on both understanding that choices have consequences and accepting responsibilities for those consequences that result from our choices."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	make the statement as simple as possible. no "catch-phrases".

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The problem with this is that it doesn't take into account the responsibilities a person has already assumed, and provides for no cause of action when the victim of lack of fulfillment is harmed. Failure to fulfill obligations to others should be actionable, even for people who cannot afford to pursue their own remedies. However, this wording is an improvement.
Oppose Support	Likely Unlikely	No No	Non-Member Non-Member	Change in wording without any difference I would add "only" between "Government's" and "proper". I would also emphasize that protecting rights does not mean that the government is obliged to maximize anyone's enjoyment/fulfillment of their rights.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Rather vague and overly philosophical for a political party's first plank, don't you think?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The "every individual" language sounds like somebody wants it to include embryos.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	With a minor addition. The last sentence doesn't reference the "right" alluded to earlier in the paragraph and leaves it to the reader as to what constitutes a "right". The statement would be more concise if the final sentence ended with "...to make such choices."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	the ammended language comes to close to approving (see the right ..depends) infringement. the right is absolute, it INCLUDES accountability. in the event of any individual not being accountable whose job is it to enforce? the state or other individuals? this leave to far open a jutification of force for more than personal injury. the original is better but could be ammended as " free to make choices for themselves, accepting the (responsibilities, accountibility, consequences* my personal favorite) included (or inhererent) in those decisions.

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This language "and the right to make a choice depends on both understanding that it has consequences and accepting responsibility for them" grates me the wrong way. Who gets to decide whether a person is ready to accept the consequences of their own actions.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The one below is a lot better. Your ideas are gloriously simple, but that's their problem. You gotta sell 'em.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like adding the term self-ownership, but I do not like the idea of claiming that the government has a proper role, or that rights are contingent upon understanding anything. A baby has a right to breathe regardless of whether said baby has any understanding about breathe, consequences, or responsibilities. If we adopt the revision, people could accuse of saying that babies do not have rights, and therefore claim that we don't care if babies are murdered.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Might be a little less wordy. Stick with "individuals are free to make choices, with the understanding that they are solely responsible for the consequences.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Even as amended, still somewhat unfocused. I think the point of the second sentence should be that in the political sphere, we do not have the right to approve or disapprove of others' choices. But it sounds like it's saying that we have that right, we're just not telling you right now which way we're going to go with it. Sentence three is grammatically confused. What does the first "it" refer to? Right or choice? Then, what does "them"--plural refer to? Right AND choice? Can't tell from the sentence. Thomas Hill Green posed the thesis that two types of rights exist. The first type we are most familiar with, and requires government simply not to interfere. But positive rights are rights that can be understood to require governmental action to bring about. Which "rights" is sentence 4 referring to? Right to an adequate education, universal health care, fulfilling employment?

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'd go further in the last sentence to say: "Government's proper role is restricted to protection of the rights of the individual (life, liberty, and property)." Saying them explicitly makes them unambiguous.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Flawed. This implies that the right to make a choice depends on an individual's understanding of the consequences. Who decides that an individual doesn't understand the consequences and therefore doesn't have the right to make a choice?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A better way to present the number one reason I support the Libertarian Party. Very Good!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While keeping in mind the the platform needs to persuade others to join our party, I believe it should just state our principles simply and concisely and allow the readers to make up their own minds. Emphatic, emotional political speeches are mostly convincing only to existing followers. This applies to all my comments. Now onto the survey... The term 'self-ownership' is confusing despite the fact that it is precise. The concept 'all individuals are sovereign over their own lives' has never even occurred to some of them. It is a concept lost to most since the time of the founding fathers, and therefore will make no sense to them.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	"Individuals should be free..." is a much better opening for a plank on Personal Liberty than "Libertarians recognize..." More importantly, many Libertarians do NOT believe government has *any* proper role, and the proposed language would misrepresent their beliefs. This proposal, with its heavy emphasis on responsibility and light emphasis on freedom, sounds way too conservative. We don't need to further conservatize or water down our platform!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Would support it if "individual self-ownership" was changed to "personal responsibility"

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Tying the right to make a choice to the understanding of consequences could be (and has been) used to support government action like sterilizing the mentally retarded. Other than that sentence, the reworded plank is pretty good.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree with both but prefer the less wordy version. Simple is better.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Its about being accountable for your actions
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	what is refered to as foreign policy content i see as a vital principal of personal liberty none may initiate force against another. individual, group or government
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is a better wording than the existing plank. The "govts proper role" part is good.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the intentions of this change; however, the wording "Our support of an individual's right to make choices does not mean that we approve or disapprove of those choices." seems weak and indecisive. Consider phrasing suggesting that the majority has no right to dictate morality to the minority or individuals.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	New language not good enough.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Says almost the same thing but takes 8 more words to say it.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"individual self-ownership" is an awkward phrase. It seems either ambiguous or redundant. At the end of the last sentence, I would add something like, "regardless of race, creed, [etc...]" Government "protecting rights" is too strongly associated with policies that actually favor one groups rights at the expense of another groups rights (i.e. affirmative action)
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Spot on.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	You cannot delete "No individual, group, or government may initiate force against any other individual, group, or government."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"personal choices" is vague, the second sentence is didactic rather than descriptive

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Last sentence you end with the phrase, "Government's proper role is to protect the rights of every individual ... and to guarantee not only the liberty of each person to make personal choices but also not protect the individual from the consequences of those choices."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The right to make a choice does NOT depend on both understanding that it has consequences and accepting responsibility for them. The consequences and responsibility follow from the action taken and do not depend on understanding them.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	One of the government roles... ..right to make personal choices to the extent that it doesn't intergere with rights of other people..
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The right to make a choice does not depend on understanding it has consequences and accepting responsibility. It is a right, not a privilege.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe there should be a reference to the US Constitution and I do not feel that the Libertarian reference should be used but instead "We the People". When you use "Libertarian", you separate into just another political party.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would remove or reword the sentence "Government's proper role is to protect the rights of every individual." Possible rewording: "To secure these rights, Governments are instituted with the consent of the governed, whenever any form of government violates individual rights, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Excellent rewrite!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think the new wording is far clearer.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I feel first one is easier to understand with quick read.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A clearer framing of the same concept.

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This statement does a half-assed job of mingling concepts of "self-ownership" and "rights" and "government's role". To one who already understands the libertarian philosophy, the relationship between "self-ownership" and "rights" and "government's role" is already clear. To anyone else, this statement is a confusing kludge of various concepts. No one, except people who are already libertarian, understand that the "right to make personal choices" stems from "individual self ownership" or that government is indeed an instrument of force and therefor has a "proper role" which is far smaller than what most people are willing to accept. Anyone who truly understands the libertarian philosophy cannot help but become a libertarian. The "libertarian problem" is that people do NOT fully understand the libertarian philosophy. They don't understand why you can't simultaneously force others to do your own bidding while expecting them not to force you to do theirs. This statement does not improve on the original plank. It does not clarify the libertarian philosophy and it does not.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The libertarian party is the only party in America whose platform is based on respect for the individual and protection of rights for said person and property. The only legitimate role of government is for protection of individuals rights only.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I worry about the word "understanding". It leaves room for paternalistic assumptions about entire groups of people clearly NOT understanding the ramifications of certain choices, else they wouldn't make them. Not sure I have an alternative for you, though.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Free individuals also own the fruit of their moral labor, and their ideas.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Needs tweaking - "recognize individual self-ownership" - what the heck does that mean? Sounds like politically correct "legal-eze" garbage. The rest of the change is good and actually clarifies things.

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would support this proposal if yow insert the word "adult" after the word "individual's"
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It is still not worded well. I do not like the "Libertarians recognize" - although of course we do. It is the LP plank, so we do not need to say that. How about: "Individuals have the right to make personal choices and they must accept the responsibility of those choices. Our support of an individual's right to make choices does not mean that we approve or disapprove of those choices. Government's proper role is to protect the rights of every individual."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Basically support it. I would change the phrase "individual self-ownership" to "individual self-determination."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It reads better if the second sentence comes third and the third sentence becomes the second..
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Too statist in tone. Conservatives are pushing the "responsibility" meme to promote societal acceptance and justification of a (state) government's authority to define and impose responsibility/consequences. The existing language uses the "right" once, and the proposed revision uses "right(s)" five times; too much "rights" talk.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I agree with the direction, that the we are trying to go here, but the statement: "and the right to make a choice depends on both understanding that it has consequences and accepting responsibility for them." This statement opens the door for people to deny responsibility for their actions. Great start, but this change opens the door for more criticism than it corrects.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	GREAT fix
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Too wordy, however I support only the very last sentence of this proposal
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Why eliminate the "initiate force" language?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"choice" is singular, "them" is plural. This sentence is unnecessarily wordy.

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think the first, existing version reads better and there's nothing wrong with mentioning points covered in another block if its used as a lead-in sentence. As long as it isn't turbid or turgid, we are okay. The alternative sentence I think seems legalistic, and people will read from that and run.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Making a choice doesn't necessarily result in a "Consequence" which implies a negative implication. Of course, in instances where a personal choice made results in a consequence the individual should be fully accountable and not attempt to hold another party liable unless they were directly involved with altering circumstances which changes the whole nature of the issue related to the choice being made.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Nice touch on the responsibilities. Our society is so focused on rights they forgot the corollary is responsibility
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	These are very similar, but the new wording puts more emphasis on personal responsibility.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	why not add an age at the end of the first sentence...."after age 18"
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would suggest adding, "Our country's Declaration of Independence states that we are endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness.' The Declaration thus places rights in the hands of each individual, along with the personal responsibility for the choices each person makes. Therefore, Libertarians...."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The initiation of force is not just a foreign policy issue. Governments us force to deny natural rights to individuals. Recently in Pinellas County FL, sheriff deputies arrived at a house at 10:30 at night with a SWAT team and requested a "voluntary" search. The man felt coerced by the show of force to allow the warrantless search. The deputies found nothing. Their reasonable cause? He purchased hydroponic equipment, so he must be growing drugs.

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Responsibilities in this proposal seem to be a negative. Being a responsible individual is a good thing. Government's role is to protect those individual choices would keep things in context.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I recommend keeping the sentence regarding "force" as I believe this is a primary concept that should not be lost. If that can be worked into the new proposal somehow, I think it would be much better.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	maybe change 'self-ownership' to 'self-determination'; 'ownership' seems to have different connotations.... i think everyone understands 'freedom' and if there's a way to put that word back in [at the start], it would help with the notion of individual freedom to live the life we choose.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	This is my rewrite... Libertarians recognize individual self-ownership and the right to make personal choices. Supporting individual rights does not mean that we approve/disapprove thier choices. The right to make choices depends on both understanding the consequences and accepting responsibility for them. The Government has it's duty to protect the rights of every individual.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Third sentence: "the right to make a choice depends on both understanding that it has consequences and accepting responsibility for them." No, the right doesn't depend on these things; it exists even if you don't understand that it has consequences and don't accept responsibility for them. Perhaps "making a choice can have consequences and the person who makes a choice must accept responsibility for those consequences." Fourth sentence: This sentence seems out of place here: only the right to make personal choices has been discussed in this plank, yet this sentence applies to all individual rights. Its current placement makes "right to make personal choices" seem like the only right.

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	would prefer a word other than "ownership", maybe "self-governance". Also needs a stronger word than "depends", say, "the right to make a choice requires both.." Instead of "them" (too vague), use "those consequences"
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What kind of choices? Can you change to "make personal choices about the way the live their lives." It seems too generic, just personal choices. It needs some more weight.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Making the right to make a choice conditional on understanding and accepting consequences/responsibility could too easily be used to legitimize force. Enumerating a right for the government is also troubling.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	. . .and the consequent right . . . [With rights come. .] The freedom to make personal choices entails an obligation to understand their consequences and to accept responsibility for them.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The new proposal is too wordy and more complicated to understand to possible new supporters- the simpler the better
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	(1) Who is going to judge whether I "understand" the consequences of my acts? Of course, I may be insane or I may be a 3-year-old. But we cannot address every possible exception to a principle. Should we change the 2nd Amendment so that the right to keep and bear arms applies only to those who "understand the consequences" of using a gun? Certain things must be assumed. (2) The final sentence is already stated in Principle 3.0. (3) My suggestion is to keep the old language but to amend the first sentence as follows: "Individuals should be free to make choices for themselves and to face the consequences of their choices." "Accepting responsibility" for a choice is more a matter of personal maturity than it is a matter of political rights.

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I understand the need for revision on this as was pointed out in its proposal. However, although I think the rewrite is an improvement, I do not like its wording. May I suggest the following instead: "Libertarians support the free exercise of rights by everyone. Every choice made, belief held, word spoken and action taken is a cause which has an inherent set of consequences that follow from it and we, libertarians, hold that the person exercising their free will owns those consequences for such actions and are obligated to take responsibility for them. Libertarians do not approve of every action taken by another person, but will defend their right to make that choice. We hold that government's proper role is to protect the lives of its citizens, their rights to exercise their free will in accordance with their conscience, and to protect their property from theft and destruction from others." The reason for the rewrite is because the statement "With rights come responsibilities, and the right to make a choice depends on both understanding it has consequences and
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I would probably support this change if the "no initiation of force" language was preserved in it.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The Libertarian platform should NEVER include any statements implying government has a proper role.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think this is a good statement of where I stand, but I have some concern the statement may be "too educated" for some I wish to attract. On short notice, I cannot think of a better way to phrase the thought.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Awkward wording. Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We follow the self-evident natural law - God's law. No laws of enforcement unless you are violating another persons rights.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The language of the change is more obtuse than the original. Individuals are sovereign. They must be free to make their own choices and accept the consequences. Government's role is to protect individual rights.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Keep it simple

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Seems clearer and I appreciate the statement of Government's proper role.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't think the original was that bad except for the implication that one can be free to accept responsibility or not.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Original statement was correct, given that the person is of correct mind, not a ward/minor/etc. The new statement should not leave out the initiation of force notice.
Oppose Support	Likely Unlikely	No No	Non-Member Non-Member	Initiating force is a key deletion here IMO. This is the single-most important part of libertarianism. It needs to be much stronger. The moralness of the second sentence is just plain inappropriate. Simply come out and say, "The only role of government is to protect individual rights. Personal liberty is the hallmark of our platform. Every individual has the absolute right to do anything they want except initiate the use of force against others, and government must protect this right absolutely."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is definitely better than the previous! But it's still not unequivocal about self-ownership, with innate rights, and self-government that naturally follows from that concept. It should be amended further to say: "Libertarians recognize individual self-ownership with all the innate rights of existence and self-government that includes. We thus support an individual's right to make choices regardless of who approves or disapproves of them, as long as they do not violate anyone else's rights. With choices come consequences, and making a choice means understanding that it has consequences and the responsibility of accepting those consequences. In such a society, if any outside, over-arching government of a small elite group ruling and overseeing others is thought to be necessary, its -- and their -- only proper roll must be strictly limited to protecting the rights of every individual against unprovoked infringement of those rights."

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We have too much of governments proper role protecting the rights of every individual. This should maybe be redefined as Governments role is to protect that the rights of every individual are not infringed, as long as they do not harm others.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I would insert the word "only" between "Government's" and "proper role" in the last sentence.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the "obligation" to accept the consequences.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	However, I would change the last sentence to say "Government's proper role is to protect every individual from force or fraud initiated by others." As presently stated, "rights" could be deemed unlimited.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It clarifies the fact that the government's only act is to protect the right of EVERY individual- aka not legislating any particular ideology. It's in easy to understand terms.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I disagree with part of it. We are born with rights and these rights DO NOT depend on anybody's understanding or acceptance. I would ommit ", and the right to make..... responsibility for them".
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I have tried to get everyone I know to vote libertarin they have been so prrpagandize from the government and mediia its hard ill vote libertarianlibertarian but go RON PAUL
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If it ain't broke, don't fix it.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Even with the risk of repeating an idea stated elsewhere, I prefer the first version. I think personal liberty and responsibility require an acknowledgement that it does not extend to forcing others to comply with the choices an individual makes simply because they are willing to accept the consequences of those actions. This is a statement of ideals and expectations as they relate to personal liberty.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Last sentence, maybe... "Government's proper role is the protect the rights and liberties of every individual."

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Change "it has consequences and accepting responsibility for them" to "it has consequences and accepting responsibility for it". "it" refers to "a choice" (singular) earlier in the sentence.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Would entertain added additon after Governments proper role ..and many not intiate force against any other individual or group.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Who determines which rights are to be protected ? If individuals have individual rights, what rights does the collective have. Who protects the individual from the 'rights' of the collective?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Does this fully communicate that we recognize our own rights equally with other's rights? -- autonomy in self and autonomy in all others
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree with the last sentence, but think it deserves a section of its own. Its more than just a reason we like Personal Liberty. Its a fundamental part of what we believe.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It does make the position clearer.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Vastly Improved
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	People Should do as they wish as long as, it doesn't effect, that of another!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	education is important to facilitate good choices
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"...individuals right to make choices (that do not infringe upon the rights of others)
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	the statement about the Governments proper role is too broad and allows "them" to interfere in order to "protect" rights.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Don't like the wording of "se3lf-ownership". I don't think an outsider would understand the term.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	In support of the LIMITED powers of government, I recommend changing the last sentence to, "Government's proper role is limited to protecting the rights of every individual."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Don't like the "self-ownership" language

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Government's proper role is to protect the rights of every individual. Strike this. Government's proper role is to protect sovereign citizens from unlimited, tyrannical, central, autocratic and self serving government; such as now exists. Government's proper role is to follow the Constitution precisely to the letter of the law and remain limited and deliberative, not expansive and expeditive.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Libertarians recognize free will, personal sovereignty and the natural right to make personal choices.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It is not enough to generalize government's proper role. It should mention here or somewhere that government must/should pass or repeal laws that infringe on an individuals right to free choice. An interesting idea is a waiver system that allows an individual over 21 to sign that he is accepting responsibility for his own actions when choosing to indulge in what might be considered risque behavior.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Not sure how this gives candidates the protection against the "3 year old" accusations, since it doesn't mention adults or any other age criteria.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Original wording is better IMO and there is no proper role for government. Government is force.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I have a bit of a problem with the 3rd sentence, as it seems to imply that failure to understand that a choice has consequences and to accept responsibility for them justifies a forfeiture of ones right to choose. I believe the true libertarian position is that ones right to choose is absolute, however there is no right to shirk the responsibility for the consequences of ones choices. In other words, a person IS responsible for the consequences of his choices, whether he understands the consequences or accepts responsibility for them.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i prefer the second version below.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The old language was a much clearer and stronger statement of Libertarians understanding, support of personal liberty.

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While I completely agree with the sentiment behind both phrases, using the term Libertarian is redundant. It is still very abstract to most people. More below.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We must accept that no one has the option to do things that hurt or threaten their neighbors rights to life, liberty, and happiness. (one has the right to drink as an adult, but not to drink and drive and threaten the lives of others)
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While I appreciate the intent of the change, and agree with the stated purpose, I don't think this particular choice of wording helps the effort...instead, I think it actually confuses the issue (I've been a Libertarian a long time, and I really don't remember hearing "individual self-ownership" used before...it's an odd phrasing, and does not answer more questions than it brings up...the same can be said for the structure of the third sentence...you can strike "or disapprove" from the second sentence, and actually improve the meaning).
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'd add this phrase at the end: to make personal choices for themselves and voluntarily in concert with others.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But it does not matter.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Word it like this instead. "Libertarians recognize individual self-ownership, that is, the right to make choices along with the obligation to understand the consequences and accept the responsibilities those choices carry, regardless of whether we we approve or disapprove of those choices."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	less wordy but says what is needed
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Substituting "Government's proper role, such that it is, should and ought to be confined to the protection of the rights of individuals, rooted first in self-ownership, these right being all derivative thereof, and are summarized as the right to life, to liberty, and to enjoyment and use of property which has not been gained by force or fraud" might state the principle better.

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What if an individual will not accept responsibility or doesn't understand the consequences of their choices? Statists will argue that many won't or can't understand consequences or accept responsibility so the State must "protect" those people.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I don't think you need the second sentence. I would put a period after "responsibilities". Additionally, the right to make choices means more than understanding it has consequences but actually understanding the consequences and accepting them. Government's role in this process is to leave us alone so that life, liberty, property and voluntary association evolve naturally
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	to protect these rights of every ...
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Government's proper role is to protect the "liberty" of every individual. If the government protects my liberty, it is my responsibility to protect my rights.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would support the following revision. The second sentence fits better at the end of this paragraph. Suggest edit the 3rd sentence as follows, "With personal rights comes responsibilities, and the right to make personal choices includes both an understanding of the consequences and accepting responsibility for those choices.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Rights don't come with responsibilities. Rights came first (God not government given rights). Responsibilities come with living in a society, which we do. The reason for mentioning this is that having an individual societal responsibility to respect the welfare of others does not mean a societal right to protect us from ourselves, which is the excuse given for much bad legislation. Adding something like legally responsible adult may help to avoid the stated problem about 3-year-olds.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Revise second sentence. It sounds too much like a CYA disclaimer.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The new wording is much clearer.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Do not omit the initiation of force language. It is the essence of the libertarian political philosophy.

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think there should also be mentioned something about infringing upon the rights of others
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The previous language of "No individual, group, or government may initiate force against any other individual, group, or government," was far too broad. It categorically forbids military engagement to protect defenseless peoples persecuted by regimes bent on death, and thus was complicit in permitting that not only liberty, but life itself, be denied to those beyond our borders.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Second sentence should read "Our support for an individual's right to choose does not mean...."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I understand why the plank was rephrased - but the new phrasing lacks the clarity and punch of the original. How about: It is a fundamental freedom to be able to make choices for one's self and to accept the responsibility for that choice and its consequences. The role of government is to protect this freedom and other rights of the individual. The Libertarian Party doesn't need to agree with an individual's choice in order to defend their right to make it.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't like the statement "self ownership" If you keep the first line and change the rest I would be ok with it.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Love it.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	'Government's proper role is to protect the rights of every individual' - it's not necessarily the role of government to prioritize the protection of these rights. please read the constitution. We should start with the elimination of the EEOC. The EEOC is an example of federal government oppression on business owners and capitalism in general.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Reference to age of majority and/or legal competence maybe purposeful in this proposal.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I AM NOT CRAZY ABOUT THE TERM "SELF-OWNERSHIP" ISN'T THERE A BETTER WORD, LIKE RESPONSIBILITY, OR SELF DETERMINATION?

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Seems wordy. "As long as you're not hurting someone else. It's okay."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Both say the same thing.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	No matter what is proposed, this corrupt present Federal Govt. will make it sound bad to the people.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	[I have re-written the proposal as follows]: "Libertarians recognize individual self-ownership and the right to make personal choices, along with the acceptance of personal responsibility, including whatever personal consequences follow such choices. We contend that the Government's proper role is to protect the rights of every individual, including the right to make their own life choices regarding the safety and welfare of themselves and their families.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"depends on both understanding" That is too much. Take that part out. We're not writing legal language that gives an out to the mentally challenged for not understanding that they are responsible for their choices.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The Party *must* understand that there are those of us who believe that an "individual" includes a unborn fetus.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"responsibility for those consequences"
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I think it can still be read as allowing for the shirking of responsibilities, and is no great improvement.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It is a key item in our beliefs. However it is written in legalese, a jargon that I find offensive. Can we use colloquial English or the King's English?
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I like the clause about self ownership, but believe the language of the original statement is cleaner.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Should read: "Libertarians recognize individual self-ownership and the right to make personal choices. With rights come responsibilities, and the right to make a choice depends on both understanding that it has consequences and accepting responsibility for them. Government's proper role is to protect the rights of every individual." The entire second sentence is not necessary.

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	slight change: ...is to EQUALLY support the rights of every individual...
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	the term self-ownership. why must we creaye new words. the right to life liberty and the persuit of happyness works for me . stop trying to reenvent the wheel
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Humans are not property belonging to themselves or another, so I would say "self-determination" rather than self-ownership. In the third sentance, change "...responsibility for them." to "...responsibility for those consequences."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The change is preachy, not a statement of purpose.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	the right to make a choice DOES NOT depend on what one understands this needs to rewritten !
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe in our constitutional rights as a people to make a effort to follow the American dream. With that effort comes consequences and greatness. We as the American people have the resources to do so and our government shouldn't stop our dreams from becoming a reality. If we make efforts to damage either our society or our well being then the government should intervene and we as a people should take the responsibility, but we shouldn't try to let that happen.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"Government's proper role is to *enforce the responsibilities* and protect the rights ..." ?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would say something like "adult individuals" to forstall the inevitable nonsense of saying we want children to choose
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think Gov's proper role should be to protect THIS described right to choose, for every individual. (Though "right to choose" should be reworded to avoid confusion with abortion specific issues).
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	It removes one of the major tenets of our party. This being that it is wrong to initiate force.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe you could leave out the approve or disapprove part, as that should be a given.

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There's a little grammatical error when you say, "it has consequences ... accepting responsibility for them". "Them" is plural, but "it" is singular. Make them both "them" or both "it".
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	too wordy, take a lesson from the founders. impact is a function of precision.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I feel like the added wording makes it a harder read for the common voter.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Clear up the language. Make everything plural: In the 3rd sentence, it should read: "With rights come responsibilities, and the right to make CHOICES depends on both understanding that THEY HAVE consewences..."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't like the 3rd person voice. I would rather an active "we recognize" than "libertarians recognize."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree with this. The government can not approve or disapprove of anything because the government is not alive and does not have thoughts of its own. There for it is only here to protect peoples ability to make their own choices. Thank You
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like 1B better.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Depends? Sorry, I don't get it. "the right to make a choice depends on both understanding that it has consequences and accepting responsibility for them."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The Libertarian Party opposes criminalization of hard narcotic drugs like heroin,cocaine and methamphetamine. Besides being irresponsible, this will make the Libertarian Party ineffectual in ever receiving a majority vote of the American people..What will the consequences be of decriminalizing these drugs?More addicts,more so cial problems and more deaths...This is absolutely foolish. Think outside the box.This position of decriminalizing hard drugs is tantamount to disaster.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	rights and responsibilities are inseparable in any free society
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Although I support the wording of the change, the third sentence is a run-on. It requires proper punctuation.

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think the initial one was worded better. (in red)
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Start with Sentence 3, then 1, then 2 and then 4.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"the right to make a choice depends on ..." implies there is a third party with the authority to decide whether a particular individual may exercise their rights.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I like keeping planks to a single issue each.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We can't (and shouldn't) babysit the world. We have to make laws that protect peoples right to free choice but also protect Life, Liberty & the pursuit of Happiness.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is my recommendation: Libertarians recognize that personal liberty means self-ownership. An individual should have the freedom to make personal choices with an understanding and acceptance of the consequences of those choices. Our support of an individual's right to make choices does not mean that we approve or disapprove of those choices. Libertarians view government's proper role as ensuring the right of individuals to make personal choices for themselves and voluntarily in concert with others.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would support if we include "--including those of the unborn" after "every individual" in the last sentence.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The original writing is not as vague as the new one. For example the last line "Government's proper role is to protect the rights of every individual" Government presently forces the rights of a few individuals upon the majority and makes the majority fiscally responsible for the choices of a few. It is not the right of any individual to ask government to enforce their personal view upon everyone else. The ambiguity of the last statement leaves the door open for just that.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Needs to be simplified, less wordy.

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The phrasing of the current proposal does not flow well (ie is difficult to follow unless reading slowly). I preferred the organization of the original. I agree with your assessment of "free to...accept responsibility" "Accept responsibility for" implies there is the option not to. What if you replaced "accept responsibility for" with "face". I also liked your changing the from a general "choices" to a more specific "personal choices". Final draft: Individuals should be free to make personal choices for themselves and to face the consequences of those choices. Our support of an individual's right to make choices does not mean that we approve or disapprove of those choices. Government's proper role is to protect the rights of every individual.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The government is responsible for protecting the rights of "the" individual. While this can be considered semantics, it is none the less a considerable philosophical concept since if government is charged with protecting the rights of every individual it precludes the states, the local , and the individual responsibility of each individual. Protecting the rights of every individual implies that some individuals have rights that others may not. The assignment of different rights for different individuals is what has led to so many societal issues today where government has overstepped its authority.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support this despite the term "self ownership," mostly because the term has no real meaning in the wider world.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Somewhere you need to cover that an individual's right to make choices is limited by harmful impact on others.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Government's proper role is >only< to protect the rights of every individual.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Personal freedom requires personal responsibility. It is only when an individual hurts others and refuses to accept responsibility for his/her actions that the government should become involved.

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I disagree with the second sentence of the proposal. An individual's rights are inalienable, therefore not dependent on their understanding of the personal responsibility of having those rights, or the consequences of exercising them in violation of another citizen's equal rights. The second sentence should therefore be replaced with something more in line with the Declaration of Independence: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness." You can't argue with the words of our Founding Fathers!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	very readable, and a significant improvement in describing the position.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't think its better or worse
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	It is better as it stands. I support the current wording where it says, " No individual, group, or government may initiate force against any other individual, group, or government." that wording should stand. the revision has the statement, " Government's proper role is to protect the rights of every individual." that should be added and worked into the former.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Leave first sentence and strike the rest.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	...make a choice requires both an understanding and acceptance of responsibility for them. ...
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	It removes the non-aggression clause with out an equivalent replacement.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Is it worth muddying this up to clarify that abdicating from a choice may also have consequences for which the party is responsible?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Too long and convoluted. Prefer: "Libertarians support and defend personal liberty, if the exercise of that liberty does not harm others, while recognizing that with freedom comes personal responsibility and decisions have consequences".

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't think you are making it much better. Idea: "Individuals have an inalienable right to life, liberty and property. Individuals have self ownership and the right to make choices as long as it does not interfere with another person's inalienable rights. Government's proper role is to protect those rights."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We oppose the use of force to infringe upon an individual's right to self-ownership.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would clarify "self-ownership". If it is taken to literally mean ownership of one's body as a physical object, and that ownership is transferrable, it opens up interpretations that allow things like selling oneself into slavery, etc...
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I like parts of both statements. From statement 1, I like "Individuals should be free to make choices for themselves and to accept responsibility for the consequences of the choices they make" because it is very clear and powerful. From Statement 2, I like "Government's proper role is to protect the rights of every individual." I also like the "Our support of an individual's right to make choices does not mean that we approve or disapprove of those choices" sentence from both statements.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	right to Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. ...an individual's right comes with responsibilities. Government's
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Support, except that I don't see how it corrects the following: "and additionally gives our candidates protection against accusations that we think 3-year-olds can choose whether or not to use heroin, drive cars, and carry guns"
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Change the word depends to, is predicated
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Change "does not mean" -- clumsy double negative -- to "connotes neither approval nor disapproval" Remove "both" -- redundant and breaks flow Change "proper" to "only appropriate"

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would expand and clarify by saying "Libertarians recognize THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF individual self-ownership". Otherwise, we're right back to debating with other parties whether self-ownership is granted by the state.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It is also not the role of government to protect individuals from their own stupidity.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Don't puss out on attacking government initiation of force. We already have 2 political parties that sell out their principles for what is "politically expedient."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What the hell is "self-ownership" . Even though English isn't officially the national language, please use the plain version of it.
Oppose Support	Unlikely Unlikely	No No	Non-Member Non-Member	The original is more succinct. If the alternate proposal does not pass, then I would recommend leaving out the "With rights come responsibilities, and" clause as superlative to the rest of the sentence.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Leave in the "No individual, group, or government may initiate force against any other individual, group, or government".
Oppose Oppose	Unlikely Unlikely	No No	Non-Member Non-Member	Prior wording seems better The 3.0 "coverage" of non-initiation-of-force is faint and late. Also, its presence in 1.0 is meaningful even if the reasoning is missing: personal liberty *stops* at the point of initiation of force.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We should leave in the sentence concerning the initiation of force. This is the core of libertarianism.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Not "self-ownership" use "right of self determination"
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"recognize individual self-ownership and " doesn't mean anything, it would be better to replace with "believe in the right"
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	"the right to make a choice depends on both understanding that it has consequences" sounds like as long as I am considered ignorant that I have no right to make a choice.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We recognize no difference between personal and economic rights as they are both linked.

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	something doesn't feel right
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is good but I like 1b even better
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Libertarians believe that individuals own themselves and that government does not own its citizens. Ownership of oneself provides freedom and imposes responsibility. Individuals make personal choices as to how to conduct their lives and are required to accept responsibility for the outcome. The proper role of the government is to protect the choice, not to mandate the result.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Like the first part of the change...as we dealing with a right. However rights, by definition do not have a conditional nature. Although I agree that there is a responsibility dimension to the right to free choices, applying responsibilities implies someone would have to legislate those responsibilities. But if, as Ronald Dworkin, et a argue "Rights are Trumps", then responsibility may certainly desired, but not mandated.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The non-aggression principle is vital to libertarianism. That language is removed in the proposed change. Also, it is questionable as to whether protecting rights is something that should be entrusted to the "state." See for example the words of Hans Hoppe on this issue.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The proposed new first sentence is good. However, the loss of the initiation of force language is bad, and the last proposed sentence violates the Dallas Accord, which I think is still important.

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We are "The Party of Principle." So, it might be useful to insert this language into the revised statement on Personal Liberty. E.G. "Libertarians recognize THE PRINCIPLE of self-ownership" ("individual self-ownership" is redundant). Better yet, "Libertarians recognize THE PRINCIPLE of self-ownership; THAT THE INDIVIDUAL IS THE MORALLY RIGHTFUL GOVERNOR OF HIS OWN PERSON AND POWERS. MOREOVER, LIBERTARIANS BELIEVE THAT THIS IS A NATURAL AND INALIENABLE RIGHT, INHERENT TO OUR HUMANITY. Finishing with the parts about "Government's proper role . . . and "With rights come responsibilities" is good, so keep that.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It at least reads now like someone not on drugs wrote it.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The wording is quite frankly, awkward. A platform shouldn't be emotional, but the plank revision seems far too static and forced.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	My elderly mother suffers from dementia. As baby boomers age, it will become a larger issue for society. The fact is that some people need help and are not able to make rational choices. Three year olds are just one end of the continuum.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This makes the point much clearer.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I am concerned about the wording that indicates that the right to make a choice depends on anything other than a God-given right to make a choice. It is far too easy for the government to deny our choice in matters because, in the government's opinion, we don't fully understand the consequences. Delete the third sentence completely and the proposal would be satisfactory.

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Government protection of rights must inherently rely on taxation, which is the negation of rights. Private defense agencies and courts can supply the services much better. Libertarianism can best be summed up by property rights (and the Non-Aggression Principle). Not much beyond that is needed. Common law will solve.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Has been watered down from the original sentiments. Not strong, not powerful, and no clearer than the original. Wimpy and forgettable.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	don't like the term "self-ownership"
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"Our support of an individual's right to make choices does not mean that we approve or disapprove of those choices." This sentence is unnecessary. If you believe in something you should not make excuses for it and that is all this sentence is, an excuse, it has no place in a party platform. I would delete it, completely.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	much better! concise with more powerful language
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	It is the role of the individual to accept responsibility for the outcome of their choice. (possible final sentence)
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It should be simple to put in language that makes it clear that responsibility comes with attaining an age where one may be presumed capable of rational decisions.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	much better.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would replace the last sentence with the following: "Government's proper role is to protect people from force or fraud on the part of others."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Last sentence needs explicit constraint to limit government's individual right's protection to avoid interfering with another citizen's rights.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do not know where to put this BUT I believe it is very important to end all dual citizenship which allows many people outside the USA in a united block of voters to override the will of the American people in the USA.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	In first sentence, I suggest you insert "of adults" between "right" and "to make".

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Pronoun number (plural vs singular) is incorrect... try again from a grammatical point of view. "Individual self-ownership" is too pop-psychology sounding.... trendy and undignified. Communicates an unclear concept.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Instead of depends on both understanding that it has consequences and accepting responsibility for them should simply say depends on accepting responsibility for the consequences Otherwise, it sounds like we are supporting a "Department of Understanding Consequences".
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Keep the prohibition against initiation of force.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The wording could be more direct i.e. Libertarians accept individual responsibility for the choices they choose. Governments proper role is to provide for the blessings of liberty and individual protection of natural freedoms.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Definitely a logical improvement.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Government's only legitimate role is to protect the rights of individuals. The only proper restriction of liberty is where that liberty infringes on the rights or autonomy of another.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	...right to make a choice DEPENDS on... The right to make a choice does not depend on anything. It is absolute. The lack of understanding and acceptance of 'consequences' may lead to sorry outcomes, but does not preclude the right to make a choice.

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"...the right to make a choice depends on both understanding that it has consequences and accepting responsibility for them." This language makes it sound like anyone who doesn't understand the consequences of their choice loses the right to make it. Now, believe me, I am a libertarian to my very soul and I completely understand the idea behind what is being said, I can just see how this could be misconstrued that ignorant people don't have the right to choose. The right to make choices while maintaining ignorance is one I believe every American has, but ignorance shields nobody from the consequences of their own choices and actions.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	The only line I draw when it comes to personal responsibility, is when it comes to violent crimes. Murder, rape, etc. I know, no one in the party supports groups like NAMBLA or bestiality! I don't want voters, to think the libertarian party would not want people who do horrible things like that would be allowed to be free under a libertarian gov't. Sad to say, but many people see a fine line between anarchy & libertarianism.
Support Oppose	Unlikely Unlikely	No No	Non-Member Non-Member	Yes, rights include responsibilities! You have to be more specific like "I WILL GIVE TO EACH AMERICAN A \$75,000 LIVING CARD IF YOU ELECT ME FOR U.S. PRESIDENT"; "I WILL ISSUE \$50 TRILLION NEW FIAT MONEY ELIMINATING THE FEDERAL RESERVE"; "WE WILL MANUFACTURE ONE HUNDRED PERCENT IN AMERICA USING THE FEDERAL LANDS CREATING 100 JOBS". If you need help call me to 571-288-7383. My family could donate also \$100 million to your PAC. Thanks Alberto Lopez WWW.EBLM.US
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The last sentence is the most important part and should be first.

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"and the right to make a choice depends..." sounds like the individuals right is dependent, whereas in actuality the individual has the right to choose whether or not they care about or understand the consequences of a choice. They do however remain accountable for them even if they do not "accept responsibility"
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A definition of "individual" would clarify this. Otherwise, the new text just makes things much much worse. Some choices do NOT depend on the acceptance of responsibility for those choices. This new language clearly erodes the very concept of inherent rights. Yes, some rights have a corresponding responsibility. But not all of them (e.g., the right to self-ownership). Why unnecessarily complicate things?
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	short and to the point
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The right to make stupid uninformed choices goes hand in hand with our purpose. The right to make a choice does not need the understanding that it has consequences or what those consequences are; just the responsibility for whatever consequences your actions have. A right that has requirements is a privilege.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Highly support this change
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Libertarians recognize an individual's right to self-determination and to make choices according to their personal ethics. Our support of an individual's right to make such choices does not mean that we approve or disapprove of those choices. Such rights come with responsibilities, and the right to make a choice is therefore dependent on understanding relevant consequences and accepting responsibility for such consequences. We believe that government's proper role in this matter is to protect the individual's right to choose.

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The revision eliminates the dictum against initiation of force. If one supports free choice but does not oppose repressive force intended to restrict free choice, the position becomes empty and meaningless.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The LP has many anarcho-libertarians who, like me, object to language saying government has a "proper role" in anything at all, since that implies that the LP is a strictly minarchist organization. Plus, this change removes the reference to the initiation of force, which is a key LP concept.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Better wording, and the proposed language seems more focused.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Support, with reservations. I like the non-initiation-of-force concept that is in the current plank. Also, I would rather say that "Government's proper role is to protect the liberties of every individual." "Rights" sounds like things that the government is supposed to provide to us; "liberties" suggests things that the government can't do to us.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Like the wording of the original better.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Replace "recognize" with "value".
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Jeeez. Cut the verbose crap. It's just this: "Government's proper role is to protect the rights of every individual."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is a very good change, in general. However, an excellent point was made in last sentence, and this should not be lost. I suggest inserting this old sentence as the next-to-last sentence of the new text: support of an individual's right to make choices in life does not mean that we necessarily approve or disapprove of those choices.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Existing language is preferable because it precludes the initiation of force. The proposed language is problematic because it assigns a role to government and so violates the Dallas Accord.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The old wording is confusing

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Assuming that most people criticising the party platform are capable of inferring that we hold three-year-olds as not responsible for their own actions, this seems like a fair ammendment.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Different language: Libertarians support the right of individuals to make choices, but this does not mean that we approve or disapprove of those choices. With rights come responsibilities, to both understand what are the consequences of their choices, and to accept responsibility for them. The proper role of government is to protect the rights of every member of society, both from itself and from individuals who might infringe on them.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	A much smoother wording of the same principle,
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I dislike removal of the initiation of force message. The rest of it is better worded, I think, and I would not oppose the change provided that it is clear that it is wrong to initiate force. Too many people believe that protecting rights includes punishing people for vague "harm to society" behaviors.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	As long as "individual" is meant to be a human being and not an embryo. After all, is an egg a chicken?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The "consequences" are not detailed. Does it mean "free to accept incarceration for cultivation of cannabis?" It's a little weak.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Non-initiation of force was one of the key points in the Libertarian philosophy. Is this covered elsewhere?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A right to choose is embedded in the declaration of adulthood, whatever age that is as determined by the state in which a person lives. If one is mentally or psychologically impaired, his rights might be curtailed accordingly, but only as prescribed by the laws of any state.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The word "both" in the third sentence seems redundant.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i support this and believe in it whole heartedly
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The first sentence sets up the second sentence.

1.0 Personal Liberty

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.6%	13.4%	100.0%
Commenters	57.3%	42.8%	10.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think you could use more clarity about the last sentence. It is very broad.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't particularly believe the change in language makes a significant difference.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Original is simpler. Revision is not markedly better.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The new version states the idea in a much clearer way.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Not happy that the "initiate force" part was removed. I think this is one of the most important points.

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.

	Support	All
All Respondents	41.3%	41.3%
Commenters	41.6%	8.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	the first version is more succinct
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Way too wordy. Who will read and/or understand its implications
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again you are assuming a considered choice. The current system does not provide for educated, informed decisions. Currently there are no consequences. Make your choice, live with the consequences. Do not infringe upon the rights of others or ask them to pay for your choices. As long as the integrity of personal choice is protected it dosent matter if "we" agree with the choice of not. The simpler the better. The original statement is clearer.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This one is TL;DR. The previous one is better.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think the way the second one is written is too wordy. I don't like the way the word consequences is stressed. Overall- tends to lose interest. "This ideal creates unrivaled freedom and abundance, and allows the greatest number to pursue happiness in their daily lives. " I'm thinking this sentence is not necessary.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This recommendation is way too wordy.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Merge them a bit? Or at the end of the of the first add a "And thats what made America so great" or something
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Likely	No	Non-Member	This second proposal seems unnecessarily wordy.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Likely	No	Non-Member	See comment for 1.0
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The second recommendation is written with a wordiness that furthers the perception and, in all honesty, the reality that the planks of our platform are an exercise in philosophical masturbation.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The second is too wordy and unclear

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.

	Support	All
All Respondents	41.3%	41.3%
Commenters	41.6%	8.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer my version noted in the comments above. I think it more concisely conveys the concepts of both options presented here.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Although well written, it is wordy -- 3 sentences in 7 lines! -- it over states what the first proposal already says.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree with the stated purpose here, but this is way too wordy.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Likely	No	Non-Member	Too many words. I do not think an average non-Libertarian would know what is being described.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This one seems wordy and philosophical.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	First sentence of this proposal needs to have added at the end: "and that such choices do not impose negative consequences on others".
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This second one hammers "American" a little too hard. The first one was enough.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	1b is far too wordy. 1a is best.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This proposal is a little too wordy. To me, the first one says the same things, but more strongly and concisely.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The second proposal is not clear, and is too wordy.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Likely	No	Non-Member	This plank is too wordy and has too much passive voice. Simpler is better.

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.

	Support	All
All Respondents	41.3%	41.3%
Commenters	41.6%	8.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Lots of run on sentences. The new version is less comprehensible in my opinion. I would propose something more like the following: The right of individual choice is a fundamentally American concept. Government's proper role is to ensure the rights of individuals to make personal choices for themselves and to voluntarily make choice in concert with others. With every right comes responsibility. The individual must bear the consequences of their choices, and those choices must not infringe on the rights of others. By understanding and celebrating our diversity as one of our greatest strengths, we necessarily acknowledge that we will not approve of all choices by all individuals. This Libertarian ideal creates unrivaled freedom and abundance while providing the greatest opportunity to pursue happiness.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The second proposal seems more positive but also more clouded with campaign-style rhetoric. The point is more clearly defined in the first proposal.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	with the comment added about section one.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The first one cuts to the chase.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This one is a little wordy.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This one doesn't get to the point. More words with less clarity.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Either is an improvement on the current.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't support the Benthamite/utilitarian reference to the greatest number.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Likely	No	Non-Member	The first sentence doesn't make sense. It should read "We recognize as the very foundation of America that an individual has the right to make choices."

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.

	Support	All
All Respondents	41.3%	41.3%
Commenters	41.6%	8.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If you could work "The very foundation of America is..." and "distinctively American quality..." etc into the first recommendation it would be even better. People like hearing about America and her qualities, but the second recommendation is just too wordy. Maybe for the first recommendation something like, "The very foundation of America is our recognition of individual self-ownership and the right to make personal choices. Our support..." and then continue with the rest of the first recommendation
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Because it is shorter and clear
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is too verbose and technically incorrect. America refers to a continent not to our country, the United States.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While I prefer not having the fluff talking about the foundation of America and American qualities, I do like the mention that we recognize the right to choose even if we disagree with the choice.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While the second does a great job of offering possible benefits, I prefer being allowed to judge the benefits for myself, rather than have them told to me. This could be an overreaction to constantly being told by current Rep & Dem's how I should live my life, though, so take this comment with a grain of salt.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Likely	No	Non-Member	I like the tone of the second, but it's poorly worded and confusing. It would be better if it could be simplified and made clearer without losing the tone.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree with the first clause of the second proposal, and feel it could be added to the plank. But the overall style of the first proposal is simpler and clearer.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	No non-libertarian is going to spend a lot of time reading this. Pithy is better.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer the more explicit content, in regards to making choices & recognizing the possible consequences

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.

	Support	All
All Respondents	41.3%	41.3%
Commenters	41.6%	8.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe we would be making a very strong statement if we reflected the language of the United States Constitution and referenced the same in the party's platform.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I see too many loop holes open in this recommendation. Voluntarily in concert with others, while appearing to be sound, can be taken from too many different perspectives.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This one seems less straight forward.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Likely	No	Non-Member	The approach needs to be consistent for each plank. And the simpler the better. Let the candidates expand on them if necessary.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The first sentence seems to make bearing the consequences temporally prior to the right to make a choice. But the right to make a choice must precede its consequences. That problem can be corrected by saying "provided they are willing to bear..." But for several other reasons, I don't like this sentence. The last two sentences suggest that America is the most free nation on earth. But I've read that at least two nations are more free than the U.S. Finally, saying government's proper role is to ensure the right of individuals to make personal choices suggests that is the only right we have.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Likely	No	Non-Member	I don't think the additional words add anything to the philosophy or to the explanation of our philosophy.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This seems wordy (for just one example, "even those which we personally disapprove of" is a grammatically-correct improvement to the first sentence). I am not familiar with traditions in political platforms, but this proposal seems to be the start of an essay, not a brief statement of our views.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Prefer shorter, more to the point version

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.

	Support	All
All Respondents	41.3%	41.3%
Commenters	41.6%	8.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	too wordy.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The Platform already contains a Preamble and Statement of Principles making this proposal redundant and overly verbose.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This one is too long.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Too many words in the 2nd proposal. If one has individual liberty there is no need to point out the fact that they may act in concert with others.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Too much text, too "weak".
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"this distinctively American quality" sounds too nationalistic. Sounds like other citizens around the world cannot, therefore, ever be libertarians. Prefer the first one.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The less wordy the better. Think of the Bill of Rights. Clarity, clarity, clarity.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is too wordy and adds little. It sounds more pompous and less clear. It invokes America twice but that is unnecessary. Libertarianism transcends country.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Too much "America". The age of nation-states has been dying since 1944, and is nearly dead now.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	the plank should stick to principles, not details
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	For me a little to "stylish" or "wordy" I would still support this version over the old.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The latter statement sound s like a political speech.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Likely	No	Non-Member	Same bad sentence, combined with too much "rah rah" Americanism.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Terse is better. It's better without the "America" talk.

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.

	Support	All
All Respondents	41.3%	41.3%
Commenters	41.6%	8.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Likely	No	Non-Member	The second proposal is overly verbose and seems a bit redundant.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Likely	No	Non-Member	the 1st is more to the direct point of the basis of what I believe the Libertarian Party stands for. 1 of the problems with amendments is that the point gets lost in endless words.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	K.eep I.t S.imple S.tupid!! We have a 2-party country to educate.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The second proposal seems to have to many 'weasel' words. or perhaps it sounds to much like legalese.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This recommendations seems quite verbose and theatric.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The second recommendation leaves room for interpretation. A phrase such as "the right to make a choice depends on understanding..." could be taken as supporting government action on behalf of the "uneducated"
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, the right to make a choice is not contingent upon recognizing consequences and accepting responsibility, a person has the right to make a choice regardless.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Second is too wordy.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The language "... understanding that it has consequences and accepting responsibility ..." keeps open the doors for continued ridiculous litigation. I actually like the original plank, but I do understand the fact that three year olds can't have the right to chose to do heroin, etc. How can you communicate common sense to people who refuse to avail themselves of it?
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Nothing wrong with this one, except its too wordy. Short & succinct is the best.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The second is too wordy for a platform statement. It is more appropriate for a commentary.

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.

	Support	All
All Respondents	41.3%	41.3%
Commenters	41.6%	8.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Likely	No	Non-Member	I like the direction of the language here, but would prefer to remove some of the "America" language. While we are a US political party, the foundation of personal liberty is that all enjoy these rights, not just Americans.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	1b is more verbose. 1a is more succinct and strikes me as easier to follow. Positive wording is all well and good, yet i do not believe that our platform has to/should be focused on promotion over clarity.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	First one, as modified by my comments
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Too wordy
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While the second versions is saying the same thing, it does so in a way that alienates me.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Likely	No	Non-Member	shorter tends to be better.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The second one tries to be more eloquent but would need to be rewritten in my opinion.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Likely	No	Non-Member	2nd too wordy
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This thing is terrible.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The first one is more concise and easier to understand
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This one is more "wordy" without really adding any new information.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think that the second one is just too wordy.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The ammendment although more descriptive, comes off as excessivley wordy
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You can't talk about individual choices and then follow by "we may personally disapprove"

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.

	Support	All
All Respondents	41.3%	41.3%
Commenters	41.6%	8.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Second one is verbose.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	started out good but quickly became wordy and too much an attempt to justify the position
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	See the previous comment. Also the version presented here was written by someone who does not appear to understand the difference between a right and a privilege. The very first sentence which reads "The very foundation of America is our recognition of the right of individuals to make choices, even those of which we may personally disapprove, provided they bear the consequences of those decisions." Number one, America wasn't founded on the recognition of an individual's right to make choices. It was founded upon the idea that a people should be allowed to govern themselves. Number two, the statement "provided they bear the consequences of those decisions" implies that if they don't bear the consequences, that they do not have the right to make a choice. This is also false. For making a choice not to accept the consequences IS a choice....granted a bad choice...but it is a choice none the less. However, even making such a choice as this, does have consequences that they will either accept willingly or have the consequences forced upon them by circumstance of what follows w
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Likely	No	Non-Member	Liberty is not distinctively American and arguably not "the very foundation of America" which was founded as a federal union of slave states and "free" states.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	As an English tutor, I have always told my students not to be too wordy. I think this is saying pretty much the same thing as above, only with more words!
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I am a proponent of KISS. Short, simple statements are much more likely to attract attention and stick in people's minds. I want folks to hear us, not get tired of listening.

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.

	Support	All
All Respondents	41.3%	41.3%
Commenters	41.6%	8.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This plank is just too wordy. We can talk about the benefits of personal choice and personal responsibility elsewhere. A plank should, in my opinion, be as concise as possible.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The pending amendment is much too wordy and convoluted.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	They say the same thing but the second one is unnecessarily wordy.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Too wordy. I get what the author(s) are going for here, but the first version is more succinct.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Anarchy is a type of unrivaled freedom, isn't it?
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The second version is grandiose. It also seems to promise utopia - a dangerous road (though in essence correct). For non-Libertarians it probably sounds antagonistic instead of gentle.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Likely	No	Non-Member	See my comment,however. I do not want to live in a country where the government thought it had a right to take my earnings and give them to others who made less, but were deemed to have an equal right to income.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think this one is too wordy. The simplest answer is often the best one.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Simple is better.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Seems less cumbersome
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The greater detail of Recommendation 1b, is helpful as explanation, but 1a is a better distillation of our stance. Is it possible to have an attached commentary to the planks? Sort of: This is our stance; here's an interpretation of the stance? In general I would prefer our planks to be direct (1a) rather than verbose (1b).

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.

	Support	All
All Respondents	41.3%	41.3%
Commenters	41.6%	8.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think a platform plank should define our position on an issue only. It does not need to justify that position beyond giving sufficient context to be clear about what its saying.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Revision Submitted for Consideration below: The United States of America was founded on the principle of protecting individual liberty. Under this principle individuals are free to make decisions regarding the conduct of their personal lives so long as it does not cause harm to another's person or property. This system requires individuals to take personal ownership over their own actions and be held accountable accordingly. A society founded on the principle of individual liberty will engender prosperity and happiness for the greatest number. The government's role is to maximize an individual's right to make personal choices for themselves and voluntarily in concert with others. Protecting and enhancing this principle is the primary focus of the Libertarian Party.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	long winded
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The first is more concise, while covering all the bases.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Likely	No	Non-Member	This recommendation is too long and the wording needs to be improved as well.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	see recommendation in first comment box
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This one is too wordy and more of a TV ad feel to it than a statement of principles.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Likely	No	Non-Member	"the greatest number" should just say "all people" and I would prefer this one over the one above.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I took part of this and suggested an add to version 1, above

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.

	Support	All
All Respondents	41.3%	41.3%
Commenters	41.6%	8.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Word it like this instead. "Libertarians recognize individual self-ownership, that is, the right to make choices along with the obligation to understand the consequences and accept the responsibilities those choices carry, regardless of whether we we approve or disapprove of those choices."
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	too wordy for most people's current abilities?
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If this one were chosen, "America" should be stricken in favor of "the government of the United States" in that the use of "America" implies validity to the idea of America as a nation-state rather than the fact enunciated in the Constitution that the United States emphatically ARE a federal union of co-equal political communities composed of the people thereof, who in each organized state are sovereign therein.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This sentence "This ideal creates unrivaled freedom and abundance, and allows the greatest number to pursue happiness in their daily lives", is too 'preachy', and should be eliminated.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I feel that the first one is more succinct. I think the historical references may be true of some times in the nation's past, but not others. I think the idea is more important than setting historical context.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Likely	No	Non-Member	as commented on above
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What about property rights?
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I also prefer proposal 1b over the existing plank.

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.

	Support	All
All Respondents	41.3%	41.3%
Commenters	41.6%	8.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe it is the right of every individual to have the freedom to make choices in all matters, as long as those choices do not affect the freedom adversely of the choices that other individuals may make in the same matter. For instance, smoking in public places should be prohibited because this affects the freedoms of the majority who are non-smokers.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"Libertarians seek to preserve and enhance this distinctively American quality" is not a necessarily true statement. Is this quality distinctive to Americans alone - that is, does it distinguish Americans from all other peoples? Do we know for a fact that no other government on earth observes this principle? Moreover, even if no other present government observes this principle, if a new country were founded which did observe this principle, the above quote would cease to be true.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is more emotional. I do not believe we need to state our emotions, but our beliefs about government. The more emotion we put into statements the less credible we appear to the public.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	the second recommendation is too complex/verbose.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	its preachy
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Likely	No	Non-Member	suggested changes: 1) "foundation of America is the recognition of the right." 2) "provided the individual bear the consequences" 3) "government's proper role as protecting the right"
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Wordier than the first one.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Likely	No	Non-Member	It's too long. Should be short, and to the point.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Keep it simple....

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.

	Support	All
All Respondents	41.3%	41.3%
Commenters	41.6%	8.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Shorter is always better. Both seem to be in rather stilted legalese than the people's English.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There's no need to explain "The very foundation of America" or what "Libertarians seek". Why get wordy? Aren't we always ready to criticize politicians who do the same thing. The first statement gets the message across.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Too wordy. Make it simple, not complex.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While this is nice, it is wordy and reads too much like a long-winded political ad.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Likely	No	Non-Member	Too wordy.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	this is subject to the same criticism as above but is too rambling in the reading... the above one is short but pretty concise.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This whole "distinctly American" thing bugs me, and I'm not so sure it's true. We should not wrap ourselves in pride. Let's just try to move toward a less shitty government and leave the unjustified pride behind.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Who is writing this stuff, a grade-schooler?
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	First one is simpler, more direct.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	. . . assuming the composition is changed to reflect standard English.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The first is shorter and more to the point. You might include a phrase similar to: "...as long as the execution of this right does not interfere with the rights of anyone else."
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Likely	No	Non-Member	I think the plank must be short for the public to grasp it. The new proposals are too long.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the term "self-ownership"

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.

	Support	All
All Respondents	41.3%	41.3%
Commenters	41.6%	8.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This version omits the duty of the government (at all levels) to protect individual rights.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do like this one too but I believe it may be complicated for a lot of people. We need as many people to understand and join us as possible.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"voluntarily in concert with others" is an important point that should appear somewhere. It's part of the freedom of assembly and free trade.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The first recommendation is shorter and to the point.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	remember K.I.S.S. Libertarians often (usually) have a problem with too much detail.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Not all of the founders recognized the rights of individuals. What is the "quality" referred to in the last sentence, and why is it "distinctively American"?
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Likely	No	Non-Member	(this is my second time typing this, as I tabbed away to read the current platform and when I came back, it had lost my place...). I prefer the first, but if you wanted to distill the second down to one sentence added before the last sentence of the first, you might paraphrase as: This ideal of the right of individuals to choose for themselves and voluntarily in concert with others is the very foundation of America and has created unrivaled freedom, abundance, and happiness.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Likely	No	Non-Member	1b is way too wordy.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Too wordy and really doesn't support the right to Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness, as in the Declaration of Independence.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Your right to make a choice is NOT dependent on your understanding and is NOT justified by allowing the greatest number to pursue happiness It IS inherent as a requirement of the life of a rational being.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Wordy, vague, unproven, abstract

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.

	Support	All
All Respondents	41.3%	41.3%
Commenters	41.6%	8.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This one is a bit too wordy.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The first, is beautiful in it's simplicity. Leave it alone.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	With my recommended change
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Too much "flowery" language in the second. brevity wins.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The fewer words, the better words.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Short is sweet. To many words leads to abiguity.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Likely	No	Non-Member	like the addition of "voluntarily in concert with others."
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	too wordy, though I agree with it I think the average new-comer will get lost in the "flowery-ness" of the language.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Likely	No	Non-Member	In the second sentence, I don't think we want to say the right to make a choice "depends" on understanding and acceptance. One can have the freedom to make a choice without the "understanding". But, as a result the individual would still live with the outcome. The second sentence could be replace with "The right to make a choice has consequences and individuals will be reponsible for the results of their choices."
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This one is too wordy and somewhat leaves the subject behind for a pep talk.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Likely	No	Non-Member	1st version is more concise.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	My preference for the first is primarily one of readability. I like the statement "provided they bear the consequences of those decisions." in this one better than the first. Maybe some sort of hybrid wording can be devised.

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.

	Support	All
All Respondents	41.3%	41.3%
Commenters	41.6%	8.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Likely	No	Non-Member	This recommendation is kind of wordy.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You have to be more specific like "I WILL GIVE TO EACH AMERICAN A \$75,000 LIVING CARD IF YOU ELECT ME FOR U.S. PRESIDENT"; "I WILL ISSUE \$50 TRILLION NEW FIAT MONEY ELIMINATING THE FEDERAL RESERVE"; "WE WILL MANUFACTURE ONE HUNDRED PERCENT IN AMERICA USING THE FEDERAL LANDS CREATING 100 JOBS". If you need help call me to 571-288-7383. My family could donate also \$100 million to your PAC. Thanks Alberto Lopez WWW.EBLM.US
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A true Libertarian wants Libertarian principles to be available to everyone, not just Americans. Calling Libertarian ideals "distinctively American" limits those ideals.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Way too wordy.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Likely	No	Non-Member	This one is too wordy and has too many platitudes. "The very foundation of America" etc. Actually this is not a uniquely american idea or goal. Many people around the world are trying to achieve this kind of personal freedom.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer the first recommendation because the second one leaves out an important protection for individuals from actions by others that may do harm.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Likely	No	Non-Member	This proposal is more wordy and less focused than the first option. It is also technically incorrect in that the ideal does not "create" abundance, rather it fosters the conditions under which abundance is most likely.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer the first recommendation above over this one AND I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The first is a little simpler and easier to understand. But it still says what it needs to say.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The language in the first proposal is cleaner.

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.

	Support	All
All Respondents	41.3%	41.3%
Commenters	41.6%	8.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Likely	No	Non-Member	Too long
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Likely	No	Non-Member	The first is still smoother and simpler. We must never lose sight of the fact that the platform is primarily a sales document, not a Libertarian Apostles' Creed.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	the second proposal is too wordy.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Likely	No	Non-Member	Too long.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	the alternate is toooo wordy...few would make it to the end.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Both proposals are FAR better than the current, but the first is superior in that it is simpler, more succinct.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Second proposal awkwardly worded and syntactically flawed.
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	should read "the United States of America...", as the America's are many countries. What if someone does not understand the consequences of their actions.... is it ok to force them to do it my way?
I prefer the first recommendation above over this one.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Definitely not a distinctively american quality many countries are more free than the USA

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.

	Support	All
All Respondents	38.6%	38.6%
Commenters	26.7%	5.7%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It's a sad day when so many words must be used to convey such a simple thought.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Even this needs elaboration on "governments's proper role"
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Still too focused on "accepting consequences", needs to address the concept that so long as an action/choice does not infringe on the rights of another individual then gov't should not be involved.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	when will the public "wake up"? We have already lost our freedoms here in the USA. I say this because everytime I am at the air port I feel that the "gestapo" is running the government. Its like some old german movie. I feel that the american holocaust is coming soon. It is just plain scary these days. I used to work for three air lines at Dulles international air port and I am just demoralized by all the security. The uniforms are different all they need are nazi insignia. I just want to weep my heart out. Its beyond prayer now. I no longer feel happy when traveling. We are a paranoid country where it sems that you are guilty before being innocent. Its a shame. I also feel that people are being treated like unthinking cattle. Why doesn't the Libertarian party take a stronger stand on these issues? There was a bill signed recently that places the military abve congress and they can come and get anyone for any reason at any time? What the hell happened to common sense ? It seems that the governm,ent does not trust its own people?

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.

	Support	All
All Respondents	38.6%	38.6%
Commenters	26.7%	5.7%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Everyone even Statists generally have rights to make choices. If someone puts a gun to your head and tells you that they will shoot you if you don't do exactly as they say you still have freedom to disobey and one could say if they don't obey and they die as a result that "they bear the consequences of those decisions". I think we need to look a bit more at the language here and to make it as robust as possible so that those who would try to interpret it far differently than most libertarians could not use our own language against us and our core libertarian philosophy. However, that could be done elsewhere and would not have to be done here.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	In the last sentence, changing the words "PROPER ROLE" to "PROPERLY LIMITED ROLE", more accurately represents our Libertarian philosophy.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Change the ending to, "...make personal choices for themnselves, in concert with others if they so choose."
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Likely	No	Non-Member	"of which" is awkward, change to "that" and drop "may". Drop last "and" change to a comma.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	much better than the 1st--no mention of gov't!- i prefer to keep gov't out of the picture
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	People have the right to smoke, drink to excess and eat to excess. Nobody should interfere with those rights but, should they have adverse consequences to the individual making them, those consequences belong to the individual, not the public at large.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Likely	No	Non-Member	This better frames government's role in the limited way that I believe was originally hoped for.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I feel that this proposal is better suited as it clearly states what being a Libertarian is all about. We need to make ourselves clear, especially in times when our rights are disappearing faster than they ever have before.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I THINK YOU HAVE IT NOW!

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.

	Support	All
All Respondents	38.6%	38.6%
Commenters	26.7%	5.7%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Likely	No	Non-Member	In either statement or somewhere we need a definition of rights. "A right is a freedom of action that an individual can take for his own pursuit of happiness that does not conflict with another individual's equal right." No one can have a right to a value they did not produce.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A touch teachy, lengthy but necessary.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This sounds the best. It gives the idea of what America was founded on and states how we want the highest number of people the freedoms that gives them happiness even if we disagree
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	again, "accepting accountability" would be better.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The recommendation is a little wordy. Specifically, consider revising the last two sentences.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	much better, and less confusing at first reading.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	They are both good and I prefer both to the existing plank, but prefer the second. I think it helps to remind people that the United States is about Freedom since many seem to have forgotten that. I wonder why we don't refer to the United States rather than America. That stresses that we are collection of states bound together for a common defense rather than a big federal government. There is a North, a Central, and a South America; so America is not even specific. I think the big government people have intended to move us away from the use of the United States.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Perhaps we could change the verbage from, "allows the greatest number to pursue..." to, "allows all to pursue..." Current wording may imply that not everyone has the right to pursue happiness when, in reality, we all have the right, some just don't exercise it to the fullest.

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.

	Support	All
All Respondents	38.6%	38.6%
Commenters	26.7%	5.7%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This one seems to be a little clearer in its delivery
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Add- "Responsibility of the responsible."
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the language in this recommendation. I think the core principle here is the notion that there is no one-size-fits-all solution for happiness and that our lives are far too complex to be managed by government. Maximum personal liberty allows each individual to pursue his or her own happiness in a way that is realistic to their own lives and contexts. The many varied and unique paths available make it impossible for these choices to be made for us. For better or worse, we must be responsible for our own lives and free to choose how we will live them. The rule of law allows us to prevent and punish choices which would bring harm to others or inhibit their ability to live freely. To rule one's life choices by law sets a precedent for potential micromanagement of our lives. I can't believe that anyone wants that.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This one is better, although where in the platform does it explain that government has three things to protect - liberty is one of them, the others are life and property.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This second proposal is much better!
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The language in this recommendation may be too complex, but I prefer it to the first recommendation because it speaks to the intended goals of our nation. It may be beneficial to simplify the sentence structure.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	, even those of which we may personally disapprove provided those choices do not cause harm upon another,

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.

	Support	All
All Respondents	38.6%	38.6%
Commenters	26.7%	5.7%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Your questions are unclear - I support this proposal: The very foundation of America is our recognition of the right of individuals to make choices, even those of which we may personally disapprove, provided they bear the consequences of those decisions. The right to make a choice depends on both understanding that it has consequences and accepting responsibility for them. This ideal creates unrivaled freedom and abundance, and allows the greatest number to pursue happiness in their daily lives. Libertarians seek to preserve and enhance this distinctively American quality and view government's proper role as ensuring the right of individuals to make personal choices for themselves and voluntarily in concert with others.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer this plank, but both seem to me to be an improvement over the existing language.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But I don't think there's anything wrong with the existing plank.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Good Job!
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Gramatical issues: First, to what does the "they" refer in the first sentence? In sentence three, what is "this ideal" exactly? What's your evidence for the "unrivaled freedom and abundance"? Seems too hyperbolic to me. And I don't think that whatever "this" is, it is necessarily distinctively American. There are zero others anywhere else with Libertarian leanings? Doubtful.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The primary role of government, and in fact the very justification for government, is to protect the inalienable Rights of all Persons as established in the Declaration of Independence.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A bit "wordy" perhaps, but more on-target than the first recommendation.

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.

	Support	All
All Respondents	38.6%	38.6%
Commenters	26.7%	5.7%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Both are good, but this one provides more context for outsiders who may not understand the concept of Libertarianism in the U.S. The choice between the two should be determined by the value that the party wants reader to receive, and I believe that putting freedom of choice, regardless of personal belief, in context of American values is important.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	love it!
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Need to work more on the exact words..
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Sure, this one is more rah-rah patriotic and jingoistic (as if only Americans should value freedom and self-ownership). But it's also more coherent and more accessible to non-libertarians than the first proposed statement. Even if doesn't clarify our philosophy, it clarifies our position.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This states the same positions but in a way that reminds us of our heritage and is more appealing to our patriotic nature.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Likely	No	Non-Member	Once again, this is a good start, but it leaves open a back window for excuses for not taking responsibility. The sentence: "The right to make a choice depends on both understanding that it has consequences and accepting responsibility for them." implies that if you didn't know then it's someone else's responsibility. This of course is not an easy one to fix. I would start by not being afraid to address the subject of emancipation, as well as mental well-being. Either way, this did not address the original issue at hand.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Need to be careful that the rights of one persons choice do not infringe on anothers.

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.

	Support	All
All Respondents	38.6%	38.6%
Commenters	26.7%	5.7%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think the first of these is a bit naive. Agreeing that we want a government to protect our rights to make many different personal choices implies that we acknowledge the possibility that government may be required to use force against some individuals or groups to protect the freedom of others. While we all aspire to a society in which people respect each other's rights completely, we are not there yet. As a Libertarian, I accept a responsibility to defend my fellow citizen's rights to act in ways that I may not choose to act myself. A good example of this is the ACLU defending the right of the American Nazi Party to demonstrate in largely Jewish Skokie, IL some years ago. I am a Libertarian, not an anarchist.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'd remove the phrase "distinctively American". I'd add a phrase to the first sentence "...those decisions, and that those decisions do not harm the life, liberty, or property of others through force or fraud." I understand the need to focus more on bearing the consequences of decisions, but the real foundation of libertarianism is that the decisions don't harm others through force or fraud...regardless of whether someone "bears the consequence" or not. I think we should state both.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do prefer either proposal over the existing plank, while favoring the second.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Might possibly consider adding "as well as those under their guardianship". Reason being to emphasize taking on responsibility of minors and others that might be placed under their care.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Keep the original. Why do you want to water down the platform.

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.

	Support	All
All Respondents	38.6%	38.6%
Commenters	26.7%	5.7%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	To me, the overall writing sounds negative. Is there a way to add "rewards" or "benefits" to counter-balance "consequences"? Would it make sense to say, "everyone will bear the consequences or rewards of their decisions" instead of, "provided.....decisions" for example?
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Excellent.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Likely	No	Non-Member	Initiation of force again.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i feel either is an improvement but the second recommendation explains itself better.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This needs to be edited down a little bit. I'm not sure our platform should be limited to America, an expectation and belief in personal liberty should be a universal statement, and I think qualified with the original statements regarding an opposition to initiating force against another. We have a right to expect everyone on earth to follow our ideals of personal liberty, but not the right to force them to do so. Expectation and action are two different things.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It's quite wordy though compared to the other two.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	more positive
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Even though individuals should be free to make choices and accept responsibilities for those choices, those choices made should not ultimately interfere with another's right to pursue "happiness"....
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	this is the best.

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.

	Support	All
All Respondents	38.6%	38.6%
Commenters	26.7%	5.7%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe that an individual who is interested in joining the Libertarian party, and is researching the platform, would be put at ease if some wording were included that mentions individuals right to make choices and live their lives as they see fit is acceptable as long as it does not infringe upon the rights of another individual. Reading the above, although well written, can be misunderstood in a way that the individual has the right to choose to commit any act as long as they understand the consequences and are willing to accept responsibility for those consequences. However, an individual may understand the consequences of robbing or killing another individual, and be willing to bear the consequences, but that does not give that person the right to commit those acts. There should be some limitation as to what personal choices are rational and acceptable, and what are not. As I look at this, I see an opportunity for non-Libertarians to find fault in the message of individual liberty that Libertarians promote, and use it against us.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	For the reasons stated in the previous comment, I would delete the 2nd sentence, and modify the last clause in the 1st sentence to, "provided they bear responsibility for the consequences of those decisions".
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i prefer this version over the first one above, but we may be able to tighten the language of this one a bit to allow it to roll off the tongue easier.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is a lot better...but I still think it could be simpler (oddly, the original wording is still more straightforward and easy to grasp, even with its flaws).
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This proposal seems to say it better than the other two.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The final wording of this "and voluntarily in concert with others." is a bit vague and difficult to grasp. Is it even necessary?

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.

	Support	All
All Respondents	38.6%	38.6%
Commenters	26.7%	5.7%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like this proposal very much. However, I would suggest we include the concept that people should be free to make personal choices as long as it does not interfere with others freedom of choice.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Likely	No	Non-Member	Replace "them" at end of second sentence with "those consequences".
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, how about: It is a fundamental freedom to be able to make choices for one's self and to accept the responsibility for that choice and its consequences. The role of government is to protect this freedom and other rights of the individual. The Libertarian Party doesn't need to agree with an individual's choice in order to defend their right to make it.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A sentence must be added - we are free to make choices that do not restrict another person's liberty. I may choose to murder and accept the consequences - it still doesn't make my decision acceptable.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The first implies or perhaps implies a reference to Property rights. This is important but should have its own section. It is too important for the glancing reference given in the first suggested amendment.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	[I have re-written the proposal as follows]: "Libertarians recognize individual self-ownership and the right to make personal choices, along with the acceptance of personal responsibility, including whatever personal consequences follow such choices. We contend that the Government's proper role is to protect the rights of every individual, including the right to make their own life choices regarding the safety and welfare of themselves and their families.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Likely	No	Non-Member	I think it can still be read as allowing for the shirking of responsibilities, but I like it better than the first proposal. Perhaps phrasing it more forcefully, by saying that individuals have the right to make choices and must accept responsibility for them, would be better.

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.

	Support	All
All Respondents	38.6%	38.6%
Commenters	26.7%	5.7%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Recommendationa; last sentence:proper role as maximizing the right of all individuals ...
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Since I cannot make two choices....I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank...also
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	As amended, per my reccommendationabove.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would like to see the world 'liberty' used sometimes in place of 'the right' in some occasions so that we can help educate people and build relationships with the concept of personal liberties. For example "The right to make a choice depends," to "This liberty depends." Again, I would prefer an active voice "we" in place of 3rd person "libertarians."
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Y-E-S!!!!!!! again YES
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Likely	No	Non-Member	I like starting with the principle and then identifying LP later in the text. But, the statement is still too long. People read soundbytes not text these days.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would begin with a sentence similar to the first sentence of the first recommendation. The concept of self-ownership should appear in the plank.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would recommend adding something that succinctly prohibits government from defining what individual choice should look like. Maybe.... "and without interference by government providing those choices do not infringe upon the rights of others."
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	See notes for 1a.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer this because it's more positive and loses the term "self ownership."

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.

	Support	All
All Respondents	38.6%	38.6%
Commenters	26.7%	5.7%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This section is on choice and individual liberty. Identifying Government's proper role (though critical) should be left to a different paragraph. Additionally, one of our basic principles is the right to make personal choices, provided they don't adversely affect the rights of others without their permission, and should be stated somewhere within this paragraph.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I really like the "pursue happiness" wording which ties into the Declaration of Independence. Much better than 1a in my opinion.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	although the position really transcends America (USA), the tie to our historical position is nice.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is better than both the original and proposed amendment 1. But it still needs shortening and revision--including removal of the "smiley face" b.s. about "abundance."
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"...view government's proper role as ensuring the right of individuals to make personal choices for themselves and voluntarily in concert with others." This is true, but it beats around the bush. More explicitly, it would say that the role of the government is the protection from force.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It is really annoying to have your server not respond in the middle of this survey not once but twice. Hopefully, not all my comments were lost with it as well. I will indicate which of these I have already voted on, this is the first.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Likely	No	Non-Member	Still change language to read an individual's right of self determination
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Cut out the "distinctively American quality." We are the heirs of a classical liberal tradition that goes through the Enlightenment all the way back to the classical Greece and Rome.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Likely	No	Non-Member	The last sentence is still problematic, implying the source of rights is governmental, but I could live with it until the inevitable governmental abuse rears its little head

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.

	Support	All
All Respondents	38.6%	38.6%
Commenters	26.7%	5.7%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	However, the words "America" and "American" are wrong. "America" is a continent, "The United States" is the name of the country. The word "American" also applies to Canada, Mexico, Panama, etc. It is important that that wording be changed if this amendment is to be accepted.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While I enjoy the new clarifications, the phrase: "this distinctively American quality" is implying patriotism that shouldn't be needed in a platform plank. An ideological view on individual sovereignty seems it could speak for itself without a slip of Nationalism.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	much better language ! mgm
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer the second proposal over the first, and prefer the first proposal over the existing plank. Make is positive. Wherever possible, eliminate the word "not" and its derivatives (can't, won't, shouldn't, etc.)
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	In English class, we were taught to stay away from words like, "it" in the second sentence. I would say, "The right to make a choice depends upon both understanding and that the choice contains consequences"
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Likely	No	Non-Member	This is much better.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Likely	No	Non-Member	Covers everything. Resounds. Makes me think of the Constitution. Unless a reasoned, and not just passionate, argument can be made to explain why this is "distinctively American", we should possibly take out that reference.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, I would drop the words "even those of which we may personally disapprove,". They are unnecessary and speak of an unconscious need to justify a belief in the right to make choices and bear the consequences thereof. We should state our beliefs, not begin by justifying them.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Better!

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.

	Support	All
All Respondents	38.6%	38.6%
Commenters	26.7%	5.7%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But the wording seems convoluted and cumbersome.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would add the following ultimate sentence: "Government's proper role is to protect people from force or fraud on the part of others."
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Instead of depends on both understanding that it has consequences and accepting responsibility for them should simply say depends on accepting responsibility for the consequences Otherwise, it sounds like we are supporting a "Department of Understanding Consequences".
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would still include the prohibition against the initiation of force.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"voluntarily in concert with others" needs expansion and/or more definition - or needs to be stricken from the statement. I am more supportive of the latter. The discussion is about individual liberty. The end of the statement extends beyond the "individual," so has no context here unless provided in expanded discussion.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Likely	No	Non-Member	Again, I think it needs to be worded stronger. The 2nd message is defenitly better, but I really believe the point needs to be driven home. Example: The party supports putting an end to the drug war. We feel what one chooses to put in their own body, is 100% their choice. But we do drawl the line when the actions of one person, puts someone elses life in danger. DRIVE HOME THE POINT!
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Yes, this is even better.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	For brevity, I would strike the phrase: "...and allows the greatest number to pursue happiness in their daily lives."
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Language should be uniquely Libertarian, using phrases such as "essential liberties" and "inalienable rights to make choices"
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do not really like the language of either proposal, but I see the need for a change.

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.

	Support	All
All Respondents	38.6%	38.6%
Commenters	26.7%	5.7%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Better and more in line with my comment above--
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Love this one. It gives a good statement as to why we believe what we believe.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would suggest adding something that shows that we recognize that these rights are not unlimited insofar as they only extend up to the point where they would begin to infringe on the rights of another individual.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Remove "very"
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It is not a distinctly American concept.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This change elaborates further on the idea and provides a clearer understanding of what Libertarians stand for.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think the second proposal is preferable. While not as succinct as the first, it does more to convey the reasoning behind the statement.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	'distinctively' should be 'distinctly'
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	However, I think the phrase, "...provided they bear the consequences of those decisions," carries an inference that choice comes with some type of qualification attendant. How consequences are borne is also none of our business; instruction might be advisable, but that delegation belongs to friends, family and religious institutions. Actually, I don't like any word like "bear" and "accepting" that seems to carry a contingency.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This amendment is better than the first, however any amendment should mention the Constitution as the basis for the statement(s) so the reader understands we are not arbitrarily making these statements, and that as a nation of law, we hold the Constitution to be the final authority.

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.

	Support	All
All Respondents	38.6%	38.6%
Commenters	26.7%	5.7%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Likely	No	Non-Member	This is longer but I like that it talks about benefits.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"We believe this ideal creates..." It is, of course, a statement of opinion.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While it panders to American exceptionalism, the last recommendation remains distinctly libertarian while being supportable by more Americans who don't already consider themselves Libertarians.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It is wordier, but more passionate.
I prefer this recommendation over the first one above.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	same as the first one

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.

	Support	All
All Respondents	12.3%	12.3%
Commenters	10.3%	2.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It seems to me that if Jefferson were writing this, he'd have made it more succinct. Why not something like "Whereas the very Foundation of the United States is the recognition of the individual right to personal liberty in tandem with personal responsibility, Libertarians seek to preserve and enhance...[text as above] ...in concert with others." There is no need to put in the bit about "even those of which we personally disapprove," which is pretty well inherent in the premise.
I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.	Likely	No	Non-Member	The second proposal has some redundancy between the first and second sentences on the subject of accepting consequences of choices.
I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The first one wins out in simplicity, the second has more persuasion and actually sounds a bit preachy, the sort of thing that starts internet arguments. The original sounds defensive and is never a good place to be.
I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Should these allude to the choice not bringing harm to others or others property. While I / we support the ability for an individual to make their own choices, part of the responsibility in making the choice also lies in the acceptance of consequences of damage brought to others.
I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"The very foundation of America and the Libertarian party is based on the right of individuals to make choices, even those of which we may personally disapprove. This ideal creates unrivaled freedom, abundance and individual happiness. Libertarians seek to preserve and enhance these American qualities, and view government's proper role as ensuring the right of personal choice made individually or in concert with others."

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.

	Support	All
All Respondents	12.3%	12.3%
Commenters	10.3%	2.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We acknowledge both the right to and consequence of personal choice. Our support of this liberty is based neither on approval nor disapproval, but on our fundamental and collective right to self-determination. It is more the role of government to facilitate and insure this freedom for every citizen.
I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	However, my freedom (and choices) should not interfere with your (anyones) liberty (paraphrased from French). Possibly something about choices and the consequence of impinging on others rights is the arena for government and its courts?
I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It may be historically inaccurate to claim that "the very foundation" of America reflects the libertarian ideals. For instance, while the first permanent settlement of North America was for business purposes in Jamestown, VA, the Puritan settlements of Massachusetts only infrequently recognized "the right of individuals to make choices, even those of which we may personally disapprove, etc." Rather, the 20,000 Puritans who settled New England often stood in judgment of their fellows, punishing drunkenness, adultery, etc. By 1776 (Declaration of Independence), 1781 (Articles), 1787 (Constitution), and even 1789 (Bill of Rights), the United States still had very weak protections of individual rights. The court system which ensured "consequences" for ones decisions were also woefully incapable on both substance and procedural grounds. While the "very foundation" here has some nostalgic nugget of truth in it, it grossly overstates the case that the founding of America recognized individual rights, much less consequences for one's actions.

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.

	Support	All
All Respondents	12.3%	12.3%
Commenters	10.3%	2.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The use of the limiters "Libertarian(s)" and/or "America(ns)" makes the platform sound like club rules, on the order of "NO GIRLZ ALOUD." Everyone, including those who identify as Republicans, have the right to make choices. Everyone, including Afghanis, should assume the responsibility for their actions. Instead of these limiters, use "we" or "us" as often as possible.
I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Still would like to see some explicit language about the "initiation of force" like the original stated. Since this is exactly one of the serious problems we have today with government taking force against citizens.
I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	See comment above.
I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.	Likely	No	Non-Member	Second is a little too wordy??But I see the benefit idea as a positive.
I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer a over b but both over the current
I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do prefer the first sentence "The very foundation" in the second over the first recommendation.
I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, I would say "government's only proper role".
I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would include language from the original proposal regarding noncoercion of individuals, groups, and governments.
I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	leave out "This ideal creates unrivaled freedom and abundance, and allows the greatest number to pursue happiness in their daily lives."
I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Let's have both.
I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	First one is more succinct but this one has prettier language :/
I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This proposal is more explanatory and flowing. Is this desired in the platform?

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.

	Support	All
All Respondents	12.3%	12.3%
Commenters	10.3%	2.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer blending the two.
I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Rather than ..."allows the greatest number"..., I would prefer ..."allows each individual"...
I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You still want some sort of collective, over-arching government, it seems. Why? Just because "the very foundation of America" was an over-arching government of rule by a few over the many, ostensibly with their consent (your wording, "and voluntarily in concert with others" is the slippery slope we're plummeting down right now. If you're "in concert with others," you're imposing restrictions on those with whom you're not in concert; and if you're not "in concert with others," your voluntary choices will inevitably be restricted. That's the trouble with our "election cycle," isn't it? The pendulum inexorably swings back and forth, and your individual choices are inexorably whittled away. This is the reason for the inevitable need for this late-to-the-party libertarian political party!) I like what I wrote above better. It's more precise and leaves less wiggle room for continuing to erode our innate freedoms through some form of government rule of the few over the many and the gang over the individual.
I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.	Likely	No	Non-Member	Although shorter wording often does not fully explain a position it is often what is digested by outsiders. If the Platform is for existing Libertarians I would favor the second modification. If the Platform is to draw in new Libertarians I would support the shorter wording. I think the Platform is more for outsiders to view us rather than to keep the insiders happy.

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.

	Support	All
All Respondents	12.3%	12.3%
Commenters	10.3%	2.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The foundation of United States democracy is recognition of citizens' right to choose, provided they bear the consequences of their decisions. This ideal facilitates unrivaled freedom and abundance, and allows the greatest number to achieve their desires. Libertarians seek to preserve and enhance personal choice, and view government's role foremost as the protector of individual freedom.
I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like both recommendations. This one is more clearer. As long as the sentence that stipulates the role of the government, at any level, is made crystal clear. We dictate the nature of civil and human rights, not the government, at any level.
I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	with something added that speaks about not infringing on the rights on others...
I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But I like the first one better. It's clearer and more concise.
I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.	Likely	No	Non-Member	But, I would suggest adding the last sentence of the first proposal - Government's proper role is to protect the rights of every individual.
I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While I prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank, I prefer the alternate proposal to the first proposal.
I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.	Likely	No	Non-Member	Actually I like both of them, but, I do believe the second proposal offers a more concise explanation so for that reason I tip towards the second pending amendment.
I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Perhaps I'm having a comprehension problem, but in both proposals, the wording still feels off. The message between the line feels like it's saying that if a person is unwilling to understand or accept the responsibilities of their choice(s), they should not have the right to make a choice, which would re-inforce the current Nanny State.

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.

	Support	All
All Respondents	12.3%	12.3%
Commenters	10.3%	2.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the first better, but I also like the part in the second where it explains that the right to make a choice depends on both the understanding and accepting of the responsibility and consequences of actions.
I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Both are better together. Not overly verbose and thereby still pertinent and more completely on-point.
I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, take out this "understanding" part. Completely unnecessary and counter productive to what you're trying to say.
I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	In the first I would change "individuals should be free..." to "individuals sARE free..."
I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't like "governments .. ensuring the right..." It ought to be "governments ... ensuring the freedom of individuals..." Rights are inherent in the individual; a government can either respect those rights or violate them; it cannot provide them.
I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The second proposal is too wordy. The best option is between the two new proposals
I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.	Likely	No	Non-Member	Except see my comment to the first proposal, as to minors making choices.
I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	eliminate the word "very" in "very foundation" substitute "ideal" with "principle" in "This ideal creates unrivaled freedom." Better yet, start the sentence with "RECOGNITION AND EXERCISE OF THIS PRINCIPLE creates unrivaled freedom . . ." (i.e. the ideal itself does nothing, if no one recognizes and exercises it. This is akin to the fact that the Constitution does not protect our rights, but rather codifies the government's responsibility to protect our rights, among other things).
I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This also explains it quite well. However I do not share the belief that the ideals of liberty are a distinctively American quality, and I do not believe most libertarians do either.

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.

	Support	All
All Respondents	12.3%	12.3%
Commenters	10.3%	2.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, I believe the words "of adults" should be inserted, in this case in the second sentence, again between "right" and "to make".
I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The first one has the advantage of being a lot shorter.
I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	the third line "them" (accepting responsibility for them) is an ambiguous reference and would be more clearly stated as accepting responsibility for "that choice" or "those consequences" whichever is being referenced. I believe it's referencing consequences as there is subject verb disagreement in the singular "choice" and plural "them."
I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't like the reference to "this distinctively American quality." Libertarian ideals apply to all human societies.
I would prefer either of these proposals over the existing plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The very foundation of America is recognizing that our rights come from God, not from the State. That is what our founding documents state. Neither of these recommendations have language that rivals the Declaration. But maybe I'm asking too much. I'd accept either.

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.

	Support	All
All Respondents	7.8%	7.8%
Commenters	21.3%	4.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Likely	No	Non-Member	Let's keep the American Nationalism out of the LP Platform.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, the Personal Liberty plank needs to include language that expressly states that coercion is the method by which personal liberty is consistently undermined; and, in order to ensure personal liberty, libertarians believes neither government, nor groups, nor individuals should be allowed to infringe on the personal liberty of a free People.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the second proposal except that it says that freedom "depends" on understanding consequences, which isn't- or shouldn't- be true. If it said "comes with" in that one sentence then I would prefer it.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe that both proposals are too wordy. Items in a Platform should be a simply stated principle. If "personal choice" and acting "voluntarily in concert with others" is important, make them an (a) and a (b) under the main Principle.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Oh, come on, now - this is starting to look like something straight out of Congress' BS machine...
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This one is on the right track but has the same problem as the first...intimating that the right to choose is dependent upon... I would prefer a direct statement like..."Libertarians believe individuals should be held responsible for their decisions and the consequences of those decisions"
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	as stated above, the understanding of consequences of your choices is not a prerequisite for our rights.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The right to make a choice does not depend on anything; it is unalienable.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Likely	No	Non-Member	Same concern, too much emphasis on right to make choices, but why scrub the non-initiation of force aspect???
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Likely	No	Non-Member	The Libertarian Party should be support libertarian principles as clearly as possible and not water down the message making it about Americanism

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.

	Support	All
All Respondents	7.8%	7.8%
Commenters	21.3%	4.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Likely	No	Non-Member	both are good but have the same problem: my right to make my own choices is absolute and does not depend on anything imposed by society
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The beginning sounds too washy washy, I'd prefer our historical documents championed rights, not laws. Or something of that nature.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, understanding has nothing to do with an individual's rights. This is part of the nanny state or big brother movement, which is at least 80 years old now. If you are ignorant of consequences, you still have rights, as long as your actions do not immediately and directly limit another's rights.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The language is not direct enough in either example. It also lacks a fluidity that would make it more readable. Consider the wording here: "The very foundation of America is our recognition of the right of individuals to make choices, even those of which we may personally disapprove, provided they bear the consequences of those decisions." It is awkward because it switches between the use of 'They,' and 'We'.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, while I like the overall positive tone and benefit statement, the intiation of force against another is still missing and is still imperative to the plank. Although with that addition, I like the first statement better than this one in that this sounds even more "conditional" regarding the free exercise of rights than the first. Overall I don't care for the language that implies that the right depends on something. Rights are rights. They are not dependent on anything. Suffering the consequences of exercising those rights should be stated to be inherent in the process, nothing more.

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.

	Support	All
All Respondents	7.8%	7.8%
Commenters	21.3%	4.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is a bit too flowery and verbose...and this "This ideal creates unrivaled freedom and abundance," this is just editorializing - yes we know it's true but as I said in 1a we want outsiders to read this and understand why what we're saying makes sense. this statement is true but would require way too much background to demonstrate here.... anyway, just one example of why this is not an ideal statement, I would take 1a over 1b if I had to choose, of course I like my suggested version even better ;-)
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Same as my reason for rejection of the first suggested change. It reeks of too much of an attempt at being "pc" when the original is just fine. This proposed change is also simply far too wordy.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Prefer stating simply that the only way to insure collective freedom for society is to hold sacred the freedom of each individual in that society, recognizing that the individual, and not the whole, bear responsibility for the exercise of such freedom.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, too long-winded. Remember that strangers to the Libertarian party will have to read this. Simpler is better. "bear the consequences of those decisions." The phrase is off point, irrelevant and vague. I am advocating liberty, and suggest we do not take a vote on what "responsibility" means, because taking a vote on everything has produced more laws than people. The plank is about liberty; if you want, add a separate plank on responsibility.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The second is better than the first, however the original is the best and will best help to bring in new members and voters which I feel is most important.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The one in blue is too convoluted and confusing. It needs simplified.

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.

	Support	All
All Respondents	7.8%	7.8%
Commenters	21.3%	4.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I have proposed an alternative statement above. There is a reason why I have proposed the above statement - it is important to recognize that individuals are born free and are not inherently owned by some aspect of their government that they cannot opt out of.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Neither is an improvement
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like mine better!
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	old way seems better
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	See above comment
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Likely	No	Non-Member	I think a crucial aspect is the original statement about Never initiate force or violence. That original sentence is important. "No individual, group, or government may initiate force" but I would add the words " or violence", since force and violence are not identical.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Same weakness as the first proposal, but more wordy.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Likely	No	Non-Member	See comment in 1a

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.

	Support	All
All Respondents	7.8%	7.8%
Commenters	21.3%	4.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The whole plank misses the mark. Where is the ability of victims to hold a person accountable for his misuse of liberty? Many of these actions, commonly discussed, do have victims, but the victims are being ignored, and these actions are being called "victimless crimes". The first re-wording is slightly better, but all of the wordings miss the rights of the victims. When a person neglects his obligations because he has committed self-harm, then there is a victim, and this fails to acknowledge this fact. There is also often a huge element of fraud, as one person sells the means for self-harm to another, counting on the fact that the buyer is unaware of the potential harm or has been convinced there is no significant potential harm, or that he personally will escape harm.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer the platform 1.0 Personal Liberty just the way it is written, it is basic and simple to understand.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think a key element of this proposal is that it stipulate that people are free to do what they want so long as it does not infringing upon the rights of any other individual. I like the personal responsibility references in the new proposal

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.

	Support	All
All Respondents	7.8%	7.8%
Commenters	21.3%	4.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Personal liberty is not an American value. It's a natural right. We might try something similar to Thomas Jefferson's definitions of personal liberty. "Under the law of nature, all men are born free, every one comes into the world with a right to his own person, which includes the liberty of moving and using it at his own. This is what is called personal liberty, and is given him by the Author of nature, because necessary for his own sustenance. (sic)" -Thomas Jefferson "Of liberty I would say that, in the whole plenitude of its extent, it is unobstructed action according to our will. But Rightful liberty is unobstructed action according to our will within limits drawn around us by the equal rights of others. I do not add 'within the limits of the law,' because law is often but the tyrant's will, and always so when it violates the rights of the individual." -Ibid
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	the second reccommendation also seeks to say that rights depend, this time on the understanding of consequences. not only for limited information, which granted is resolved with Libertarians in high offices, but as a party plank it cannot assume all information acess to all individuals, therefore preserving the right for persons to be stupid..um er.. make decisions we may not approve or agree with :-). Take as a forinstance the HARD job of any Libertarian representing the up to 63% of constituents that did not vote for them (which is a requirement of the job even though many R & D's donot fuffill this duty of representative government)

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.

	Support	All
All Respondents	7.8%	7.8%
Commenters	21.3%	4.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't like the phrasing "The very foundation of America." Where it says, "our recognition of the right of individuals to make choices," I think it should say, "our recognition of the right of individuals to make choices for themselves." I have no right to make a choice regarding whether you dye your hair, and force my choice upon you, even if I am willing to bear the consequence of my decision to force you to choose the hair colour I demand. I still dislike the idea of the platform claiming that the government has a proper role.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Neither proposal elevates the right to live as preeminent over liberty or pursuit of happiness. Both proposals are ambiguous regarding an individual's right to live. Individuals who have been denied the right to live have been preemptively denied their rights to liberty and pursuit of happiness. This weakness in the Libertarian party kept me from joining for many years. We--The United States of America--continue to unjustly take the lives of non-combatants in undeclared wars. We continue to pervert or deny due process to individuals in our custody resulting that we unjustly take their right to live. Furthermore, We have become an altogether corrupt people who have perverted the order of preeminence of rights. We now elevate our liberty of personal privacy, even perverting the meaning of privacy, to deny the right of individuals to live if they are too small to notice. Our apathy regarding individuals' right to live puts us at odds with the source of our own right to live. The Libertarian party will not grow beyond their ambiguity on this fundamental right.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Likely	No	Non-Member	Too wordy; we should also be grown up enough to avoid engaging in national narcissism with expressions like "distinctly American quality."

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.

	Support	All
All Respondents	7.8%	7.8%
Commenters	21.3%	4.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Likely	No	Non-Member	We should retain the language about not initiating force -- the Non-Aggression Principle is the heart and soul of libertarianism, and deserves to be more heavily emphasized in our platform, not deleted! Once again this proposal represents an attempt to give our "Personal Liberty" plank a more conservative tone. It adds the unnecessary nationalism of referring to the "foundation of America", and to a "distinctively American quality", when in fact libertarianism is a universally applicable philosophy that is not restricted to any one country or people.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	are we stating a platform or arguing a point. i am not opposed to changing the grammer of the first sentence but this proposal is kind of preachy
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Likely	No	Non-Member	Still, not good enough. Sorry.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Likely	No	Non-Member	Brevity is the soul of wit. Everything Libertarian takes too many words. While the proposed statements might be slightly closer to our core values, it's just too long and therefore not as likely to be read.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Likely	No	Non-Member	You cannot delete "No individual, group, or government may initiate force against any other individual, group, or government."
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Version 2: Overly broad, vague, begins like every other political party, defining what America is.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Maybe I am reading it wrong but I sometimes get the feeling that the LibertarianParty is moving more towards either the Democrat party or the Republican party in hopes of reaching out to those dissatisfied with their party. although, if true then I understand the reasoning behind it but I prefer not to see it.

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.

	Support	All
All Respondents	7.8%	7.8%
Commenters	21.3%	4.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Same comment as the first proposal: The right to make a choice does NOT depend on both understanding that it has consequences and accepting responsibility for them. The consequences and responsibility follow from the action taken and do not depend on understanding them. I also say that these are poorly worded. We need better word smithing.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It starts off great, however gets too lengthy fast.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Second one is excessively wordy and could be interpreted several ways, depending on how you read it. First proposal is clearer once you deal with "recognize individual self-ownership" psychobabble.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Likely	No	Non-Member	The proposed revision suggests that one's exercise of liberty is conditioned ("provided they bear") upon one's acceptance of another's right to imposed undefined consequences and responsibilities upon the one exercising liberty.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is more wordy than the first proposal.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This version is verbose.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Making a choice COULD result in a consequence, but the way both of these read suggests all choices result in consequences. If the outcome of said choice is positive in the eye of the individual, how is that a consequence?
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Freedom and responsibility are two edged. One needs to have the responsibility to make choices as well as being responsible for those choices. one cannot truly exist without the other
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Too many unsupported statements, like "the very foundation of America" and "this ideal creates unrivaled freedom and abundance".

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.

	Support	All
All Respondents	7.8%	7.8%
Commenters	21.3%	4.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Likely	No	Non-Member	The second proposal is too wordy.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Don't directly state that choice is conditional on understanding consequences/accepting responsibility.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Talk about happiness for the greatest number sounds like socialism. Let's stick to individual rights and let the social planners deal with the greatest good. Once we start appealing to the greatest good, we have lost the moral high ground. I do not need to defend my right to live my own life. If you think I do, then I am already in deep trouble.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Likely	No	Non-Member	Same comment as above.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	See comments above.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Likely	No	Non-Member	Keep it simple
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Keep it simple, stupid. The fewer words you use, the better.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What is wrong with the plank written in the Declaration of Independence? "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." How can we Libertarians say it better? Are we in a one upsmanship contest with the Founders?
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	too wordy.

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.

	Support	All
All Respondents	7.8%	7.8%
Commenters	21.3%	4.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Same as above, but to make it more concrete, it should reference the golden rule. Instead of saying "Ideal", mention that while occasionally personally distasteful acts might occur, that attempting to control freedom, prevents people from being creative and limits all human endeavor including of new science, art, and methods of education which would make the world a better place.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the second recommendation except that it should include the limitation that one person's rights stop where another person's begins (e.g. no has the right to murder someone else just because they are willing to take responsibility).
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Omit the jingoism. Freedom is not a "distinctly American" idea or ideal. And, again, do not omit the intiation of force language!
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	keep it simple. we believe in freedom of choice
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Too preachy. A statement of purpose is sufficient.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer the existing plank.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Too much emphasis on America - Libertariranism should be universal
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"Depends" again I don't get it.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	See my comments above
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Not only does this have the same problem (who decides whether someone fully understands or sufficiently accepts responsibility) and adds to it the false suggestion that personal liberty is distinctively American which is demonstrably false.

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.

	Support	All
All Respondents	7.8%	7.8%
Commenters	21.3%	4.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is my recommendation: Libertarians recognize that personal liberty means self-ownership. An individual should have the freedom to make personal choices with an understanding and acceptance of the consequences of those choices. Our support of an individual's right to make choices does not mean that we approve or disapprove of those choices. Libertarians view government's proper role as ensuring the right of individuals to make personal choices for themselves and voluntarily in concert with others.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer this one as long as the rights of the unborn are protected.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Needs to be clear and concise.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Too wordy. Look at The Constitution for clarity of purpose.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Likely	No	Non-Member	It removes the non-aggression clause with out an equivalent replacement.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"Libertarians support and defend personal liberty, if the exercise of that liberty does not harm others, while recognizing that with freedom comes personal responsibility and decisions have consequences".
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This whole "proper role of government" line is selling out on the Non-aggression principle. The goal should be reducing government. Once we get down to barely nothing, then we can talk about what is "appropriate" or if any government is appropriate.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Is this an amendment or a speech?
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the current wording: simple and to the point.

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.

	Support	All
All Respondents	7.8%	7.8%
Commenters	21.3%	4.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Likely	No	Non-Member	I would prefer something about self-determination and making choices that ultimately decide our life being a fundamental right of all free people; that they not be forced or fraudulently coerced into making decisions by government or other individuals.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	nope, still not right
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Likely	No	Non-Member	This is better than the first proposal, but still not as good as the current language.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Too much ambiguous language. This could theoretically could also be supported by leftists - sure, you can make choices about how to use your property, but they're subject to the "consequences" of me wanting all your money.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A number of specific basic rights must never be denied the individual even for a majority consensus.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Pronoun grammar problems again.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	See comments to first proposal.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Amazingly over-complicated! Plus, for adults, the right to make a choice does NOT depend on understanding that it has consequences (although any enlightened individual will understand that). If a person wants to make a bad choice thinking that it will not have consequences for them, then I have NO problem with that!
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Libertarians recognize individual self-ownership and the right to make personal choices. Our support of an individual's right to make choices does not mean that we approve or disapprove of those choices. With rights come the responsibility for the consequences of those actions. Government's proper role is to protect the rights of every individual.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Likely	No	Non-Member	For same reason as expressed above.

2.0 - Personal Liberty - Pending Amendment

I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.

	Support	All
All Respondents	7.8%	7.8%
Commenters	21.3%	4.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Likely	No	Non-Member	Wordy, and the objections stated above still apply.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Likely	No	Non-Member	I think you've become brain-dead. Cut the BS. One Simple Statement.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Likely	No	Non-Member	The existing plank is preferable to both alternatives.
I support neither of these two proposals for this plank.	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Nothing against initiation of force.

3.0 - Personal Privacy

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Commenters	50.8%	49.2%	10.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The legal term "include" means to exclude that which is not listed. Since this is a discussion of the legal process it would be better to say "...includes, but is not limited to, records...."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I have reservations about this - children are individuals, but I believe wholeheartedly that my 9 year old has only a limited right to privacy and self-determination. Left to his own devices he would sit watching cartoons all day and munching on crap. An adult can make those decisions; a child lacks the knowledge and experience to make informed decisions.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Support, as long as the crossed out lines are included elsewhere.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	For the sole purpose of this revision leaves out the proper definition of a crime, leave that in and you have my support.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	As long as it still states other where, unambiguously, and bluntly, that we are against victimless crime.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Last sentence unnecessary.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, too many words. The original statement is clear and simple.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Support but would include a statement that explains infringement on the right's of others as a crime.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What "media and substances" is getting too specific.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This sentence is confusing and might read better if you add the word 'those' or something like that . "Protection from unreasonable search and seizure should include (THOSE) records held by third parties, such as email, medical, and library records.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the first sentence but the last one seems clumsy, it should be rewritten, perhaps as 2 sentences.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe that the original wording of the first sentence in 1.2 says it all. "Protection from ..." and "Individuals have the freedom and responsibility..." could be added as (a) and (b)
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The term "self-ownership" leaves open the interpretation that humans can be owned.

3.0 - Personal Privacy

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Commenters	50.8%	49.2%	10.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Think the whole thing needs re-working. Too much "handing-off" of responsibility.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The air port case in point. We are being unreasonably searched and privacy violated. I am really outraged at the awful invasion of privcy and the touching of my body because I will not go thru a scanner !!!!!!! Its sexual harrasement !!!!!!!!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Safeguarding privacy should be the responsibility of the individual and is a right they should have government support for protecting but it is not something that they should have as a default right because of the impossibility of enforcing without getting the government to violate those very principles that they would ironically be trying to protect. It is a very sticky business to say that the government has responsibilities to protect the rights of individuals and then say that one of those rights is privacy. How can the government especially a small government adequately enforce this without itself spying on its own people and thereby violating their privacy themselves? I am far more concerned with my own government abusing my privacy than I am with other individuals. Individuals should be able and allowed to take personal measures to protect their own privacy and those privacy measures should be respected by the government and other individuals. At the behest of the wronged individual, the government should help individuals to seek compensation or justice re
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Not sure of the intent using the word "media".

3.0 - Personal Privacy

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Commenters	50.8%	49.2%	10.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I AGREE that EACH person owns THEMSELF, even IF they are "brain-bugged" wih neural microchips(!) and that Americans HAVE and SHOULD BE protected by the rights to be secure in their PERSONS, HOMES, and PROPERTY from unreasonable search and seizure. However, in some forms this guarantee is not feasible. Emails, UNlike postage mail, are only COMMERCIALY private between the "venue vendor" and the user. Thus, the "vendor" has the right to monitor and convey any CRIMINALLY suspicious messages to the government for investigation; the level of government depending however on the nature of the level of the suspected criminal activity. Library records are also "public domain" information for authorities but again, should ONLY be delivered to the appropriate level of government authority depending on the nature of the suspected activity. UNfortunatealy, people receiving governmental disability compensation benefits have NO privacy to their medical records. I DISagree that ALL substances should be publicly available without restriction if they are poisonous or psychotrop
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This should include a qualification statement that ensures Libertarians do not object to the protection of children from exploitation via pornography or exposure to potentially harmful substances or activities.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Eliminate the last two sentences and drop ALL references to drug use.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Each individual is owned by our Creator, not by himself.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Simply put; In a free society we must accept the bad freedoms along with the good freedoms. We also must accept the consequences for our own actions. We believe everyone has the right to life, liberty and their happiness as long as it does not negatively effect another from pursuing the same.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Privacy rights and the criminalization of certain behaviors, while related, are independent of one another, and should be treated as such.

3.0 - Personal Privacy

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Commenters	50.8%	49.2%	10.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Change wording to read "each individual owns him or herself." It seems like a petty issue and not too long ago people recognized that male pronouns also served a gender-neutral role but people no longer think that way. A slight modification further shields the candidates and party from accusations of sexism which, as we are currently seeing, is a favored weapon of the DNC.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Add: "FINANCIAL RECORDS, ETC." (specifically list this one); "BOTH BY GOVERNMENTAL AND NON GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS"; between "they knowingly and voluntarily consume "AND ALLOW ACCES TO," and what risks they accept
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Why are we striking "only actions that infringe on the rights of others can properly be termed crimes"? This is good verbage and can still be used before the addition.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Libertarians observe that each person regards their body and their intellect as personal property due the same right of privacy and ownership assumed with any other possession. We support the rights instilled by the Fourth Amendment, to be secure in our persons, homes and property and free from unreasonable search and seizure thereof. This includes information in any format regarding our properties that are held by other parties, whether or not confidence is expressed, being stored by public institutions, medical care providers and other service providers in connection with our sensitive, private records. Libertarians affirm the right of adults to the life style of their choosing; the right to treat their bodies and their personal welfare as they so deem, assuming all risks associated to their decisions. We believe adults enjoy the freedom to decide whatever substances they willingly consume or introduce into their bodies and that the prohibition of substances, is antithesis to the freedom of choice and self-determination.

3.0 - Personal Privacy

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Commenters	50.8%	49.2%	10.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'd like to see wording that would prohibit by law, any person or group, including government from demanding passwords or in any way accessing personal records or information, unless there is uncoerced voluntary consent by the individual or individuals who are the owner(s) and or subject(s) of those records, information or other data.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I suggest amending the second sentence to read "Libertarians support the rights recognized by the Fourth Amendment to be secure in our persons, homes, and property, including records held by third parties, such as email, medical, and library records."
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Come on, really? Are you serious? Now you don't even want a specific call to end Prohibition?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But, why did you remove the "criminalizaton" wording? Maybe, if you added, "...only actions, by government representatives, corporations, and other ? can properly be termed 'crimes'..." it would be more precise in its intent.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support this, but I would also include more specifics about what controversial substances and media we're referring to. As Libertarians, we are almost all opposed to the War on Drugs, so I think we should indicate that. The redacted text in this proposal includes that language, and I would suggest keeping it. The additions to the plank are good though.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The original version is stronger and clearer, especially regarding victimless crimes
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We have to let people know that there are restrictions to liberty if one crosses unto the boundaries of others.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Except to the extent that harm to another person - whether physical, property or financial - may result. I.e.; as a practical matter, someone collapsing in front of us is going to the hospital where real costs will be incurred that the responsible party may not be able to pay - how do we deal with that?

3.0 - Personal Privacy

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Commenters	50.8%	49.2%	10.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Doesn't point directly at specific cases and covers more topics. I like this suggestion.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would make it more gender neutral (switch himself with themselves)
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Our apparently primary focus on legal drug use makes me sick. As long as this country is a welfair state and society continues to foot the bill for the shattered lives, workers comp claims, feeding and housing the familys of drug users I cannot support this. Our platform does not make this issue dependent on any changes when we advertise this issue. We make it stand alone and it appears that all of you would gladly put the freedom of drug use first before any changes were made to responsibility which makes us look like a bunch of waco's.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The risks associated with drugs especially normally will not be admitted, whether through ignorance or self-deceit. The public should not have to face those risks at the sake of so-called "liberty." I know John Stossel would not agree with this position.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The two sentences address two distinctly different topics - privacy and consumption. These should be in separate sub-planks to reinforce the distinction.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	No victum no crime is good
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	The emphasis on individual control is very much preferred.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The only thing I would change is: making himself to "theirself" or some similar word. I don't think it sounds that sexist, but we don't want anyone to get that form of connotation.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Only in the event the individual is not forced to consume the media and or substance if harm is imposed
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	strike "and therefore has the right to privacy, etc." Insert "and therefore has the right to control his body and his mind without interference by government.

3.0 - Personal Privacy

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Commenters	50.8%	49.2%	10.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We recognize for each citizen of majority the right to be unmolested by government intrusion in victimless acts, and secure in person and property of all form and possession, absent tort or crime.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	acceptable.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	and add on, that the choices as to media and substances will not infringe on the rights or safety of others.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The first statement is not necessary, and the second portion restates the first proposal of self ownership, and responsibility. Examples in the last statement have nothing to do with privacy, they have to do with choices Make it a separate proposal.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think a compromise is in order for this one. An acceptable statement would be a combination of the two. We are still in the midst of legalizing, per se, victimless crimes, and should continue to push for that. The latter sentence should be assimilated with the first.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I am in favor or allowing individuals to consume drugs if they so choose, but am in favor it it being illegal to drive while under the influence (poses risks to others).
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	But I would change "Individuals have the freedom and responsibility to decide" to "Adults have a constitutional and natural right to decide". The Constitution does not protect our responsibilities, but our rights to freedom of choice.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would like to keep the sentence "Only actions that infringe on the rights of others can properly be termed crimes."

3.0 - Personal Privacy

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Commenters	50.8%	49.2%	10.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While I believe in both I feel they should be two separate planks. I also think that the section section should include something along the lines of "and should neither seek nor expect others to be responsible, in whole or in part, for the consequences of those actions." While this may be implied this is something that I believe in firmly and would like to leave no doubt about who bears that responsibility. Also, let's not forget that others may VOLUNTARILY assist in recovering from results of those decisions but none should be compelled to do so.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think you could still add the "Only actions that infringe on the rights of others can properly be termed crimes." other than that, I really like the rewording
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It would be nice to see an extension of the self-ownership (since its being added) position to include a statement regarding prostitution, etc. but preferably phrased as "do with their bodies" as they see fit. This might even extend into selling labor, sexual relationships, etc.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Prohibition was and still is an example of government getting it wrong and acting like a tyranny. A Temperance movement that discourages public drunkenness and encourages 'social' drinking over outright inebriation would have made a much better structure for our future than Volstead's Folly.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the new language. I would keep the old language in as well.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	is a bit specific, should we not mention social media? you tube? public record is a hazy line but I agree with the first part of the statement.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Privacy. Media. Substances. Just too many diverse topics in here.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the blanket assertion that in order to be crime, an action *must* infringe upon someone's rights. I would support a revision that retains language emphasizing that fact.

3.0 - Personal Privacy

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Commenters	50.8%	49.2%	10.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would simplify this to just "Privacy" - IF you were to use my suggestion for 1.1 then that is the established Natural Right of Self-Ownership. Now in 1.2 we establish the Natural Right of Privacy. Privacy IS a Natural Right and does not depend on self-ownership (IMHO). It stands on its own. Again, I would drop the "Libertarians recognize" stuff in every one of these, it is redundant. And the last sentence about substances consumed... there's just no need for it here... yes privacy rights are violated in order to convict people of unjust laws but its not the privacy violation that is the issue, it is the unjust law that violates Plank 1.1 and 1.1 covers all of it w/o being explicit... if we are explicit we will invariably leave something out, leaving it broad and abstract allows us to put all these types of things under one single umbrella of individual free-will for 1.1, we don't need to keep bring it up in other planks. Anyway, I would say: PRIVACY IS A NATURAL RIGHT. AS WITH ALL NATURAL RIGHTS WE ARE OBLIGATED TO SECURE THIS RIGHT FOR OURSELVES BY ESTABL
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Previous wording is FAR more realistic. Individuals should have the freedom to decide EVERY aspect of their lives unless they wish to engage in activities which harm others.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	support with reservations. "owning" one's self is very peculiar language. What about "sovereign liberty"? Speaking of "ownership" relating to persons just sounds very strange, and we should avoid that.

3.0 - Personal Privacy

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Commenters	50.8%	49.2%	10.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What does "owns himself" mean? The first sentence makes no sense at all. Does a slave that does not own himself not enjoy privacy? Having purchased his freedom, does the slave suddenly acquire privacy? I suggest this: (The portion in black) "Libertarians support the rights recognized by the Fourth Amendment to be secure in our persons, homes, and property. Protection from unreasonable search and seizure should include records held by third parties, such as email, medical, and library records. " All of the extra stuff could be put in an essay if someone were so inclined; it does not belong in a "plank" or statement of principles.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Original wording is preferred.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A commendable change, but it does not seem important enough to be listed so high as a Plank 1.2. The issue of personal privacy and private decision-making (drugs, etc) does.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would either make the language gender neutral or add "herself" along with "himself." (e.g. "Libertairans recognize the right of privacy as a result of self-ownership at the individual level.")
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Seems like two different issues, though. One is the right to privacy; and the other is the right to decide about things related to privacy.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Excellent wording
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"Self-ownership"? You must be kidding! A person can no more own himself than he can own the person who cooks his food, cleans his floors, and calls him Massa. Scratch the first sentence and send the person who wrote it to Jail without passing "Go."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would specifically add "vehicles" in addition to property in the first sentence.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Why use responsibility when consequence might be more appropriate?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would leave in the words "actions that infringe on the rights of others can properly be termed crimes."

3.0 - Personal Privacy

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Commenters	50.8%	49.2%	10.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Propose rewording as follows: The 4rth ammendment is based on the principle that government has no inherent claim on the privacy or productivity of the individual, because government derives its authority solely by the consent of the individual.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	As long as the "victimless crimes" aspect is taken up elsewhere sufficiently.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	first sentence repeats somewhat previous proposed amendment
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Perhaps should read "...they knowingly and voluntarily consume, or refuse to consume, and what risks they..."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"...what media and substances they knowingly and voluntarily consume... " reaches me as inflammatory "porn and drugs" although reaching beyond them. May I suggest: "... what pursuit of happiness they willingly seek,..."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	first part is good; second is not
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Keep the title change and first revision, lose the second revision.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Is non-disclosure of records a responsibility of 'third parties'? Only if it's subject to the conditions of a contract or subject to some 'standard of care' expectation of non-disclosure. Record holders should have the right to refuse unreasonable search and seizure (without fear of retaliation), but they should also have the right to disclose records that are not subject to non-disclosure clauses (or to a standard expectation of non-disclosure). *Requiring* record-holders to refuse search-and-seizure is a monopoly-esque type of government protection of intellectual property, which I believe should not have any place in the Libertarian platform.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Individuals who are considered adults in the eyes of the law....
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	there should be stronger language about the emails and web surfing media collecting data on us.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think that the phrase, "Only actions that infringe on the rights (or property) of others can be properly termed as crimes should be left intact.

3.0 - Personal Privacy

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Commenters	50.8%	49.2%	10.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the title ammendment, but the language about actions that infringe is crucial and should not be excluded.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'm not clear what we are after here. The "philosophical underpinnings" of self ownership are vague at best. If we look at the Lockean Proviso (perhaps the first argument for the notion of ownership, the concept means merely to "adhere" or "a-fix" labor to an object. In other words alter it in some way from it's native state. We can't really say that humans do this in any real sense since we are not "foreign" to ourselves. That being said, I don't understand what we are trying to achieve here. We can debate "self-ownership" ad infinitum and never reach a conclusion. I believe that the real issue is the power of government, how it is derived, and how a government will be limited to implementing, or mandating, it's authority over the citizenship. We should leave philosophy to scholars and idealists.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the first sentence addition, but I do not like the proposed last part more than the original.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Would like to see "Only actions that infringe on the rights of others can properly be termed crimes. We favor the repeal of all laws creating "crimes" without victims" left in.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree with the removal of wording regarding "crimes" from this section.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Not strong enough about victimless crimes. Opposition to so-called victimless crimes must be explicit. 1.5 doesn't do it. Maybe 1.5 should be strengthened.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While I support the addition, I would recommend keeping the first sentence, legal restriction should not be placed on actions that do not infringe on the rights and well being of other individuals.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We still need to make it known that the use of these drugsthat does infringe on others rights will not be supported by the party.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	old one is better

3.0 - Personal Privacy

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Commenters	50.8%	49.2%	10.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Support the revision, but "such as email, medical, and library records" is awkwardly phrased.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Concerned though that those who do make those choices are not able to accept the responsibilities of their choices and will become dregs on society. Will be hard to 'close the door' on the nowsick and destitute for many.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the passage that states "only actions that infringe on the rights of others can properly be termed crimes".
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would also add that it is the responsibility of Adults with children to decide what media is appropriate for them to consume. To echo the sentiment of the first plank... we may each have individual opinions on these matters, but it is the right of parents to decide what is or is not appropriate material for their children to view, play, etc. Censorship by nature carries the risk of silencing free speech. That is not a risk worth taking. Adult individuals and families are capable of managing their own value systems as it relates to media consumption.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	An individual should be able to defend their person or property against it's being taken from them involuntarily.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think it's better written as it was--seemed more clear to me.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"We favor the repeal" language directs action; don't water down the action items!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like emphasizing that the libertarian viewpoint on crime is "any action that infringes on the rights of others". I believe it's important to point out that we don't believe in EVERYTHING - just what a person can reasonably do without imposing on his/her neighbor.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is good because it eliminates a problematic sentence. A lot of people think crimes can be committed against yourself, so this new proposal is more clear.

3.0 - Personal Privacy

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Commenters	50.8%	49.2%	10.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Technology makes a big difference in privacy. Anyone who understands the underlying mechanisms of the internet, realize that NOTHING sent out over the internet can very be secure. Anyone who looks into those servers's message buffers, can have access to your packets. Those individual message packets are sent from server to server, in essence randomly. So you can't predict the path of any of the packets of any message. Your only hope is to have good enough encryption to keep most snoopers out most of the time.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the first sentence, however I have some concerns with the second. As to finances one may have additional responsibilities; children, etc. I agree with the former clause on victimless crimes and medicinal uses but I think this clause might be to open ended.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	However, the term "self-ownership" is not necessarily clear.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would keep the stricken line while using the final sentence from below.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But should say adlts as below - except what are you considering adult? 16? 18? 21?
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Needs to be extended to cover gambling, prostitution, seat belt laws. Additionally the new language is not clear or concise enough.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I guess I am opposed to the original statement and to the modifications. How do I impose a 4th amendment protection for myself on 3rd parties? If a free library asks, as a condition of lending, that I provide my address and allow them to rent that address, does this provision imply they should be prohibited (by statute) from doing so?
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	But the reference to "media" reads poorly when linked with "consume" and may be confusing.

3.0 - Personal Privacy

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Commenters	50.8%	49.2%	10.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would support the proposal with the following changes: (1) Strike the first sentence. It looks like a nonsequitur: it isn't obvious that a right to privacy follows immediately from self-ownership (which entails other rights from which privacy can, perhaps, be derived). Besides, self-ownership is already mentioned in the new version of 1.0. (2) In the last sentence, insert "should" between "individuals" and "have".
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Much improved!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	search and seizure "shall" include Using words like should, would, may etc. allow unpredictable interpretations.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	although I like the "Libertarian Party" versus the use of Libertarians
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't like the first sentence - the use of "himself". Perhaps "Libertarians recognize self-ownership and therefore the right to privacy."
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	There needs to be an exception to child pornography and the use of drugs by pregnant women because the rights of the adult are impinging on the rights of the child.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This seems to limit the platform to favoring only the repeal of drug laws and not laws against other vices.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think that the last sentence is unnecessary, and should be addressed in sections about censorship and drug laws.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is a distinct improvement.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree with the first sentence but most converts arent familiar with this philosophic argument and it takes more than one sentence to explain to someone unfamiliar. I believe that the idea that infringing on the freedoms of others is the only true crime and there is no such thing as a victimless crime - I dont think this should be removed.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	As long as govt doesn't classify people who screw up as another protected class.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would explicitly emphasize the property-based interpretation of the 4th amendment over the "reasonable expectation of privacy" interpretation.

3.0 - Personal Privacy

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Commenters	50.8%	49.2%	10.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't like the new first sentence. It is a non sequitur. I prefer the original, older version of this plank.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support this, however, it should say "themselves" or "their self" instead of "himself".
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would keep the new language and also keep the struck language. Move the struck language so that it is at the end.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The original language is more clear, legal, and overall better represents the Libertarian ideology.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The 4th Amendment also protects one's "effects" and this isn't mentioned. It's the protection of "effects" that extends the 4th Amendment to all those items over which a person has complete personal control. Lastly, privacy and the 4th Amendment cannot be extended or assumed to protect us from any searches by third parties, reasonable or unreasonable, with whom an individual has entered into a contract. Email and medical records are held by parties with whom each of us has entered into a contract. If said contract allows them access to one's personal information, then the only way to prevent them from using it as they choose is through the terms of said contract. If you don't like the terms, don't sign it. The Internet is a public place, period. Any argument to the contrary is absurd. If you cannot personally protect something like your home, your papers, your property, or your effects, you have no right to expect privacy in that domain.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	seems to dilute the personal privacy language beyond what can reasonably be understood. the proposed striken language is very clear and sets a necessary boundary
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	change the word "should" to "shall".
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the additions, but I also think the eliminated sentence should be retained. Eliminating "Personal" from the title, though, is fine.

3.0 - Personal Privacy

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Commenters	50.8%	49.2%	10.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	To make the first sentence gender free and grammatically correct, I recommend the following wording: "Libertarians recognize that all individuals own themselves, and consequently have the right to privacy." or "Libertarians recognize that each individual owns themself and has the right to privacy as a result of that ownership." If you leave "and therefore" in the sentence, then I would put a comma between "and" & "therefore" to make it read better.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would simply eliminate this plank and address privacy elsewhere or start from a clean slate.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Don't drift into specifics when crafting a manifesto. It reduces your room to maneuver.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There should be language about making a informed decision.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer the wording "personal privacy" over "self-ownership". I'm okay with the last sentence being added, and the sentence about crime being removed.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	However, I regret giving up any wording that recommends repeal of unjust laws. I feel that repeal of such laws should be an important goal.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like adding the new stuff here.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is an appealing proposal, however I would amend that the title be "Self-Ownership." I would also amend that the following sentence should remain, "Only actions that infringe on the rights of others can properly be termed crimes."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Might prefer we leave the clause that naturally limits our freedom, that it does not allow us to impose on anyone else's freedom. Our freedom and liberty are self-limited under natural law.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The phrase "what media and substances they ... consume" is unnecessary and repetitive, since "what risks...life" covers the same concept, but more generally.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer 1.2 as written in its above entirety, including the sentence in red that's to be struck out.

3.0 - Personal Privacy

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Commenters	50.8%	49.2%	10.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I understand the purpose of the change and I generally support it, but removing the phrase "we favor the repeal of all laws creating "crimes" without victims" is important. If plank 1.5 takes care of this, then fine, but it should be somewhere.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'd prefer "a right to privacy" rather than "the right to privacy". Some searches and seizures are reasonable, though far fewer than the present regime is accustomed to.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Supports the Libertarian why even better.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I see benefit to all of the above language, both the original and the new language.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	not fond of either version
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	remove the word "should". Replace with "shall" or adjust the sentence properly if "should" is simply removed.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Slight support with reservation the "individual owns himself" is odd sounding. Why not .."every individual has the right to personal privacy"?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Keep the former, add the latter.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The language proposed for deletion is NOT redundant to what appears in the "Crime and Justice" plank (1.5). The language that conservative-oriented platform chair (for life?) Alicia Mattson wants to delete, sets forth in clear, simple, powerful language the important principle that "victimless crimes" that do not infringe on the rights of others are not crimes at all: Only actions that infringe on the rights of others can properly be termed crimes. We favor the repeal of all laws creating 'crimes' without victims, such as the use of drugs for medicinal or recreational purposes. This language could be *moved* to plank 1.5, but it should not be deleted. Also, "each individual owns himself" is not gender-inclusive in line with current phrasing.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"Self-Ownership" seems trite. Compared to what... self owned by others? If you want to describe what the term means, I would suggest that it be addressed on its own, rather than lumping it in with the Privacy rights of individuals. Other than that term, I concur with the changes.

3.0 - Personal Privacy

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Commenters	50.8%	49.2%	10.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I like the added first sentence, but dislike the deletion substitution at the end.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I only support substance freedom if all safety nets are removed. Society shouldn't pay for the risks. Language needs to be added to reflect this.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the new beginning sentence, but would rather the last sentence remain the same. But, it's not that big a deal to be honest.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Suggest removing the comma following "consume".
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You can do what you want in Amercia (even if your a Freak) as long as it's in your own home.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	well written
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Better. Not perfect, but better.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Every plank of the Party Platform must be based on principles that MUST be mitigated by a primary principle that if we don't attract a substantially increased number of members, the other principles won't matter. matters.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	While the essence is the same, it seems a bit watered down as to the point that there should be no such thing as a crime if no one is harmed but possibly yourself.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	In the last sentence, I would love to see "Adult citizens" rather than Individuals.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Excellent. Good work.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I will likely support this provided that crimes committed under the influence of drugs are covered elsewhere, as I do not agree that individual drug use is necessarily a victimless crime.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I really think that whole concept of "self-ownership" is unnecessary. I think it will just confuse people. Best to keep it simple.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The current plank is more direct and easier to understand than the proposed substitution.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The added wording is good; however, I suggest keepign the sentences that are crossed out.

3.0 - Personal Privacy

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Commenters	50.8%	49.2%	10.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	You cannot delete the concept: "Only actions that infringe on the rights of others can properly be termed crimes. We favor the repeal of all laws creating "crimes" without victims, such as the use of drugs for medicinal or recreational purposes." You are GUTTING libertarianism.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Strike the words "knowingly and voluntarily", those conditions are contained in the bundle "decide" and do not, if absent, absolve an individual of responsibility (or liberty).
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	add protections from 14th Amendment for due process as well (against NDAA)
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I feel that explicitly stating opposition to the creation of victimless crimes is integral to our positions.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i would support this proposal if the portion that is in red were added .to me to be a libertarian i believe that as an adult i should have full civil libertys.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Basically agree, however..... Missing is the web traffic tracking issue per advertisers and especially, those sorts of aggregating database companies which serve both the corporate and the government systems. You do know that it is precisely these companies selling our personal lives information to the government that enables leviathan to skirt what meagre laws that have been enacted to supposedly protect us from the evil empire's horrendous hunger for all our lifeliving data! The current language is way too weak and lacking focus wrought from current "daymare" reality. Please read through what the Electronic Frontier Foundation has available on their website. To offer a suggestion, though, (1) add "all" to the third sentence, to thus read "...should include all records held..."; and (2) add "personal web traffic" within the examples, to thus read "... such as personal web traffic, email, ..." Also, believe the last sentence would be more reality congruent truthful were it to end as such, "... or life, and to others within their family, workplace and community. I believe
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Delete the second sentence, as is and as revised.

3.0 - Personal Privacy

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Commenters	50.8%	49.2%	10.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Glad the "personal" was removed from privacy, rather redundant, no?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	too simplistic, what about child : is he an "individual"? from what wage he can consume ...? Better not to put ideas which is not finished.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The section to be erased is too important. The new material should be added, not in replacement.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	change to him or her self. we must be politically correct.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This clause sounds like you support and promote drug use! This needs to be totally reworded.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Support adding the first sentence so that it reads: Libertarians recognize that each individual owns himself and therefore has the right to privacy. Libertarians support the rights recognized by the Fourth Amendment to be secure in our persons, homes, and property. Protection from unreasonable search and seizure should include records held by third parties, such as email, medical, and library records. Only actions that infringe on the rights of others can properly be termed crimes. We favor the repeal of all laws creating "crimes" without victims, such as the use of drugs for medicinal or recreational purposes.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Excellent rewrite, I agree with the positive focus.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like that the first proposal explicitly mentions the repealing of all laws creating "crimes" without victims; that should be added to refreshed proposal.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do not like the own their self. It sounds repetitive or self explanatory. I also like old part of as long as act doesn't interfere with others rights.

3.0 - Personal Privacy

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Commenters	50.8%	49.2%	10.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again the mishmashing of concepts. Is this statement about privacy, self-ownership, or "what-we-may-ingest"? The title change is fine. As is the first added sentence. Up until the last sentence, we have a pretty coherent plank that seems to explain how, if we believe we own ourselves, then we also own, and have the right to control, the level of privacy we are willing to surrender. And that the government therefore has no standing to violate that privacy by force. Good so far. Then the last statement pops up. It has nothing to do with privacy, but with that other child of self ownership, personal choice. While every libertarian, myself included, certainly agrees with that last sentence, it adds nothing to an already coherent plank about privacy. Of course "privacy" and "personal choice" are related (through the concept of "self-ownership"). But almost every libertarian concept is a child of the concept of "self-ownership". That's fine, let's hammer on self-ownership often. It is the primary source of every thing we believe in. But in most people's minds, "privacy" and "pe
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Mostly good. Still need to define what "self-ownership" is. Keep "only actions that infringe..." as well as adding initial and the final sentences.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Perhaps the inclusion of personal responsibility for the choices made would be good regarding the media and substances part.

3.0 - Personal Privacy

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Commenters	50.8%	49.2%	10.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Honest answer: i neither support nor oppose this proposed change. Neither wording appeals to me. I've been a capital-L Libertarian since 1980, and even right now in 2012, "self ownership" strikes me as an odd phrase. I understand the intent, yet i don't go around thinking about how i "own myself". I think about how i am in control of my choices and actions, and responsible for them and what ensues from them. The last proposed sentence is understandable, yet seems to be drifting away from specificity (the existing wording) towards vagueness (the proposed change). I think the proposed change is more comprehensive, yet may not resonate with non-libertarians, who might (i don't know) tend to think more in terms of the concrete ("drugs") rather than the over-arching conceptual ("substances").
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like adding the first sentence. Leave the last sentence as it is.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would not make the deletions. Also, the word "confidentiality" needs to be introduced in addition to privacy, as it relates to personal communications, financial, and medical records. Lastly, the last sentence must begin: "Individuals MUST have the freedom and responsibility..."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The first deleted sentence could go at the end after the last added sentence to further explain that an action toward oneself should never be criminalized.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	My support is conditioned on the placement of the stricken language in the Crime and Justice plank.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	this is tepid support... since it is impossible for me to advance in this survey so as to see what changes - if any - to plank 1.5, I cannot say for sure, but on the surface, I support this (for now). In the future, send these surveys in a format that allow us to read all of the changes and then go back and give our opinions.

3.0 - Personal Privacy

	Support	Oppose	All	
All Respondents	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%	
Commenters	50.8%	49.2%	10.5%	
Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	the title Privacy and Self-Ownership and the adition of the first sentince I agree with. I am unsure of the last sentence I like the crossed out one better than the new one.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Not sure I like the "individual owns himself" -- aside from the issues of his/her the concept of ownership of a person, even if it is self, doesn't feel Libertarian. Perhaps "Libertarians recognize that each individual is responsible to themselves and their communities and therefore has the right to privacy."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Original is more direct.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the notion that only actions that infringe on the rights of others can properly be termed crimes (unless there's some great counter-example that I'm not thinking of at the moment). If that's not retained somewhere else, I hate to lose it.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The first sentence (Only actions....be termed crimes.) is an absolute true statement and NEEDS to be included. This needs no qualifiers and will stand alone, no other qualifiers need to be included!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Add the proposed sentences, but do not strike away the original. Rather blend the two.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think this needs a bit more elaboration. Privacy issues associated with information technology is such a large and growing issue that it should be treated separately from behavioral privacy issues such as religious practice, sexual preferences, and drug consumption.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I likethe old one better.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"self-ownership" where did this come from? Libertarians believe that the 4th amendment should be read literally. And then the last sentence.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the deleted language

3.0 - Personal Privacy

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Commenters	50.8%	49.2%	10.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Addictions as such, should be treated as medical problems, not crimes. "Fishing expeditions" should not be used as an "ends justifies the means". We already have laws in place for situations where the authorities have to act fast then get permission after the fact: but in general situations, we don't need thought police.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree however would place more emphasis on other areas than drugs to have more mainstream appeal.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the heading "Personal Privacy" and the entire line that was crossed out....
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Just curious why you include persons, houses, and effects from the 4th amendment, but not papers in the second sentence. Papers are alluded to in the next sentence, but not tied explicitly to the amendment.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Should be: "Self-Ownership and Privacy" Should be: "...each individual is the "owner" of their own life (i.e., we are all sovereign entities)...." Keep some statement concerning the general concept of victimless crimes (as a category, although citing a specific example or two is okay)
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The language is cleaner and doesn't make people presume to think about the possibility that they are supporting one particular area over another.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i prefer the existing. prefer the original title. don't see the need for the opening sentence. i do prefer the new last sentence.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Object to 'self-ownership'. That's not appealing to the Christian people. Otherwise I support.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The former is more straight forward and clear.

3.0 - Personal Privacy

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Commenters	50.8%	49.2%	10.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	First sentence (inserted): How does the fact that each individual owns him- or herself give rise to a right to privacy? I agree that we have one, but I don't think the inserted sentence will convince anyone who doesn't agree. Final sentence: To me, "media" means the press, TV, radio and similar means of mass communication; I don't understand how one would "consume" them.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	the last sentence needs work
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Love it, as long as plank 1.5 still favors the repeal of "crimes" without victims.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Although I agree with both points in the first statement, I believe it is a non-sequitur. Nevertheless, I would support it if it was changed to be inclusive towards women. It is also dangerous to list specifics because that raises the question: What about those not explicitly stated?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Add:While not infringing on others safety etc.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Leave the old one exactly as it is.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would change the word "consume" in the last sentence to "expose themselves to" to make it more neutral. People can be exposed to Fox News, C-Span and Marijuana. But typically, people do not "consume", the O'Riley Factor or Glen Beck, but do "consume" marijuana.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	It may not be clear to many how the right to privacy derives from self ownership. Perhaps some elaboration of this point would be appropriate.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Good work
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Except for title change. I don't like the term "self-ownership." I prefer "individual sovereignty."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think the existing language is adequate and more appropriate to expressing the ideas of this plank.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	...this again encourages personal responsibility rather than "well--addiction is a disease; so therefore, I'm not to blame for it."

3.0 - Personal Privacy

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Commenters	50.8%	49.2%	10.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I also oppose part of the existing language. As it stand I would support the existing language with the removal of ", such as the use of drugs for medicinal or recreational purposes" By continually bringing "drugs" into the conversation we loose support of people who other wise would connect with us. I believe the current verbiage, minus this section, speaks to our freedoms without narrowing our focus.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think it would be fine to add what is being proposed to add, without deleting what is suggested for deletion.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But keep the push for repeal of victimless crime laws.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Talking across this state, people find this view regarding drug use as offensive. This does more harm to candidates than help
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I strongly believe that there should still be a sentence in this plank that favors the repeal of all laws creating crimes without victims (there sadly many federal law examples)
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I like the no victim, no crime terminology to be included actually.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Keep the language it had! This is an awful change.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Last clause: "Adults who have reached the age of majority have the responsibility of knowing the consequences and risks of what they choose to personally consume, do with their personal finances, their health, safety, and life, and monitoring or restricting those choices must not be imposed by others on them."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The final sentence is factually incorrect. The party may choose to try to secure such freedoms, but they are not currently possessed. "Should have the freedom" would be better wording.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Property includes whatever individuals create. (And) The government has no constitutional right to claim (steal) the individual's production. Tax is theft!

3.0 - Personal Privacy

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Commenters	50.8%	49.2%	10.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The new statements are O.K. but I would retain the deleted portion up through the word "victims." I would then end that sentence with a period and proceed to add the new sentence as proposed in plank 1.2. for "Adults.."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Short and to the point. A side note- I think there needs to be factual information about substances given to the public- no more DARE bs and other scare tactics- so that the individual truly knows exactly what they are getting themselves in to.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I suggest adding "Adult" in front of "Individuals" to avoid the appearance that we think children should be able to smoke, drink and use drugs.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the first half of this proposal. However I like the original "Only actions.." better than the proposed change.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Although I do not recommend adding the first line about "each individual owns himself..." It is just not needed.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"...each individual inately has self-ownership and a right to privacy." - "...to decide what items, media and substances they knowingly and voluntarily consume or produce and what risks they accept..."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support, but wish I could read 1.5 before doing so.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I do like the nod to "victimless crime" but overall the language is better as amended.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Change "Libertarians support the rights recognized by the Fourth Amendment to ..." to "Libertarians recognize rights granted by the Fourth Amendment to ...". Change "should include records held by third parties ..." to "includes records held by third parties ...". Change "Individuals have the freedom and responsibility to decide ..." to "Individuals are free in their homes and persons and responsible for deciding ..."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	a possible addition at the end, as long as they do not infringe on the rights of others.

3.0 - Personal Privacy

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Commenters	50.8%	49.2%	10.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I strongly object to the use of the phrase "third parties". I believe that the Constitution places limits on government (and arguably therefore those acting on its behalf) only, not on arbitrary third parties (which could be me).
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What a person consumes can also affect others such as their families or innocent people on highways, etc. I do not feel people have the right to consume what they want if it results in harms to others (drinking and driving for example)
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"..... to decide what media and substances they knowingly and voluntarily consume" as long as their actions does not harm someone else either personally or their property.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I wouldn't mention media, but concur with the concept of this.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Still not satisfactory
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	how are we to know the risks if corporate America is lying to us about their products??? (e.g. the food they put on our supermarket shelves)
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	drugs comment not needed because it is encompassed and implied in the ideology
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	the second item "media and substances" should be seperate from search and seizure language in my opinion...a seperate "self-ownership" plank
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But I would like the idea of victimless crimes left in.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I still don't like the wording "self-ownership"
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I'm ambivalent on this plank, but I had to support or oppose in order to proceed. I think both versions could still be improved.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree the struck sentence is valuable under "Crime & Justice"
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer the term "personal sovereignty" to "Self-Ownership"
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Privacy is an inherent right just like the right to life. The platform should be that one sentence.

3.0 - Personal Privacy

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Commenters	50.8%	49.2%	10.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Makes the plank sound like we're promoting the use of marijuana, not that we don't have a problem with its use. Expanding it to "consume or not consume" may be a small step toward rectifying that supposition people will draw from the language.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While privacy is important in many aspects of our lives, I don't think personal property rights equates to privacy rights, and thus I don't think the 4th amendment is really about privacy, but possession. Thus the first sentence i do not think is appropriate. I do however support changing the last sentence.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	the new verbiage doesn't talk about getting rid of laws making crimes with no victims
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I'm having trouble with the wording "each individual OWNS himself." I don't know would be better wording, but to me ownership implies something that can be bought and sold.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support on the condition that we don't lose the part about favoring the repeal of victimless crimes.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer the victimless crimes statement.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	crimes without victims says it better
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would not mix the two concepts. I would be more concrete about the dangers of loss of privacy: stolen IP, identities (because the government has such wonderful security), coercion and blackmail, embarrassment. The pleasure of being secure in your own castle without invasion should also be mentioned. Perhaps go back to the original revolutionaries for inspiration and emotional resonance. Patrick Henry?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Drug addiction is a form of slavery and destroys families and communities. Libertarians are not anarchists and do not agree with this idea of unlimited drug use.

3.0 - Personal Privacy

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Commenters	50.8%	49.2%	10.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This "self-ownership" thing again...is this a new Libertarian fad or catchphrase? It will not resonate with anyone outside the party, and probably not everyone in it. Also, I don't think anyone has a right to privacy...individuals have a right to be private from the government, but not from each other. I do like the new last line, though.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Starts to get a bit redundant.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Do you want to enumerate those specific records? I know they're examples, but will folks think others not listed are excluded? Maybe something like 'all electronic or written records'
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Keep the first half of the strikethrough.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	says it well
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the addition, but not the deletion.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The original is tightly focused on one issue. including the right to do drugs mixes issues. If it isn't already, that deserves its own plank. Privacy under the fourth is one issue, and is very non-controvertial. Victimless crimes are more divisive, and deserve their own plank with lots of positive wording for support.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The right to life, liberty, property and, voluntary association assumes these points, is redundant and highlights points used against our candidates.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Individuals have the freedom and responsibility to ensure no harm to others when making personal choices over their own physical body and to decide
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Substances is too broad. If you are referring to drugs and alcohol, then when that person goes out in public (driving, for example); WE have to suffer the consequence of those actions.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would prefer to keep the wording of repealing "laws creating crimes without victims."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Haven't seen 1.5 yet but assume that it covers the "no crime without a victim" issue.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	You forgot to mention banking records, investment records, etc.

3.0 - Personal Privacy

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Commenters	50.8%	49.2%	10.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Right to privacy is undefined and does not clearly follow from "self-ownership" (another undefined term). I favor the omission of the "crime" sentence but the rest should remain as is. If you must do a "privacy" plank do it separately.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I like it better, but defining "crime" would be good too, so long as it remained brief.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The former language about the repeal of crimes is a less effective statement than fundamentally establishing the right to personal decision, which the additions establish. In addition, the clarifying additional sentence is a positive change.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The wording's not the best, but it's OK.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't think this ownership veiw is the way to go. We are responcable for our actions. Ownership statements have a way of sounding like we beleave in slavery.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'd remove privacy. This all goes back to personal liberty. If you aren't hurting someone else, it's okay. Unreasonable search and seizure hurts someone else. Refer to previous plank. We could remove this one all together.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The concept of "self ownership" is weak. Does it imply you can sell yourself into slavery? There seems something more fundamental about the sanctity of self. Perhaps a reference to natural law or the classical philosophy that guided the founding fathers would be more appropriate.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would leave the struck out sentence in. While there is some redundancy, I think both sentences (red and blue) should be included.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Should be "themselves" not "himself". I personally don't care, but some might throw a fit.

3.0 - Personal Privacy

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Commenters	50.8%	49.2%	10.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think the original wording would be better, but would recommend stopping at the words, "...without victims." Most people, including me, have a strong objection to drug misuse, but ultimately making criminals of victims does not make sense if but only if the victim is not in the process hurting others. Too often drug users do hurt others either by committing other crimes or by neglecting their duties to families, friends and employers.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I still feel that the phrase "...We favor the repeal of all laws creating "crimes" without victims, such as the use of drugs for medicinal or recreational purposes"
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the language of victimless crimes better.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The wording is better, and I personally prefer this, but I feel that for many people (other parties in particular) this wording muddies up the issues to a slight extent when compared to the above which is pretty cut-and-dry.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I like the first revision, but not the second.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	It reads funny by jumping from unreasonable search and seizure to consumption. Is it possible for the Self-Ownership aspect to fall somewhere else in the Platform or be an entirely new subsection?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like this because it is broader in its scope than the previous language rather than zeroing in on drug legalization or other hot-button issues.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The proposal leaves the determination of the source of consequences involved too vague compared to the original.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	add to rfirst sentence...in non-public circumstances.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	we are 10% of the way through the 21st century, the 4th amendment seems like what the platform should say
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Sounds much more professional

3.0 - Personal Privacy

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Commenters	50.8%	49.2%	10.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, I do not agree with the idea that humans can be owned. I recommend: "Libertarians recognize that all individuals have a right to personal privacy." I recommend removing the word "media" from the final sentence to avoid any possible confusion or impression that Libertarians support illegal pirating of electronic media.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support this with qualification, said qualification being that distribution of controlled substances should be subject to quality control, licensed and taxed.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the first sentence but do not care for the last sentence. The concept should be just limited to that of identifying the victim. If the victim is oneself then that law should not exist. References to media, substances and risk are examples of the concept and need to be stated as such to remain.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Without any constructive implications or conclusions of law by me, and supported solely by the statutes within the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970, Signed into Public Law: 191-513 by President RICHARD MILHOUS NIXON, and codified into the FOOD and DRUGS ACT of 1906 as Title 21, United States Code, Section(s) 801 through 904, supposing I was able to prove to your complete satisfaction; That for over 35-years, the executive and judicial branch of the government of the United States have operated America's luciferian and moralistic "WAR on DRUGS" against any person at random or targeted by the DEA, under color of the most repugnant F R A U D ever perpetrated and conducted by a government against its own people in the History of the World, What would you do? I can and I will! Before you dispose of the above seemingly arrogant statement in the shredder, here is another statement of fact followed by a question for you, ready? Statement of fact Scholars and intellects from all around the World have proclaimed our documents for sel

3.0 - Personal Privacy

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Commenters	50.8%	49.2%	10.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Grammatical error. "homes, and property" ... lose the comma. You guys should have an English teacher go over these proposals before they go out to the world as a whole. If I can see errors, you're in trouble, because I'm not that great a writer. I would rather that the Libertarian party not be laughed at because their grammar is lousy. The bastards in big media will take every opportunity they can to ridicule us.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The revision sounds like it supports repeal of laws designed to curb internet nuisance.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Please keep the old, and add the new.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like to wording the wording that is to be deleted. I also like the change as in the alternative below. ADULTS have the freedom.....
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Privacy is what makes some searches unreasonable. If there were no sense of one's need for privacy there would be no offense. Again, it is a matter of ownership.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the addition of the first sentence, but do not prefer the final sentence.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the addition of the first sentence. I don't care for the replacement of the last sentence.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do think the idea that an action can only be criminal if it infringes the rights of a victim should still be in one of the planks somewhere.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would prefer to keep in the crossed out part, but I understand the need to delete it
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Rephrase S4 as first and then follow with S1, S2, S3
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	OK, but the self-ownership concept should still appear in the previous.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the original, stating only actions that infringe on others are crimes
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Last sentence should read "individuals have the freedom and responsibility to decide what media and substances they knowingly and voluntarily consume, and what risks they accept to their own, and other's, health, finances, safety, or life."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	second sentence, needs to start with Adults
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Make statement gender neutral

3.0 - Personal Privacy

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Commenters	50.8%	49.2%	10.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The line "Only actions that infringe on the right of others can properly be termed crimes" should stay.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The original is clearer and more spelled out.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Libertarians support the rights recognized by the Fourth Amendment to be secure in our persons, homes, and property. Protection from unreasonable search and seizure should include records held by third parties, such as email, medical, and library records. Doesn't that say everything - is the rest just making a very simple statement confusing and redundant?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'd support this IF the new first sentence didn't include the term "himself." Call me PC, but such wording is stone-age. And the term "self ownership" loses my support.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Sentence "Individuals have....," should properly be placed in the preceding paragraph on personal liberty. "Homes" and "Property" is redundant. We should also emphasize the right to be secure in our private transactions (contracts) and not allow the government to become too involved in our business.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree with the first sentence, the second sentence is redundant to the implication of secure in homes and property. It makes us sound like we just want to legalize pot.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the first line of the proposed change, but prefer the final 2 sentences of the old version to the new. I think the phrase 'crimes without victims' is a core principal of libertarianism that connects well with people exploring the beliefs of the party, and should be visible near the top of the platform. There is also concern about the way the word 'media' is used. There are those that will try to misconstrue this in ways unintended... say for instance, illicit images involving minors. If this change is accepted, 'media' either needs to be defined, or a better word needs to be chosen that more specifically states the definition of 'media' that is intended.

3.0 - Personal Privacy

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Commenters	50.8%	49.2%	10.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Should re-instate the sentence, "Only actions that infringe on the rights of others can properly be termed crimes".
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I like the new wording, but I would also keep the old wording in there as well.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Now our rulers are telling us what we can eat. Where will it all stop? Each and every time we allow this kind of behavior by our rulers, we give away another liberty.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I favor its intent, but it's poorly written. How about this: Libertarians recognize that individuals own themselves and therefore have the right to privacy and to be secure in their persons, homes, and property, as recognized by the Fourth Amendment. Protection from unreasonable search and seizure extends to records held by third parties, such as email, medical, and library records. And further, adults have the right and responsibility to decide what media and substances they knowingly and voluntarily consume, and what risks they accept for their own health, finances, safety, and life. We favor the repeal of all laws that criminalize victimless actions.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Are we not mixing up two different issues here? The last (blue) sentence has little to do with privacy, I would think. Suggestion is to split into two streams/topics.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think something should also be mentioned to the effect that just because it's okay to drink or to use drugs, it's not necessarily okay to operate machinery (drive) as that endangers the lives of others. I get this question personally a lot and would imagine representatives/candidates getting similar questions.

3.0 - Personal Privacy

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Commenters	50.8%	49.2%	10.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the first two parts of the phrase as they're about privacy and self-ownership, which is what the section is titled. The third sentence however no longer talks about privacy, but instead about rights and responsibilities of making choices. Seems the last sentence is redundant since that was covered in 1.1. If a blurb about media and substances is to be included here, it should have privacy as its focus, not rights and responsibilities as a repeat of 1.1.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i like this so far. The wording seems better connected to the way people think/feel.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the new wording but feel like the claim has been transformed into a weaker one than it should be.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe that if an individual is going to voluntarily consume a media or substance that they not only accept the risks to their own health, finances, safety or life, but they should also be responsible and cognizant of what effect their actions have on family or other individuals in our society. I don't care if you want to smoke marijuana, but if you hit my car or me on the street, then know there are consequences.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	we shouldn't move the onus and stress of the statement from the noncreation of victomless crimes to what substances (drugs) we may or may not consume. It's best left as is.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Each individual owns himself and therefore has the right to privacy. Strike everything else.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	...responsibility and freedom... I feel the general public sees the freedom and ignores the responsibility - present them first with responsibility and then maybe they will connect it as a cost of freedom
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The stricken wording is essential.

3.0 - Personal Privacy

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Commenters	50.8%	49.2%	10.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is tricky. If Google willingly gives records about their experiences with me (such as my email or my search history) to the government, it is not necessarily the government executing an unlawful search, anymore than if the government asked me questions about my neighbor's habits, and I voluntarily answered. The determination is the terms of my contract and relationship with (in this case) Google. If they've assured me privacy, they may be liable for the breach, but the government probably shouldn't be held so. Liberty- & privacy-loving people can seek out vendors and venues that respect privacy, if that's a criteria for them, in just the same way as many people seek low prices as a criteria.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This isn't very comprehensive. And sentence 1 in blue needs to go.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Prefer original.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The right to privacy is a vague term. Does this also keep individuals from reporting on the public words and actions of other individuals, or only to the government?
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Unless you have changed 1.5, I would leave this as is. I do not like the wording "media and substances".
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	As long as 1.5 keeps the definition of "crimes", I am ok with this.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Government was instituted among men to guarantee the rights under the 4th amendment.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I support the addition at the end, but would NOT strike the preceding two sentences!
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I think the original was better. Adding the new text while keeping the old would be good as well.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Specify that the media in question does not violate another individual's rights. Things such as child pornography, authentic rape videos, etc. should not be covered by this clause.

3.0 - Personal Privacy

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Commenters	50.8%	49.2%	10.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Media and substance consumption are very different, so this conflation jars. Not sure how you differentiate safety and life in the context of either one. Omit all trailing commas before conjunctions. And please, can we avoid gender-specific pronouns when discussing individuality?? Just say, "Every individual is self-owning..."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is ok, although I don't see the purpose of striking the sentence starting with "only actions." It has an important message and isn't superfluous.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Keep the first sentence you crossed out. Remove the second sentence and replace THAT with the new text.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"Owns himself" Really? What does the last sentence have to do with the first three?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would amend the second sentence to read, "Protection from unreasonable search and seizure should include protection for records held by third parties...." The additional words "Protection for" clarifies the point.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Though they are the same in essence, the latter seems more passive. Our long-term belief may be the proposal, but our immediate goal is the "repeal."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the original language better. In this critical time, we do not need to get bogged down with controversial issues that the opposition can use against us.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	One of their biggest invasions today is the airport searches performed by the TSA. We should specify this. "Individuals have the freedom...". This whole sentence seems out of place and confusing. It would work better as sentence number two, not number four.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would prefer that we keep the existing language, but add the new lines to it.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Suggest 1st sentence change - replace "himself" with "themselves"
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	stop highlighting drugs...I believe in freedom on many other grounds too.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I guess it does sound redundant with 1.5.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	"media and substances" is an odd phrase.

3.0 - Personal Privacy

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Commenters	50.8%	49.2%	10.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Including french fries if so desired...just kidding
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	With exceptions for email and medical records. Who owns these? If Googele provides gmail and a user accepts the terms, there is no force. Google can use the information per the contract. Government may step in and require the contract be honored, but may not alter the contract. Facebook owns Facebook. Facebook owns all the photos, comments, and clicks. It is not for government to decide that it doesn't like that. Library is different. Library records are owned by the government and not individuals or corporations. That fact makes the privacy clause special.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree with the amendment, but I would prefer the inclusion of the deleted sentence "Only actions that infringe on the rights of others can properly be termed 'crimes'."
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The proposal is good in its essence, but the "victimless crime" language should be kept in some form.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	The right to privacy should not extend to abortion, since it involves the responsibility to not get pregnant if you're not going to be responsible. The Right to Privacy outlined in Roe v. Wade does not make sense. Also, the right to an abortion obviates the rights of the unborn's right to life.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It should read "such as personal email". Government, elected government officials and corporate emails should be siezable. Can't support the last sentence either, because when someone knowingly and volutarily consume a substance the affects their own health, finances, safty, or life then I am the one that has to pay for their medical bills for the rest of their life. The only way I could support that sentence is if it said they would be left to die in the gutter.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	must be a better word than "self- ownership"

3.0 - Personal Privacy

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Commenters	50.8%	49.2%	10.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Purge the document of the word "personal" where ever practical - it is a "selfish" word with negative vibes. "self centered" may be good in economic theory, but it will not win votes when spun as selfish.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is a good improvement.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The phrase itemizing "only actions that infringe on the rights of others" is favorable because it illustrates logic behind the plank. It also has a much wider scope, not just drug usage. The proposed rewrite commits more words to drug usage than is necessary (since "consume" is not often associated with the consumption of "media"). Drug usage, in my opinion, is merely an example of the critical notion of "victimless crime."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The right to privacy doesn't exist. Property, yes. Privacy, no. Of course, this issue can very well be settled through social ostracizing.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	prefer personal privacy to self-ownership
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'd dump the word "therefore" in the first sentence; I don't see the connection.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This omits the tenet that only crimes with victims need laws. I do not like the repeal of the sentence. I do not oppose the addition of the last sentence. I oppose the deletion.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think this change will help our candidates.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While I agree with the statement, I think our original plank was better stated.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Add to end: "... until the actions infringe on the rights of others."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	individual owns himself himself in place of himself above
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	In the last sentence, substitute "Adults" for "Individuals".
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	No self-ownership jargon... see first comment.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Government invasion of personal privacy should be strictly limited by the words and intent of the fourth amendment but with an understanding of the modern electronic world.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Another definite improvement.

3.0 - Personal Privacy

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Commenters	50.8%	49.2%	10.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I emailed the party several weeks ago to find out its stance on pro-choice. My email was not answered. Therefore, I have no idea if the use of the male pronoun here is to accomodate restriction's on women's liberty regarding reproduction. I prefer self-determination to ownership.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	see 2b comments
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	With change in 1.2 Pending amendment
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This portion sounds much better as is proposed. It has a connotation that is a lot less likely to be used by the right and left to refer to libertarians as "extremists." Softer language will likely draw far less criticism from bipartisans.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	But there is still a silver lining that needs to be driven home! For Example: We can't allow people to make "meth" in a home where kids or any human beings are in.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Do we consume media?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Yes, this is an improvement.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	As the final sentence, I would append the phrase: "Only actions that infringe on the rights of others can properly be prohibited."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You have to be more specific like "I WILL GIVE TO EACH AMERICAN A \$75,000 LIVING CARD IF YOU ELECT ME FOR U.S. PRESIDENT"; "I WILL ISSUE \$50 TRILLION NEW FIAT MONEY ELIMINATING THE FEDERAL RESERVE"; "WE WILL MANUFACTURE ONE HUNDRED PERCENT IN AMERICA USING THE FEDERAL LANDS CREATING 100 JOBS". If you need help call me to 571-288-7383. My family could donate also \$100 million to your PAC. Thanks Alberto Lopez WWW.EBLM.US
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I can't figure out what the last added sentence is doing there. It seems out of place. I would support the addition of the first sentence and the suggested cut.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the new first sentence and last but I'd hate to see the sentence "Only actions that infringe on the rights of others can properly be termed crimes." be deleted.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It needs a lot of help.

3.0 - Personal Privacy

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Commenters	50.8%	49.2%	10.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The right to privacy does not necessarily follow from self-ownership! I have no idea how you arrived at that. If you make this an issue then you must explicitly explain how the right to privacy happens due to self-ownership. How does one "consume" media? How does one accurately denote and measure the risk involved? Why do you want to open up a can of worms here?
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	not the place to get too specific, so good rewording.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't care for the term self-ownership and the last sentence is too specific about consumption as there are many many personal privacy issues besides simply consumption.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I generally support this concept but when it comes to media this would mean that someone who consumes child pornography is not doing any harm to anyone. Similarly, someone who uses drugs may not be physically hurting others by doing so but they may certainly be doing emotional and economic harm to someone else. Furthermore, while not all drugs seem to be harmful, there is great dispute among the scientific community on that subject.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Suggest: Privacy and Self-Determination Libertarians believe that each individual has a right to privacy and self-determination. Libertarians support the rights recognized by the Fourth Amendment to be secure in our persons, homes, and property. Furthermore, individuals are to be protected from unreasonable search and seizure and such should include personal records held by third parties, including email, medical and library records, and the like. An adult individual has the freedom and responsibility to decide what media and substances they knowingly and voluntarily consume, bearing the further responsibility to understand any risks accepted to their health, finances, safety, or life.

3.0 - Personal Privacy

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Commenters	50.8%	49.2%	10.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Keep the 2 proposed additions and keep the proposed removal, but move it to be the last sentence.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The repeal of laws creating "crimes" without victims is a necessary and essential position to be included in the platform.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I like the added first sentence. I object to the sentence being deleted, since by deleting it you are weakening a strong statement about ending the WoD and the war on prostitution, etc.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I prefer the original wording. It includes more legally specific language, and more clearly delineates for Libertarians where the legal boundary of "crimes" should be.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think the only thing that's missing here is the point brought up in connection with plank 1.1, that we should protect candidates from the accusation that we think that 3-year-olds should be able to choose drugs.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	While I do not require political correctness, others might. I would suggest "each individual owns him- or herself and..."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is a HUGE improvement!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think it all should be in there.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	That's better. Getting shorter and more to the point.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Make the first sentence gender neutral.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Proposed change distorts the meaning and focuses it too narrowly on drugs, only. The new leading sentence is OK. The proposed last sentence is terrible!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	No comment
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think Plank 1.2 should only include the language which is not being proposed to either be deleted or added (the second and third sentences only).
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Although the first sentence being added is fine and perhaps the last one, I feel that we should retain the two sentences that you would eliminate to make it clear that we want the existing laws on victimless crimes repealed.

3.0 - Personal Privacy

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Commenters	50.8%	49.2%	10.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Proposed alternative is lightyears better than the original! It still doesn't adequately address/make clear the risks individuals cannot and MUST not accept, i.e. the risk to others (impaired driving, for example). I would at the very end "unless it represents a clear and immediate threat to another."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The deleted text is stronger. the new text is too vague. The repeal of drug laws, I believe must be an explicitly stated plank of the platform.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What, we don't favor repeal of drug laws, etc?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree, but should leave in the clear statement about infringing on anothers liberty is a punishable crime.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Not sure about the language "each individual owns himself". Aside from the fact it should be himself/herself...the sentence would read better "recognize that each individual has the right to privacy". I agree with the last sentence though it may read better "Individuals have the freedom and responsibility to decide what media and substances they knowingly and voluntarily consume, and only the individual is responsible for the risks to their own health, finances, safety, or life"
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would prefer we leave in the first sentence struck out. "Only actions....be termed crimes."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Dislike the use of owns himself. Like second addition.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer the crimes without victims wordage.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think the unreasonable search and seizure in the 4th amendment pertains to the government. Perhaps add the word "also" between "should include" in the third sentence.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	replace 'himself' with something more gender neutral or 'his/herself' there is more consumption than just 'substances' and 'media', needs broader definition.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The last sentence limits things that you may not have included on that list.

3.0 - Personal Privacy

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
Commenters	50.8%	49.2%	10.5%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the addition of the first sentence, however, I oppose the deletion of the phrase "Oly actions that infringe on the rights of others can properly be termed crimes."
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The Self-Ownership argument is too abstract. The Change takes it from concrete examples, to abstract ideals.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Inferior to existing language.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	However, I would still like to maintain the old language about not creating laws that make "crimes" of actions that individuals only do to themselves.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Good call.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This statement walks a fine line on the use of illegal substances. I do not agree with legalization of drugs or other substances that cause mental impairment such as opium, marijuana or other drugs currently illegal
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But should include "Only actions that infringe on the rights of others can properly be termed crimes."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would support it if a bit of the fourth amendment stuff were left in.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	No one "owns" me, not even myself.

4.0 - Personal Privacy - Pending Amendment

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Commenters	43.0%	57.0%	9.3%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It is not a question of *age* so much as a question of the ability to take personal responsibility. When I was a poll watcher I saw two severely mentally handicapped individuals brought into the voting location to cast their ballots; they had no understanding of the importance of what they were doing. Furthermore, some individuals are mature at 15 and some are immature at 25. What is the definition of an adult? Old traditions had females become adults at 12 and males at 13. There has to be a better solution than what is proposed here.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	People younger than adults should have these freedoms too.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Would prefer more specific: Adult individuals or Individual adults
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The rights of children to make their own decisions should closely resemble those of adults, and the governance of their actions and decisions naturally falls to their adult guardians. By naming adults specifically in the plank we risk implying that while adults may make their own choices, the government, not parents, may restrict children's freedom of choice.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The Human being as Dr. Paul describes is NOT an 18yo adult. We are not China! All human beings own themselves
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If the goal is to make a sufficient distinction between adults and children throughout the party's platform, then I'd prefer you make an entire plank devoted to that distinction. A plank that states the rights of the parent in raising a child, and the rights of the child as a free individual who is still under the guidance.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	At what age is adult? 13, 16, 18, 21?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	And in turn adults have the responsibility to control what substances minors under their guardianship consume.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	However, I believe that children that are able to understand a situation should have the right of refusal for substances they wish not to have. Vaccination is a great example.

4.0 - Personal Privacy - Pending Amendment

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Commenters	43.0%	57.0%	9.3%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Grow up, there does not need to be a Distinction! Children have adult supervision for that.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	However, the sale of drugs known to cause addiction should be illegal, unless the benefit outweighs the risk to consumers. Also, pornography involving minors or those entrapped by addictions or mental deficiencies need to be protected from pornography exploitation as well as dangerous substances. I just lost a 25 year old nephew through addictions of perscription drugs. I do not believe addictive or destructive drugs should be legal to SELL, nor do I believe pornography should be SOLD. Both are destructive and exploitive.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	How does one decide when one becomes an adult???
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While I recognize Adulthood, who defines the time frame in which an individual, passes from a child to an adult? Leave the Individual alone, to decide when he/she becomes a responsible individual, no matter the age of that individual.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	That is an important distinction.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think that this should also be included in the first proposal. I think it's important to define individuals as "adults" as children cannot make informed decisions and require additional protection.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Adults need to be defined.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Well! Something simple, clean and workable.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	some children are wise beyond their years and some adults are total idiots? Who is to say that chronological age is a determining fctor in this matter?

4.0 - Personal Privacy - Pending Amendment

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Commenters	43.0%	57.0%	9.3%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I could support this as a concession: I don't support arbitrary age discrimination, but I do support a changeable age default where the government (without court order exemptions) assume an age of competence has been reached. Which could be challenged by anyone who feels thereby wrongly limited. The issue is whether or not the child has reached competence to knowingly make potentially harmful choices in their right mind. For this reason I am also against abortion as a default position. Because I think that until the child has the competence to decide for themselves whether they wish to live or die they can't be expected to be competent enough to make that choice until they have matured to the point where they can make an informed decision which requires them (most likely) to live past their birth day.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Does the word "media" mean paraphernalia?
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Are we going to define "Adults" ? 18 ? 21 ? 13 ?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Now you have to define adult. Is that eighteen? Or twenty-one? I oppose the dual standard where and eighteen-year-old can vote, marry, own property, etc, but not drink or (generally) purchase a hand gun. I don't care which, let's pick an age of majority and be even-handed in its application
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I however believe that if someone isn't an adult the government doesn't become the dictator of their lives. Parents are and can then choose what they can or can't do for them.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I oppose based on the grounds that explicitly poisonous or dangerous substances requiring the specialized knowledge of administered direction to prevent being fatally used SHOULD be regulated by law.

4.0 - Personal Privacy - Pending Amendment

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Commenters	43.0%	57.0%	9.3%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support this, but it is not enough to say adults have the freedom and responsibility, etc. We MUST use explicit language that ensures the intent to protect children FROM those free adults.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Improves the proposal, but still not an adequate replacement.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	HR 2736 should be of utmost importance to libertarians. Children and their parents should have the right to refuse conventional medical treatment or accept non FDA approved treatment options for minors
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Drop the drug references.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support youth rights. We need to do some in-depth work on articulating the respective rights of youth/children and their custodial adults (parents/legal guardians). For now, it's better to leave it open by just saying "individuals."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	who decides at what age you become an adult?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What is the definition of Adults?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Why not include general language elsewhere that makes this distinction applicable to all tenets of the platform. Or not make this distinction at all - does the Constitution and/or Amendments make this distinction in exact language?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	To specify adults is needless and redundant: in the document's entirety, one would assume it applies to adult citizens - children are always excepted as a matter of assumption.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	See prior commentary.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Yes, please!!!

4.0 - Personal Privacy - Pending Amendment

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Commenters	43.0%	57.0%	9.3%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It seems to me that the distinction should not be between adults and children, but in whether the individual, regardless of age, demonstrates responsibility for self in being independent of others. A youth who depends upon his parents for food, shelter, clothing, etc., for example, places his parents in a state of involuntary servitude if he makes decisions that force them to be responsible for the consequences of his actions. Equally, so do elderly parents who depend upon their children for support. Liberty requires responsibility. Prove responsibility for self, and you are justified in making your own choices. place responsibility for yourself upon the shoulders of others, then to be just, you must allow those others to make your choices for you.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The addition of adults addresses on of the chief concerns, although it does not address the right of the guardians to determine medications and foods consumed by the children for whom they are responsible.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	If age of consent laws had any basis in reality I could agree with this. As things stand, nope.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But, again, add "...they and their children voluntarily consume..." This way, adults are held fully responsible for their children -- something that has almost disappeared in our society
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	If we accept new language for first plank, that does cover the idea that rights come with responsibility and can only be realized if you understand the consequences.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I guess I support this, but what exactly is an "adult"? Isn't the term "adult" defined by governments? Isn't that something we should be actively questioning?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Parents are responsible for the actions of their minor children. Even when they provide alcohol or other "bad" things to them.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Who defines the term "adult?"

4.0 - Personal Privacy - Pending Amendment

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Commenters	43.0%	57.0%	9.3%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	same defect noted above plus what about the adult who is responsible for a child and that adult does not do as they should so harm is caused the child or the child does harm to another?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the word Individuals better than adults the defination of what an adult is keeps getting older and older
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This type of definition impedes progress for future generations.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It is important that we make the distinction, so that others know that we recognize children have varying responsibilities compared to adults.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Maybe include that any crimes comitted while under the influence of drugs should still be prosecuted as such, that is to say they will not be pardoned simply because they had consumed drugs
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	see above
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	sort of a grey area--for example; last fall there was a gay rally downtown and of course the libertarians were there to support them.--the rally was organized by a 16 yr. old!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Contract terms need definition. Switching the term individual to adult is meaningless if the age of majority is unclear.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Same reason as above.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Same comment as above.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Libertarians must support the rights if children, if we don't nobody ewill be left foing it at all.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I support this change so that Libertarians will not be accused of supporting children having access to materials inappropriate to their age and development.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like this better than the above ending
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	How about "Families have the freedom..."?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You have to define adult.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What constitutes an adult? Is it cut and dry at 18 or is there gray area? There are 16 year olds on city councils, would they be adults? What about the mentally handicapped? They are of age but not necessarily able to take care of themselves. I prefer the original "individual" wording.

4.0 - Personal Privacy - Pending Amendment

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Commenters	43.0%	57.0%	9.3%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Honestly, I am not sure where I stand on this.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The prior plank establishes that the freedoms discussed are dependent on being able to understand the choice, responsibility and consequences that come with that freedom. In our society, someone under the age of 18 is assumed to not be able to make those choices. Also, the proposed change does not read or sound as good as the original wording.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The problem I see is when one would be considered an Adult. 16, 18 or 21. Alcohol and guns are 21 in most States to considered an adult but you can smoke cigarettes at 18. So the word adult is still a little hazy as to when it starts but still better than individual.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We recognize for each citizen of majority the right to be unmolested by government intrusion in victimless acts, and secure in person and property of all form and possession, absent tort or crime.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Until the age of majority, 21, most (of us) do/did not know which end is the handle.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	YES!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I completely disagree. After women and minorities, children are the next front of civil rights. Age has nothing to do with maturity. Many of us have experienced that, for better, or for worse. It will not be popular, but truth rarely is.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Hmmm . . . this could get sticky. Parents 'should' accept responsibility for raising their offspring properly - and should be given the freedom to choose to what their children are exposed - without governmental interference. The rewording could leave this aspect open for judicial review?
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I think clearly stating that this applies to adults is very important. I'm new to the party and haven't heard the criticism you reference, but I agree that the LP must make an effort to shatter the image that it is a party of extremists and anarchists.

4.0 - Personal Privacy - Pending Amendment

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Commenters	43.0%	57.0%	9.3%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"Individuals" is clear and obvious while "adults" is subjective. If you want to achieve the goal I intuit above, you'll have to define either adult or individual regardless of word choice here.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	How is adult defined?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	All persons, when they reach an age where they can understand the consequences, should have this freedom, even if they're not yet 18.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Even though I like the wording of Individuals, Adults having the freedom is better because of the misconcepting that Libertarians would make it so kids can do drugs
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Although I know that there are a few who constantly like to push the boundaries of "age of consent", I am troubled by any subjective term like "adult" which will ultimately require definition, etc.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer this wording over the first one.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Minors should be fully instructed by their parents or guardians to attain the necessary levels of responsibilities before they earn their freedoms.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer "Individuals"
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Strongly support
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I fully agree with this statement, perhaps one could say ' Individuals found to be of legal majority....is literally a point of legal order for adulthood.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	People have that not. Teenagers as well as Adults

4.0 - Personal Privacy - Pending Amendment

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Commenters	43.0%	57.0%	9.3%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Moot, as I recommend removing this. I think we need a general plank on Children's rights as they relate to the contractual relationship they have with their parents, i.e. that parents have an implied contractual relationship to care for a child and make choices for the child that the child is incapable of making and that is in the best interest of that child. This general statement squashes all criticism about the "right of a child to use dope" - no, a child can't make that choice because the right to make the choice is the parents, not because the child is property but because the child has granted that right to the parent through implied contract, the implied contract being a mutual exchange of consideration, the child has been granted life by the parent and in exchange the child implicitly grants the parent the right to do whatever is in the best interest of the child until such time as that child can rationally make those decisions on his or her own. The concept is along the lines of medical power of attorney... while I am incapacitated I grant so and so the right to make decisions for me bec
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While a small child should not have the responsibility, a teenager should, in my opinion, be able to decide that his or her medical records or library records or other such things when facing legal repercussions. Why should a minor facing legal proceedings not have control of their legal issues?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	of course. no 12-yr old has that right, it is not only the parent's right, but responsibility to guide a developing youth's choice.

4.0 - Personal Privacy - Pending Amendment

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Commenters	43.0%	57.0%	9.3%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It is ironic that during my youth, well more than half those in High School were not 'virgins'. Of course the law now says that (essentially) anyone not a virgin in high school has been raped; I do know of people who have been prosecuted for having sex with their (usually) girlfriend. By adding "Adults" this proposal is being ambivalent about liberty. What if the "child" wants to be vegan, and the government does not want to accommodate that choice?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You may even want to qualify that to exclude mentally deficient adults. Although a better word would need to be used to avoid the slippery slope.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Both would be fine but I feel individuals is a better word in this situation.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Adults in a limiting factor, defined by the state instead of the individuals. A person at the age of (say 13) should have a right to declare their adulthood. Because it is difficult to determine maturity; we should not accept the arbitrary definition of the state.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Opens up the question of when an individual is considered an adult.

4.0 - Personal Privacy - Pending Amendment

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Commenters	43.0%	57.0%	9.3%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The concept of adulthood presumes a defined age at which the government recognizes a person has reached the age of majority, age of consent, etc. However, children/ adolescents/ and teens can also have "freedom and responsibility" to know and give consent for their actions. State laws recognize, for instance, the "age of consent" at which young persons can engage in sexual relations. While such laws may be a common-sense measure to protect against statutory rape and other sex crimes, such arbitrary line-drawing is confusing and at times insulting to children, as it presumes legislators know better than they, personally, what feels emotionally or physical comfortable. While a 15 or 16 year old would not be considered an adult in any state, they have some limited capacity to accept risks to their health, finances, safety, and life. That includes their choices in sexual activity, media, and in taking mind-altering substance choices. Through the proposed, the Libertarian Party recognizes the arbitrariness of current government line-drawing without any meaningful clarification
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Children do not have individual choices now? Are children not just as much individuals as anyone else? Where do the changes leave them?
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Individuals of legal age have.....
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Agreed children are not adults - but - think on difference and how to transition between the states.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I understand children cannot be expected to make informed decisions individually, but the term 'children' has a loose definition. In the eyes of the law, one can choose to commit their lives to America at 18, yet do not have the capability to decide to consume alcohol until 21. Furthermore, some states consider "children" to be responsible enough to start having sex at the age of 16 while others reserve that right until 18. "Adult" is too vague.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This change is absolutely critical.

4.0 - Personal Privacy - Pending Amendment

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Commenters	43.0%	57.0%	9.3%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Children should have some rights as well, especially as it pertains to a public (government) school making decisions for them. Parental rights come first, then children rights, and only then school rights.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	OR how about Individual Adults or even non-minors as a distinction?
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Either is a bit better than the former plank; however, I would prefer "Individual adults" or "Adult individuals" to the proffered wording. Further, (e.g.) is "adulthood" an arbitrary number of years specified by each separate state---or is it both the willingness and the capability to support oneself and accept the consequences of one's free choices?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Adults who have not been convicted of a crime against another individual's life, liberty or property - are guaranteed by their creator, and the 5th ammendment full ownership over their own life/body, their liberty, and their property. By virtue of that freedom, the individual has the sole authority to decide what they want to consume, and what risks they want to accept over their own health, finances, safety, or life.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The distinction between adults and children is naturally foggy and very variable. I oppose attempts to codify it.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Individual children should have the right to refuse what they don't want to consume.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	ageism is another ism. NYRA and ASFAR are also libertarian movements
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Use 'Competent Adults' instead, or something similar. Adults who are unable to recognize and accept risks are not part of this set. (It's why we have people put 'being of sound mind' in their Last Wills.) Such as the mentally incompetent, insane, psychopaths, etc. ...There are probably special exceptions for those with living wills, etc.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But what do we define as adults?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Why limit to adults?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	That does make it a bit clearer when we deal with issues involving children.

4.0 - Personal Privacy - Pending Amendment

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Commenters	43.0%	57.0%	9.3%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	18 and older, if they can serve his or her country they should be able to make decisions concerning substances they consume, etc.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The concept of an adult is an arbitrary one. At 18 I'm free to die in war to protect my country but I'm not free to have a beer. So when am I an "adult"? We should leave it as individuals since some day an 18 year-old may get married, drink a beer and die for his/her country without incident.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do think an age line needs to be drawn, although it is unclear what that age should be. 18 is obviously what it currently is.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Might want to go farther, and add something on the recognition of Parental Authority over their minor children and their right to choose what those minor children are taught and are exposed to.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do not support changing individuals to "adults". Adult is a very loose term. When does one become an adult? Is it when they turn 18 and can buy cigarettes? Is it when they are 21 and can buy a beer? I think a better way of making the point to differentiate between 'adults' and 'children' is leave it not age-specific, rather to a point where the individual can understand the ramifications of their actions. This does leave some interpretation as well, but would weather legal changes to what constitutes an "adult".
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	"adults" leaves it open the government to interfere between children and their parents.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Like that it states adults.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I only oppose this due to the problematic definition of 'adult', I cannot, off-the-top-of-my-head think of a useful replacement though, but some better phrasing is needed.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'm not sure what proper wording would be, but I would suggest making it clear that "adult" means a person over 18 in all cases, not sometimes 21 in arbitrary cases, such as for alcohol and handguns
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Great change.

4.0 - Personal Privacy - Pending Amendment

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Commenters	43.0%	57.0%	9.3%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	ADULTS is vague and could be used to support jailing Mr. and Mrs. Twenty for drinking the beverage of their choice.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe children should have the same rights as adults, to a certain degree, but I'll reluctantly support this change
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do not think this is one of the places where this distinction needs to be made.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Fair distinction. I would argue (as mentioned above) that adult parents also have the freedom and responsibility to decide which media their children consume. This doesn't necessarily extend to substances.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Yes, it should say adults.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	leave it as individuals. Tho not strongly opposed, I fear the designation as adult calls forth too much of an idea of a state imposed age limit.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is exactly what is needed.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	We don't have an agreed upon definition of "Adult" so should not use it. Is an Adult anyone over [35, 21, 18, 16, 15, 13, 14"? Different ages are used for different milestones [Old enough to be president, old enough to drink, old enough to serve in the military, old enough to marry] And is age to be the sole parameter for adulthood? What about the truly horrifically mentally defective?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If this is seen as a valid response to a valid criticism, then I support the distinction between adult and children. It should be clear that children, especially younger children, require the guidance and authority of parents or other responsible adults
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Then what rights do children have? It's too vague.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It is self evident, that persons and individuals, as referenced presumes adults in good legal standing, and not deemed mentally unfit. This is no different than Constitutional language.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We need to define adult.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the addition of the word "adults"

4.0 - Personal Privacy - Pending Amendment

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Commenters	43.0%	57.0%	9.3%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Government exists to protect the rights of all INDIVIDUALS. One cannot be denied rights because they have not reached a certain age. It's like saying that someone who is 18 has rights but someone who is 17 and 364 days old does not have rights.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would support this additional change to 1.2. But, again, place "should" before "have".
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I cannot fathom whose definition of an adult we should use.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What about "capable" adults? Or "legally adults" in the case of emancipated minors? Maybe as-is written now is fine though.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Children are already sufficiently made to feel like 2nd-class citizens. Libertarians should not support that trend.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I oppose this because the term Adult is not descriptive enough and I believe that, in most cases, children should have all the rights included in the sentence with guidance of their parents and peers rather than pretending like they are second class citizens.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't oppose this proposal that strenuously but when you replace individual with adult, you open a can of worms over who is an adult, therefore leave it at individuals.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	AS noted there are 2 exceptions in my book, i.e. child pornography and using drugs while pregnant.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	who defines adults?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Doesn't this go without saying it? Children are extensions of their parents or their family unit until they are of legal age.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Children, no matter their age, ARE individuals, and shall be respected as such. I oppose ageism in any and all forms!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Rights come with responsibilities. Children necessarily cede a portion of both to their parents/caretakers.

4.0 - Personal Privacy - Pending Amendment

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Commenters	43.0%	57.0%	9.3%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Another distinct improvement. But please keep in mind that an adult who engages in self-harm, and as a result, has neglected his obligations to others has EFFECTIVELY become a legal minor, because he is failing to show responsibility for his own actions. Rather than open the can of worms to deny legal majority to individuals who engage in self-harm, there should be a mechanism by which a victim can assert his right to fulfillment of obligations owed to him.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Let's not start an argument to define what constitutes an adult
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Why not say Individual adults
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Good choice
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think this should say individuals because young adults and even some children are keenly aware of their choices and the responsibilities that come with those choices.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Children aren't individuals?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	An excellent qualifier
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is absurd. Natural rights are enjoyed by all regardless of age. If the party chooses not to recognize this, then it ceases to be a libertarian party. If this enters the platform, I will resign my membership and cease contributions.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i think it is (only) unnecessary and only creates fractional problems of WHAT IS AN ADULT?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	NO. We need to focus on "individuals". People are silly to try and needle us with the "children" issue.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Who defines an "adult"?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Even though children have rights, it is important to make the distinction that it is adults we are talking about here.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	good
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The distinction is unnecessary.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If we are slinging out adults the we likely need some kind of addition about children.

4.0 - Personal Privacy - Pending Amendment

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Commenters	43.0%	57.0%	9.3%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I wholeheartedly oppose this amendment. I oppose giving government the permission to define "Adult." A whole host of "crimes" and unjust punishments rest upon this government foothold. I believe in the right of parents to regulate the transition of their children into adulthood. This amendment sanctions government to supersede rights which ought to be reserved for legal parents and guardians. This amendment says Libertarians believe in permitting the government to criminalize "underage" individuals who would otherwise as "adults" not have committed any crime. It says we believe in governmental arbitrary impositions of ages of minority and adulthood.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Seems clear and clarifies the point.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If we change this wording to exclude minors, then all other references to individuals will also have to be similarly changed. If not, then it will seem as if, for those untouched references--we would not except minors. I think it would be better to stick with "individuals", and assume that children amount to an entirely different case and that we are addressing the rights and responsibilities of competent adults throughout.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	How do we define adult? Or do we leave that vague so as not to invite controversy?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I propose a third option: "Adults (and minors with parental permission)". Would the LP seriously take a stand that marijuana use by minors should be illegal? How exactly is that enforceable? When does freedom "magically appear" for an individual?
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Opens a new bag of worms.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	yes, but this can get complicated - ie with adults with mental disabilities, etc.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Another good change.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Next thing you know, the debate will be what is considered an adult. Leave it as individual.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Prefer Adults

4.0 - Personal Privacy - Pending Amendment

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Commenters	43.0%	57.0%	9.3%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	For clarity is is important that readers understand that a minor is not an individual (nor is an adult without sound mind). Perhaps a statement that a minor or an adult of unsound mind is not an individual could be incorporated into the preamble or elsewhere. I am not in favor of substituting 'an adult of sound mind' in place of 'individual' as 'individual' is so fundamental in the U.S. Constitution and Bill of Rights.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	As human beings, children have rights. How could rights be "inalienable" if people do not possess them from birth? Children merely delegate certain freedoms to their parents until such time as they choose to become legally independent and assume full responsibility for their own actions. This looks like an ageist attempt to write children's rights out of our platform.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Individual infers 'competent adult' in my view.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Perfer adult or legal majority over individuals
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	leaves room for govenment to modify definition of adult
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The plank should be toned down to something like, "We support the principle that laws controlling victimless crimes should be gradually liberalized in order to find a standard of behavior that citizens can responsibly impose upon themselves."
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	However, what definition of "adult" are we using?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	As stated previously, I would rather have this as Adult Citizens.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	There should be a strong line concerning the age to make a decision and understand the complete effects of those actions
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I VERY much like the change to wording of "adults"
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Absolutely. It is important to make that distinction as fear of use among minors continues to be a driving factor in support of prohibition.

4.0 - Personal Privacy - Pending Amendment

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Commenters	43.0%	57.0%	9.3%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	My suggestion is "Individual adults". I think that the word "individual" needs to be retained because we often speak of "individual freedom". I do agree with adding the word "adult" to clarify that we don't mean children in this sentence.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	With respect to the group of 18-20 year olds- doesn't this mean that they do not have the same freedom and obligations as those who meet the legal description of an adult (i.e., age 21)? Many young people under the age of 21 are already responsible and productive members of society. This should be addressed. I would also remove or re-word the examples "media and substances" to avoid limiting the intent. Perhaps strike "media and substances they knowingly and voluntarily consume" and replace with "commodities and activities they knowingly and voluntarily consume or pursue".
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	KEEP Individuals: What if a STATE decides you have to be 25 years old to be an adult.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i still believe it should read as individuals, children are individuals as well as adults.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Same comment as the other plank. Also, do I really have a "responsibility" to decide? It's clearer to say "Adults have the freedom to decide what media and substances they consume and what risks..."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The Libertarian Party should include children somehow. Today's children are being raised so safely, that many have never known freedom. The next generation's love of freedom, guarantees our freedom! Life is not safe! Why are we stripping our children of their freedom and leaving them unprepared for real life? Please find a way to include children!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	alternatively; why not use both? Adult individuals ...

4.0 - Personal Privacy - Pending Amendment

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Commenters	43.0%	57.0%	9.3%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree with the intention of this suggestion, however, is 'adults' defined consistently throughout the 50 states? Might "Persons of legal age have....." be better as it respects the issue of states rights in defining legal age? Personally, i adhere to the idea that children given the consent and under the supervision of their legal guardian (parents and so designated others) may learn from whatever their freewillfully chosen experiences, yet parenting from warm, benevolent, safety-conscious yet open minded wisdom questing within the cooperative lifelearning adventure is yet too scarce (at least within mainstream media discourse); and thinking such as this would be howled at with myriad negative projective interpretations by probably way too many. The point, though, is to engender and nurture our arise as a Lifelong Learning Culture and i ponder upon just how damaged adults have become by 14 or 16 or 18 or 21 in order to be considered inquisitive, exploratory and creative open minded learners!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Very good for ending the 'so children can decide to do drugs" argument
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	From what age? Why to put it to the platform at all?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Minors have rights, too. Perhaps some balance between minors' rights and parents' rights/responsibilities.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	And these freedoms and responsibilities extend to the affairs of minors and incompetents under their charge.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Prefer "Individuals" unless and until you can objectively define when adulthood begins.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Unfortunately, the word "adult" is defined at so many different ages for so many different activities But, for the sake of argument, it does work better.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	still promoting drug use!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Begrudgingly opposing this....I support the sentiment, but without a clear definition of "adult", I think its better to leave it as individual.

4.0 - Personal Privacy - Pending Amendment

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Commenters	43.0%	57.0%	9.3%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Yes underage individuals should be the responsibility of their legal gardens.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"Enfranchised Adults" would be even better, since incarcerated individuals, or those serving out a legal penalty, may not have the same free access to media and consumables.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The proposed change just makes the sentence more awkward and doesn't really do anything to address the valid criticism that libertarian philosophy doesn't really know what to do with children. The fact of the matter is this: In the real world, we live amongst people who are NOT competent to make their own decisions. Many of these people are young children. Many others might be considered insane or incapacitated. Until libertarian philosophy can address who gets to decide which people are competent to make their own decisions and which people are not, then the criticisms against us are valid and just. Who gets to decide that an individual is incompetent to drive or have sex before the chronological age of 16 years, incompetent to vote or fight in a war before the chronological age of 18, or incompetent to choose to drink before the age of 21? Who gets to decide whether your "Crazy Uncle Ernie" is merely "eccentric" or is "a danger to himself and others"? To what extent should the government be involved in making these decisions of competence? In my mind, the go
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It is implied in "Individuals".
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Since adults are responsible for children, agree with this change.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Good modification. See previous.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Legal adults
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I would support this, but I see the potential for a long debate on the definition of "adult" at the Convention. ;)

4.0 - Personal Privacy - Pending Amendment

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Commenters	43.0%	57.0%	9.3%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Leave it as "Individuals" or make it "Individual adults". This seems like a problem which might be better addressed once, near the beginning of the document (clarifying that our principles are intended for competent adults), rather than scattered throughout specific planks. I don't believe any part of humanity, much less any political party including our own, has come to terms with how to always successfully handle the fact that some humans are able to successfully take on competent self-ownership and responsibility at, say, age 14, whereas others at age 50 have yet to mature to that same level.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But I do not like the way that it is worded.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe that there are some decisions that legal minors should be able to make on their own without the intervention of their parents.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would also add, at the end: Additionally, parents have the freedom and responsibility to decide what media and substances will be consumed by their children.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Yet I would say "Adult individuals have..., smoother..."
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Who defines "adult"? Age is a poor measure of cognitive, emotional, and volitional capacity.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I haven't really thought this one through. Not really sure how I feel about it.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Nit-picking.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You are simply repeating what you said in the statement above.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Does "adult" need to be defined? Some age?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This may open the door to banning sugar for kids. The parent has this right of supervision
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Parents still need to be in charge of their children.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Substitute Adult where individual is found.

4.0 - Personal Privacy - Pending Amendment

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Commenters	43.0%	57.0%	9.3%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There should be a clarification or separate section of the platform that indicates that we are talking about adults and perhaps what our views are concerning children and those citizens whose intellectual and developmental disabilities and/or medical-psychiatric conditions leave them in severely incapacitated states and unable to function.
Support Oppose	Unlikely Unlikely	No No	Non-Member Non-Member	how about 'individual adults' as the edit?? Vague - when is a person an adult? Currently the state defines it one way, but allows exceptions so that children can be tried as adults for capital crimes. So it's not at all clear.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	At what point does one become an adult. According to the courts 18; but is a 16 year old not capable of their own well being? To restrict the consumption of media and substances to a 16 year old is to make them more appealing. It is the parents responsibility to monitor their children's behavior until they feel that they are mature enough to become an adult, not the government. If the government gets involved in these prohibitive tasks, there is no limit to what freedoms can be removed in the protection of the children. The prohibition of alcohol became a major movement because of concern for children. Cigarette companies aren't allowed to advertise because they don't want to encourage children to smoke. If you can argue that people mature at different ages, then you can also argue that government can't dictate what age makes one mature. If we consider children as individuals, then they are subject to the same rights and privileges as individuals. Also note if minors are being abused, that is a criminal action, the abuse is the crime regardless of age. If the parent is abusing the individual sounds better because most children make choices about different issues.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Individuals sounds better because most children make choices about different issues.
Oppose Oppose	Likely Unlikely	No No	Non-Member Non-Member	sentence doesn't flow for me What is the definition of adult?

4.0 - Personal Privacy - Pending Amendment

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Commenters	43.0%	57.0%	9.3%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I understand the reasoning, but what do we consider adult? 18? That's for contracts and voting. The age of consent for sex? That's 16 in most states. What do we mean by adult? Many of us would say teenagers have some of this freedom too, especially in the media part.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We all know we are talking about adults. Children don't vote.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would add in "and their children" between "they" and "Knowingly" to restore the premise of individuals but still designate a distinction between how has the responsibility of exercising the rights between the two groups.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Who determines when childhood ends and adulthood begins?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The term "adults" should be defined more thoroughly. A mentally retarded adult, for example, may not be capable of understanding the consequences of his actions.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	This is an important point to make.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Yes, adults and children do not have the same brain. However, if you really want to re-word this better, say VOTERS!!!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I categorically reject the current day principle that children are sub-human. Children need guidance and mentoring, not suffocating protection.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would say consenting adults or somehow differentiate between adults with the capacity to understand what they are doing and those without that capacity (e.g. the mentally challenged).
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would prefer that the differences between children and adults be addressed separately.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would strike it completely. But if it is decided to stay then we should use "Constitutionally protected individuals". this eliminates children, criminals, and those within our borders that are here illegally.

4.0 - Personal Privacy - Pending Amendment

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Commenters	43.0%	57.0%	9.3%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I am loath to support only rights for "adults;" especially since we (as a society and government) define adulthood in such a moronic way - as a number picked out of the air by legislators and made to apply to everyone, as if people aren't individuals who mature at different ages. Alexander Hamilton was running a import/export business at age 12! (although later he laid the groundwork for the screwed up leviathan we have today)
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Use the individuals element but add something that points out that adults are the people that have this right. (Age of majority, etc.)
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Not required.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Do we have to explain to people that children are the responsibility of their parents?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	How is adult defined?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"Individuals" is sufficient. "Adults" may require some clarification.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Adults as defined by whom?
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	But who really gets to make that determination? No two are the same.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	As dumb as it sounds, I think that it should specifically state "Individuals over the age of 18" instead of vaguely saying "adults"
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would phrase it: "Individuals capable of understanding the consequences of their choices and accepting responsibility for them have the freedom..." I find the term "adult" somewhat arbitrary, based on age, when really what we mean by "adult" is someone who understands and can be responsible. The mentally ill, for example, although adults, probably shouldn't have complete freedom in this area; alternatively, some children, in certain aspects of their lives, display more understanding and responsibility than some adults I know-- children should be permitted such freedoms accordingly.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Amend to "Adults, who have reached the age of majority, . . ."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Same critique applies.

4.0 - Personal Privacy - Pending Amendment

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Commenters	43.0%	57.0%	9.3%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	However, define what is an adult? What age? Maintain the "individuals" precept in the documents. What about adults with mental problems?
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I also propose keeping part of the deleted portions as noted above.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I personally don't think there needs to be a distinction because I feel like it is IMPLIED that if, say, marijuana was legalized and regulated, it would have age restrictions put on it like cigarettes and alcohol. BUT I think it would be a good move for the party to make this change to appeal to people outside of the party and perhaps make a Libertarian out of them.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It's a given that minors are protected by and answerable to their parents or guardians. That doesn't have to be part of the LP platform.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Individual Adults or Adult Individuals or variations thereof might be even clearer.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Kids have these same rights limited by their parents choices and other considerations. Imposing THE LAW on children or anyone else should always be suspect.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Adults is a better sell in this case!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Change "Adults have the freedom and responsibility to decide ..." to "Competent adults are free in their homes and persons and responsible for deciding ..."
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Work the concept of 'victimless crime' into the platform
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think using adults instead of individuals suggests that the government has the power to define if a person is capable of making decisions for them self. Freedom is a right of all people and individuals, regardless of government implemented age restrictions. I think attacking the LP for insufficient distinctions is a petty argument and assuming that it does not apply to three-year old children is reasonable. My issue lies with the fact that just because an individual is not yet 18 does not necessarily mean they are incapable of making informed decisions and thus should not always be exempt from the freedoms given to those 18 older.

4.0 - Personal Privacy - Pending Amendment

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Commenters	43.0%	57.0%	9.3%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't like it, but see how this change may be necessary for public discourse.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Maybe even "Legally competent adults"...
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Adult or Minor are legal terms that should be determined at the state level.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A good idea to put in Adults
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What age is considered an adult? 18/21 or whatever age the government creates.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Usually it's assumed that citizens who have reached the age of majority (age 18) are those who this platform is applied to. Children are covered by law to protect them from exploitation and abuse of any kind. Those below the age of majority, or who are not emancipated, are assumed to NOT be competent enough to be responsible and therefore not accountable.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Please see above
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Minors rights may limited, but individual rights are the core issue.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	when does a child become an adult????? age ??? we can die in a war at 18 but can't drink alcohol until 21. there is no consistency.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	18?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We shouldn't usurp the responsibility of parents to control their children. We are concerned with restricting government.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Adult Sovereign Citizens have the freedom and responsibility to decide what media and substances they knowingly and voluntarily consume, and what risks they accept to their own health, finances, safety, and life.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think it's a given that anys statements of a platform mean Adults OR anyone of age to make an informed decision.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Given the inclination of progressives to make everything about the children, I like that we address adults!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Unnecessary, if you state that privacy is a fundamental right just like life.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The devil is in the details. We stretch the definition of child far too much and any attempt to restrict the rights to "adults" allows far too much.

4.0 - Personal Privacy - Pending Amendment

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Commenters	43.0%	57.0%	9.3%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Rights shouldn't be limited to specific populations; they're universal. Children have rights too. Instead of "adults" we should put in language such as "Competent individuals" or "Individuals with the ability to make decisions for themselves."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Maybe something that says under-aged children are the responsibility if their guardians would be helpful too.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Do we define 'adult'? Or should we say Individuals of majority age as determined by the local community
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	So who does have the freedom and responsibility to decide for children. I think wording needs to be added to say something like "Adults have the freedom and responsibility to decide what is best for their children."
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Define "adult"
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like it, but again, "media", while being concise, is abstract. And "substances" are too close to common term "controlled substances". Why can't we say "information", "food and medications"? And if you do that, you could also mention that parents have the right and ultimate responsibility for making those decisions for their children.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Maybe find a way to say "Parents and guardians also have the freedom and responsibility for their children to decide what media..." especially because the nanny state is trying to control the what children consume and the nanny state is taking away parental rights and freedoms.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	no, free drug use is modern slavery, we should never allow modern slavery through drug addiction.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Yeah, that might be a good idea, even though "individuals" sounds stronger.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	qualifies it
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We need to define adults. I believe the youth have just as much rights as those who are over 18, and just as capable to make rational decisions.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Use of the word "adults" is a slippery slope. Is that age 16 or 18 or 21? What about the mentally impaired?

4.0 - Personal Privacy - Pending Amendment

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Commenters	43.0%	57.0%	9.3%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'd rather avoid the implication that we support regulating children.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think this is an important distinction.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'd prefer to leave control of children to their parents and not give the government a pretext of "it's for the children."
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Who defines "adult"?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Sensible and clear!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	need to define adult is it 18 or 21
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Should we define adult as "over the age of 18?" This would be in alignment with the 26th Amendment.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The rights of all people, regardless of age, are the foundation of libertarianism. Let's not spit on that.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The term "adult" is too ambiguous.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	being under a certain age must not allow any government to treat an individual as less than one
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It should remain Individuals. What a child has the right to be exposed to should be determined by their parent or guardian, not the government.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	To the extent that the platform needs to acknowledge the distinction between children and adults, I think it should be done in a single place, indicating the extent to which the platform restricts the rights of children and the justification for the restrictions.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Adult is miss used by government, 14 are adults for some crimes, yet not allowed to drink until 21, does not make sense, so don't add Adult.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Without getting into the weeds the definition of "adult" can often be confused with those whose chronological age would put them at adult status but whose behavior should put them at child status. Then there are those "kids" who at thirteen behave with more maturity than their parents. I've known both cases. Just had to make a comment on this.

4.0 - Personal Privacy - Pending Amendment

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Commenters	43.0%	57.0%	9.3%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	'Individuals' is a clearer term. 'Adults' would require more defining. If 'Adults' is then there is a lack of parallelism between this sentence and the first. Thus, what you would be saying is that Individuals have the right to themselves and privacy, but only 'adults' have the ability to make responsible decisions. I strongly urge you not to accept this change.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Good point. We do need to clarify that.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Why only Adults? non-Adults have (or at least SHOULD HAVE) rights too
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Could we not say "Adult citizens?" Or even just "Citizens" since you must technically be eighteen to be considered as such.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The idea that children have freedom to decide what media and substances they consume is patently insane. This would effectively be an utter destruction of vast portions of parental rights. It cannot possibly be the position of the Libertarian Party that children should choose what television programs to watch, or what to eat for meals, over the objections and guidance of their parents. Are we to argue that a child has a right to decide to use a recreational drug, eat nothing but candy, or watch pornography, when a parent demands they not? Thus, this assertion should be limited to apply to adults only.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Would not change to Adults, would leave as "individuals"
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Very important change; this must be the case... as we could easily be attacked for not clarifying adult over individual. Unfortunately, that is the case.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like both - as in "Adult individuals"
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	DO YOU NEED TO DEFINE ADULT?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This gets into a whole racket. Who are adults? Are they the ones that can die for their country or are they the ones that can drink alcohol? Can still refer to first rule. If you aren't hurting someone else (be they 4, 14 or 82) then it's okay.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Adult Citizens.

4.0 - Personal Privacy - Pending Amendment

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Commenters	43.0%	57.0%	9.3%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This change leaves a loophole that children do not have the freedom and responsibility - and that maybe the government can step in - e.g., force a vaccination, despite the parents' objection. This change seeks to enforce the parents' authority, but unwittingly cedes it to government. This amendment would be repaired if it read "Adults have the freedom and responsibility to decide FOR THEMSELVES AND FOR THEIR CHILDREN, what media and substances they knowingly and voluntarily consume, and what risks they accept to their own health, finances, safety, or life."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Doesn't sound good. Perhaps "Individuals of legal age..." would be better.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Why make a distinction? A child has no rights? As a childhood sexual abuse survivor I am insulted by this.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While I understand the concern, that small change in rhetoric brings far too much focus on the adult vs child idea, and thereby it detracts from the purpose of the statement. So if it is possible to include another clause elsewhere that would be recommended.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Is "Adult" defined anywhere? Is a person considered an Adult when they are 18? What about 21? I adult defined separately in each state?
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Making this distinction provides government with sufficient loopholes to interfere with the rights of minors.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't believe that the average Libertarian expects six year olds to make major life decisions about the use of guns, drugs, helmets or seat belts, and this change could shut down some of those hyperbolic arguments from nanny-state types.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	True adults have this freedom but how do we word that as adult parents we are in control of our childrens choices??
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Perhaps phrase as "Individual adults"
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	One of the biggest attacks others have against us is they think we'd let kids do bad things. This sounds good.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Unless you want to add the definition of 'adult' leave this one alone.

4.0 - Personal Privacy - Pending Amendment

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Commenters	43.0%	57.0%	9.3%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	the word INDIVIDUAL is used elsewhere and unless there is an almost massive replacement of ADULT for INDIVIDUAL, then this is confusing. It should be stated elsewhere that children do not have full rights.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I take the Rothbardian view here...
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Should it define an adult? I agree with using adult with the term defined. As above I do not like this sentence.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Either of these proposals clarifies and cleans up the existing language without changing the intent or meaning.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think this distinction is unnecessary.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think it is a sad commentary that this must be specified, but I am sure it is true.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Children are individuals too, they are subject to the laws, and thus should be given the same rights as adults, with parental supervision. Freedom isn't just for adults, and children should be protected by the Bill of rights. children for too long have been indoctrinated into an authoritarian society where their rights have been mitigated in the name of school safety, get the police out of schools and allow kids to have the freedom we had as kids.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	That will help avoid what is often the first hurdle put up by non-Libertarians!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Irrelevant.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	children are owned by their parents, who then take responsibility for them. again it is the ethics that surround ownership that produces the concept of an adult.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	define adult ... 18 or 21?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I am for youth rights...Sticking adults here would turn away our younger voters, especially those 18-21.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The use of the term "adults", requires a definition of the word.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	if we are differentiating between adults and children, then I would also like to see an addition that speaks to the adult/individual knowing what is best for their families. Do not believe that the Gov should be deciding vaccinations and medical decisions for our children when opinions differ

4.0 - Personal Privacy - Pending Amendment

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Commenters	43.0%	57.0%	9.3%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A little off subject, but I would like to think the party supports the idea that anyone who is not trusted enough in their decision making ability to be allowed vote (children) cannot face the same punishments as an adult.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	ALL people including children take responsibility of what they choose to do. If we don't include children we are setting a bad example for them. How can we raise them differantly than how we expect them to behave as adults. Other wise this is great.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If natural law is the source of our liberty, why should we arbitrarily draw a line at 18 years of age for when one can enjoy the fruits of those freedoms?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	see my initial comments at the beginning
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	My earlier comment wasn't needed?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Support the term individual over adult
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Any age related distinction is arbitrary. Is a 17 year old incompetent but an adult with brain disfunction competent?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I oppose this change because the statement is inherently about adults with capacity to make decisions. Children would be the responsibility of adults and therefore not strictly bound to this concept. We should not change the wording because of what 'they' criticize us for.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Possibly specify that parents have the right to make these choices with their children.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would prefer this phrase if people acknowledge the consequences of their actions to not only themselves--but others.

4.0 - Personal Privacy - Pending Amendment

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Commenters	43.0%	57.0%	9.3%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Children have rights, too, against governmental infringement. Their parents have the right, stemming from the voluntarily-assumed duty engendered in bringing the children into existence, to instruct, guide, and discipline their children. If you change the word from "individuals" to "adults" you need to make this point clear. Government-run schools stand in loco parentis, taking instruction from parents as needed, and they do not have any right to displace parents or overrule them.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	So who is an adult? Age of consent? Age 18? Age 21? Age to be tired as and adult?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Helps point out why I would propose just dropping that sentence and going with the easy sell.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	strongly so!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Do we really have to spell it out that we are always talking about consenting adults when we refer to an individual
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"Individuals" is the right term. "Adults" invites government intrusion by defining what an "Adult" is. Does a 18-year-old have the right to consume alcohol? What about a 17-yr-old?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	All people have rights no matter their age. The only difference between those under 18 and over is that if they are under their parents take responsibility for them and thus the parents have the rights (and responsibility) to direct their children in what choices they are allowed to make wilst under 18. I would suggest if you change it to adults here, then add another line talking about how all individuals regardless of age have rights ... etc etc but parents direct their choices while under the age of majority (18).... you know something like that.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would prefer 'Adult Citizens'.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	How should the term 'Adult' be defined, exactly? I realize the importance of distinguishing between adults and children, but the distinction seems somewhat arbitrary.

4.0 - Personal Privacy - Pending Amendment

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Commenters	43.0%	57.0%	9.3%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I oppose for the reasons I mentioned in 2a. Basically that plank 1.2 is about privacy, not rights and responsibilities (covered in 1.1). If a sentence about media and substances is to be included yes, please make it for adults only, but also redirect the focus back toward privacy, in relation to media and substances.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think our platform should be focused on individuals, with the implication that they are adults. somewhere else, perhaps another platform item - but i think not, we can address the differences, sticky as they may be, between adults and children
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	How about using adult individuals. I think individual is an important to the basis of libertarianism.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Where are we drawing the line of adult and child. Currently an 18 year old can't drink, but we can put a gun in their hand and send them overseas to fight. Then when they come back home, they still can't buy a beer. Does this amendment cover this?
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	it should be all individuals, not just adults. rights derive from personhood and that is from conception.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	perhaps add that parents are responsible for their minor children
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Agism is not a libertarian value.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Have we defined "adults" anywhere, explicitly or by reference?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Children have rights, too.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The word "adults" should be changed to something more like, "Individuals, as adults,.."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Freedom includes children and families. Government regulation fails every time, no matter what the age.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	With the wording caveat above.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	This answers my comment to the first proposal.

4.0 - Personal Privacy - Pending Amendment

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Commenters	43.0%	57.0%	9.3%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I believe this gets too much into having the government dictate what people can or can't do. I think that parents/adults should be held accountable if they impose their negative habits on children, but the government should not be involved in dictating the consumption habits of children. There are other avenues to protect the children from harmful environments.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Specify as "individual adults" as to remove the possibility of considering the term "adults" to mean a group.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	See above changes. This is fine, except where is our definition of adult? Are we going along with 18-up, or...what about "mature individuals"?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	So minors should have no say in what risks they accept to their health? Mom and pop can just send them into the hospital and harvest their organs? Again, stop weakening the message. Individuals have rights, kids included.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Better but again does not seem to tie together with the rest of it.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I actually like both the "individuals" and "adults" versions, but will tentatively support the latter because of the potential for ridiculous accusations that Libertarians somehow support the idea of children being involved in adult activities such as pornography, drug use, prostitution, etc. (yes, I have had to put up with some of this stuff, and it really gets tiring). A possible compromise proposal would be to have the first part of the sentence read "Individual adults have the freedom..." or "As individuals, adults have the freedom...".
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"Individuals" is better, because it includes teen agers and other, younger children, who have rights and responsibilities as well as do adults. Perhaps use of "All persons" at the start of the sentence would adequately and accurately express the point.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is also a duplicate (now triplicate) vote.

4.0 - Personal Privacy - Pending Amendment

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Commenters	43.0%	57.0%	9.3%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Everybody has the right to Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness. Regardless of age, race, gender, or whatever.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Also confusing. It does not follow the thought of the first as described above.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Non-adults don't have freedom???
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Adult individuals...
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The individual is the key to the libertarian party and should be referenced all as much as possible.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This change only makes sense if you add a definition of adulthood. The change as is implies that responsibility and self-ownership only start at an arbitrary age set by the government.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Would rather see final sentence begin with "Libertarian philosophy (sp) promotes that"
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Learning responsibility is part of learning to be an adult, though minors do have less freedom. I think addressing this criticism is a good goal, but I don't think this is the best way.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	If you really want to be technical, it should be "emancipated individuals"; however, if a candidate is too stupid to not be able to spin out of the "child" stuff they're obviously not a very good candidate. -- something like "My xxx Party Opponent is apparently running for 1st grade class president. I, by contrast, am speaking about what I believe the voters should...." etc.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I take the position of Murray Rothbard and Walter Block that the distinction between adults and children is meaningless. The important distinction is between those with the intellectual and capacity to support themselves through their own labor, make use of property rights and can therefore enter into the social contract and those who do not.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	let them criticize.... INDIVIDUALS have rights, not just adults
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	good change
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I fully support this important distinction so long as the definition of "adult" is clearly made.

4.0 - Personal Privacy - Pending Amendment

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Commenters	43.0%	57.0%	9.3%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What is the clear dividing line between adult and non-adult? Why is 20 years and 364 days different from 21 years? The correct wording here is "individuals." If you wish to make the distinction, then "Emancipated individuals."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Define "adults"
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I would be OK with "Responsible individuals," but keeping in mind the audience for the platform, I think adding the word "adult" raises the question of what constitutes an adult. (This is already somewhat true for "individual," and even for "responsible individual," but I think both provoke the questions less strongly.)
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Keep the word "individuals." Only the moronic and disengenuous do not understand what is meant here. If necessary, we could have a plank defining the importance of age of consent and ability to consent, and that the determination of these legal definitions should be left up to the various State Legislatures.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There aren't very many people that can be considered adults.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"Adults" only limits the scope of Liberty to those deemed "Adults" by official decree. A more liberal word can secure more liberty.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	nit picking
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Define the term adults perhaps in a footnote. Mentally retated (whatever the current PC term) and elderly with dementia may not be up the the task of more responsibility than an elementary school student. Deal with it so it doesn't turn into a debate on theory.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Individuals should be sufficient enough to explain your point.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The term "adult" is difficult or impossible to define. Also, those who are not adult still have freedom and responsibility for their decisions (albeit a lesser extent). It is the responsibility of parents and society to steer children toward a responsible and prosperous future (id est, to use their freedom wisely).

4.0 - Personal Privacy - Pending Amendment

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Commenters	43.0%	57.0%	9.3%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	if you will specify adults you also need to specify that their children are included. Parents should have the right to determine what media and substances are appropriate for their child to consume. If a 16 yr old has cancer they should be able to use marijuana to treat it without the parents getting in trouble for it.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It seems silly that adults need to be identified, but I'm ok with the change.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Perhaps instead of Adults we should say: "Persons over the age of 18".
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Keep it straight and simple. The emphasis is on individuals. The topic of child's rights is not yet settled conclusively in the community.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Who defines "adult"? Is it "drinking" age? "Marrying" age? "Draft eligibility" age?
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	children have rights
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would be hesitant to specify "adults" as it may be construed that children may not have these rights until a certain age, and defining that age could be arbitrary or problematic.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Opens the question of defining "adult." Parents should take care of the question relative to their kids.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	while I think Individuals "sounds" better, Adults is better suited for "covering our butts" when defending our platform...
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But, one does not have the right to endanger others as a result of partaking of substances.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Good change in light of previous.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like both but Plank 1.2 is a lot better.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	although I oppose the use of the wording from 2a, I think the use of adult is better, as children are under the guardianship of their parents until they have enough maturity to take on the responsibility of adulthood.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Some youth also have the ability to choose and should not be restricted by the limitation of saying "Adults"
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	That's exactly what I suggested above.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	VERY GOOD! But even clearer "Adults, as defined by the laws of the several states..."

4.0 - Personal Privacy - Pending Amendment

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Commenters	43.0%	57.0%	9.3%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I don't feel strongly about this one, but what is an "adult?" Lots of "children" ages 14-21 have sex, drink, smoke pot, and join the armed services.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The definition of adults and children is nebulous. the term should be Citizens or People
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Creates the conflict of inconsistent terminology, but definitely should be changed to this.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There may be a need to define non-adults, and the limitations/reasons for non-adults to be limited. Address the relationship of child - parent/guardian.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	One of the most astounding losses of liberty is in schools, even Universities. I don't think we should draw the line at "adults" and should instead simply support freedom for all individuals. After all, are we not all Americans, entitled to those same unalienable rights?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	In this case, individuals sounds more like a polical platform and less like a weak form of policy. In general, the rights of minors as dictated by the government are all based on the protection of the children themselves. All other rights of children are more or less dictated by the parents/guardians. Anyone who would intentionally misread this statement and say that Libertarians believe a six-year-old should be allowed to try heroin if they want to should be actively ridiculed in public for a complete and total lack of human integrity. Anyone unintelligent enough to mistake this statement's meaning in a similar sense will likely lose the battle to natural selection before the next election cycle.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I agree 100%! But, I think the libertarian party needs to come out in support of a legal age of 18. (When it comes to alcohol & marijuana use, sex still needs to be debated.) Something like, if someone is old enough to die in war, they are old enough to smoke & drink.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"Adults" is definitely a better word to use than "Individuals".

4.0 - Personal Privacy - Pending Amendment

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Commenters	43.0%	57.0%	9.3%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You have to be more specific like "I WILL GIVE TO EACH AMERICAN A \$75,000 LIVING CARD IF YOU ELECT ME FOR U.S. PRESIDENT"; "I WILL ISSUE \$50 TRILLION NEW FIAT MONEY ELIMINATING THE FEDERAL RESERVE"; "WE WILL MANUFACTURE ONE HUNDRED PERCENT IN AMERICA USING THE FEDERAL LANDS CREATING 100 JOBS". If you need help call me to 571-288-7383. My family could donate also \$100 million to your PAC. Thanks Alberto Lopez WWW.EBLM.US
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Do we need to define "adult"? Is it universally understood to be 18? Or is it 21? We need to be clear.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is meaningless handwaving. If you replaced "adults" with something indicating "people who can give informed consent" or the like, I'd be happy. But there are adults who ethically can't be regarded as able to consent to things, and children who ethically can. Focus on abstract competence, and I'd support the change.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Lacking a definition of "adult" you lay the foundations for tyranny. For example, a government, etc., might define "adult" as someone who meets a set of narrowly defined criteria that we would find totally unacceptable. Consider that Nazi Germany might not have defined "Jews" as "adults" in any set of circumstances.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	if people want to pick at the word "individuals" they are splitting hairs. Everyone knows what this means. Additionally children have rights and responsibilities. Plus the cutoff age for "adult" varies. Who decides what that age is? 16? 18? 21? Any choice is arbitrary.

4.0 - Personal Privacy - Pending Amendment

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Commenters	43.0%	57.0%	9.3%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would favor a separate clarification of the term individuals as Adults is too non-specific. What is an adult? 16? 17? 18? 21? an emancipated minor? What about an incapacitated adult, are they still able to make this decision? I believe that this could be better handled by identifying individuals as those who are capable of being responsible (i.e. understanding the action, the consequences, and personal responsibility for it) and when laws dictate whether a person can and can't be held responsible that we respect the laws of our land as the arbiter of that distinction.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe children do have these rights, but there parents supersede this till the child becomes the age of an adult or independently provide for themselves. Maybe make a plank that describes the views of the party towards children and parent/child relations to completely clarify the party's views to everyone.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	See comments above.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	See above.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I oppose this for the same reason as expressed above. If the two red-lined sentences are not deleted and the final sentence is added, I would support this change.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	How are you going to decide when someone becomes an adult, and thus suddenly acquires rights?
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Non-adults have legally and morally recognized rights, but not to the same degree as adults. I don't believe there is confusion that the original language intends for citizens of all ages to be treated as identically responsible--parental responsibility still exists either way.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	See above.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Should, then, 1.2 also refer to "each adult"?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Adult individuals might be a better choice, not just either word by itself.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't support the legalization of hard drugs. I don't want to share the road with people on heroin.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	True.

4.0 - Personal Privacy - Pending Amendment

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Commenters	43.0%	57.0%	9.3%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Children should have special recognition, including the recognition that their parents have responsibility in raising the, well.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Good distinction. (Leaves the status of children unclear -- which is probably for the best, in a platform!)
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Children have rights, too, and their freedom should be respected.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	No comment
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The age of reaching adulthood is one more arbitrary government dictate.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It's my opinion that NONE of this applies to someone who is underage...
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	While I know many Libertarians who disagree, I believe society has a compelling interest in protecting those not yet able to look out for themselves.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would recommend using the language "Individuals or their guardians have the freedom..."
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Would prefer "adult individuals."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Current laws reduce minors to legal non-persons. This is a sticky and complicated issue, but I do not believe individual rights begin with adulthood as defined in terms of chronological age.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"Adult" should be defined. The thing that makes us adults is a rejection of childhood dependency (fiscal) on parental figures. This may occur at any age and sadly, sometimes not at all.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Requires definition of an adult.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Adults should not usurp the rights of children to an upbringing free of undue influence, the Party recommends a wide ranging education for children that arms them to make lifes decisions in a most informed way
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Individuals can be defined as adults separate from this amendment. The same way children do not have the right to privacy (from their parents) in the first sentence. Children have the rights their parents allow them. When they are an adult, then they are allowed "all" their rights. However since the parents choose(and/or allow choices) for the children, then the parents are responsible for the results of the choices.

4.0 - Personal Privacy - Pending Amendment

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Commenters	43.0%	57.0%	9.3%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I have never heard the accusation against libertarians that we don't make a distinction between adults and children. I personally think we, as a society, don't view young people as individuals enough, but if this is a known issue, I support the amendment.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Nice.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	An absolute MUST!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	'substances' and 'media' is limiting to what is trying to be said. this sounds specifically like 'porn' and 'drugs' and I do not want to be associated with just that material.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Could the above be combined?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	it's way to vague
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What is an adult, 16, 18, 21, or 26?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Yes. Another good point.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	People 16 years of age can make their own choices, when the USA was founded people came of age at 15
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If worried about the term individuals then define what an adult is. aka at voting age?

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the change since I've been called a non-Libertarian for holding what is mostly a pro-life view; I don't support the original 1st sentence. We can disagree about when life begins and still acknowledge that, when it has begun, it is the role of government to protect that life; the denial of the importance of government in this issue is troubling. Deleting the 1st sentence and adding the new sentence would be an improvement; then we can debate, at a local level, when life begins and, thus, when the government is allowed to protect that life.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think the primary goal of most pro-life voters is to eliminate choice concerning abortion and many other personal choices.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would prefer LP make no comment on this issue at all
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Inclusion of the term "pro-life" is unacceptable as it is a euphemism for "anti-choice". An individual may be pro-choice and still be morally opposed to abortion, making them pro-life, but in the contemporary political atmosphere the term implies someone who opposes a woman's right to make decisions about her own body, which is as un-Libertarian as you can get, and we should not be welcoming such persons into the party.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Why dilute a SOLID one sentence statement of belief with wishy-washy garbage?
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Implied defacto division of Libertarians as "pro-life" and/or "pro-choice" implies that the abortion issue is an inherently political issue instead of a personal/moral issue. The original quote from the platform is complete.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It's not that we believe government should be kept out of the matter. Stating such a thing would be to deny the views of the pro-life members you're attempting to welcome. Instead, I'd recommend language such as: "Recognizing that abortion is a sensitive issue and that people can hold good-faith views on all sides, we leave the question of abortion to each person for their conscientious consideration, especially concerning the principles of life, liberty, self-ownership, personal responsibility, and the acceptance of consequence. We welcome both pro-life and pro-choice members into the Libertarian Party."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Completely and totally Abortion in my eyes is murder and this is one thing I am imovable on. Life to be begins at conception.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe this is an issue that the FEDERAL government should be kept out of but I'm okay with state and locality deciding on this.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Contradictory statements: "we believe that government should be kept out of the matter" and "We welcome both pro-life and pro-choice member". Would support making first sentence read "..we believe that the Federal government should be kept out of the matter..."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree with this provided the unborn is NOT viable. I would say this would be before 5 months, and 3 months would be more reasonable. Certainly if the unborn is viable, than their right to life is infringed upon. Prior to 3 months, the unborn is definitely not viable.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The existing plank implies a "pro-choice" attitude, and so the second part isn't needed. Note that I didn't write "pro-abortion", just "pro-CHOICE".
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Modify text language, as follows: No-choice and pro-choice. Or delete sentence 2, totally.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It would definately be best if government was out of this issue as it is such a private matter and best left to the individual to deal with but...in a safe manner. I would think the safety issue is why government became involved and then everyone else who had an opnion became involved in a matter that should remain private. It is after all, an issue that is as old as life. It should never have become a political platform.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Although, I don't know WHY you have to even make that distinction. The platform is all about getting the government OUT of individual choices so as a Libertarian it should be understood that you can have different opinions in regards to your OWN choices.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Abortion is a matter which should be left to each individual (adult) for their personal consideration.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Regrettfully, "pro-life" and "pro-choice" are words that are bandied around in a non-sensical manner way too much, thereby masking the deeper issues. Would we also use them for "pro-choice" to put our elder relatives out in the desert to die, as some civilizations have done??? This, like other parts of the plank, needs more work.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Another difficult concession.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But do you support government regulating abortion? This is where the battle is now.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Recognizing that a just government does not take a life without due process...
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The only acceptable tenant for libertarians is pro-choice. Anti-choice is the antithesis of Libertarianism and the ability for adults to make their own informed decisions with regards to life, LIBERTY and the PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS. ADULT women are worth more than a clump of cells that MIGHT become a human child.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The US Constitution guarantees to ALL the "right to life"; therefore except in cases of pregnancy being of explicit risk to the health or life of the mother abortion should not be allowed.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	NO! This is saying that any currently "sensitive issue" is beyond the purview of Libertarian judgement. That's ridiculous. Suppose the current "sensitive issue" was companion animal torture or the use of comatose women as surrogate mothers? Would Libertarians shy away from those "sensitive issues?" Yes, it really IS that complicated. Think about it for a while.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe all humans, born and unborn have the right to life and liberty.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The Pro-choice position contradicts other libertarian planks which state that the government has a duty to protect the rights of all individuals. Unborn humans are individuals, therefore they too warrant protection from violence and aggression from doctors or their parents. The Pro-choice position is anti-liberty.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Unborn persons have a natural right to life as stated in our constitution.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Seems out of place in the Platform
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The platform does NOT make it clear that the party "acknowledges that there is more than one legitimate position as to when the right of life begins." I don't see that mentioned in the platform at all. I'm also not sure how the Libertarian Party platform can say "the government's role is to protect the rights of the individual" and then say that "government should be kept out of the matter" of protecting someone's right to life.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Post and Partial Birth abortions are a barbaric acts of Murder. Most,,,, trimester abortions should be considered Murder. Other than these situations, It is not Mine or any other Persons business to involve themselves in a purely Family Matter. Further a "Family" should be legally defined for legal matters.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think that this additional sentence leans toward marketing of the LP, of which I am not in favor.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'm pro-life and I can't agree with you more!

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The issue of abortion speaks directly to core Libertarian principles of privacy, self-ownership and self-determination. Our philosophy of individual choice supports the right of a person to pursue safe and secure recourses regarding their life, their conscience and moreover, their medical welfare; it is not a governmental matter. The Libertarian Party recognizes and respects all views on this often volatile and polarizing issue, and we welcome both Pro-Choice and Pro-Life proponents in our membership.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'm basically neutral on this proposed addition.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I can support this as long as anyone claiming to be pro-life understands that theirs is an individual choice that applies only to themselves. If they believe in libertarian principles, they must agree not to support laws that will in any way legislate morality. True Libertarians support the rights of adults to make their own decisions.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The issue of abortion rests upon the shoulders of self-responsibility as mentioned in my previous comment. If a woman accepts responsible for herself, she has the right to decide for herself whether she will provide life-support for the fetus in her womb, or not. Any action of the state to force her to provide that life-support free of charge to the individual residing within her forces her into a state of involuntary servitude to the child, or fetus. Liberty is the opportunity to love. Deny a woman the right to DENY the child within her life, and you deny her the power and right to GIVE the child life. On the other hand, if that woman depends upon a husband or others for her support, and irresponsibly becomes pregnant, forcing them to bear responsibility also for the child within her, then she must, in justice, let them make the decision regarding the life and future of the fetus living within her. If that is not the case, she forces them into a state of involuntary servitude.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would leave out the last sentence.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think this statement is lame, and not courageous. We all know, from even gradeschool science, that the processes defining life are present from conception (cellular growth and division, exchange of genetic information, consumption of substances required for growth of cells). The important question, that is most ignored by both sides of this issue, is when is it ok to kill. Abortion does kill, so can self defense, so does war, even an insistance upon individual transportation results in many traffic related deaths every day. I believe we must face, head on, the real question of when we will and will not kill.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	All I'll say for this one: RIGHT ON!!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is one of the few areas that divides our party and the current favorite bat the left likes to wield to beat us. Not taking a moral stance on this issue as a party is incredibly important regardless of our personal feelings as both large parties tend to expand our non-stance as support for the other.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We should not welcome any "pro-life" members unless they affirm that they also support a woman's right to choose and that they also oppose any attempts to coerce a woman into giving up control of her own body.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Stop using code words. A person is pro-life or a pro-abortionist. There is no choice in this matter.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Redundant. The important thing throughout is to emphasize that government has no business meddling in the private affairs of individuals.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Abortion infringes on the rights of the unborn.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support, but this sounds a bit like pandering to me.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	pro-lifers in general do not recognize the right of anyone to disagree since the matter is one of homicide insofar as they are concerned. If they were to do otherwise would be totally inconsistent.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think this is a very important sentence to add if we want new-comers to understand the party values easily.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Add to the end of the first sentence: "and at their personal expense" as there is no need to steal from one person to pay for another's choices
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'm actually luke-warm on this. While Representative Paul is running in the republican platform, his position on abortion is clear, the only debate being when life begins. While I do support this concept (above) it almost comes across as 'we won't deal with anything relating to this topic'.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This position should be qualified to include the liberty to opt-out, without consequence, of assisting in any way in the performance of abortions should that individual have a personal objection to abortion.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Pro-life and pro-choice are terms applied to people who want to use government to enforce one point of view or another.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The added "clarification" is an unnecessary sop to special interest groups (and an obvious attempt to lure people to the LP).
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"government should be kept out" implies active action addressing changing existing policy. The wording should be changed to imply a state of being rather than an action: "government should have no voice in the matter,"
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	In this day in age if we aren't addamentatly prolife we should remove this plank all together.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	As a Christian, I am glad that Libertarians are seeking to remove government from this issue. I would propose to add, "Government is not a god that has the power to legislate what people should believe."

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I personally do not favor abortion because as soon as a female's egg is fertilized it is a growing human being. And to be a libertarian who says that they believe in individual rights, then turn around and say that as long as a child is inside its mother it is not an individual and therefore can be killed makes no sense. The child didnt ask to be there. It wasn't its choice to be there. It is only there due to the actions of others. I know a person who used to be pro-life. He slept with a married woman. She later found out that she was pregnant and that he was the father. They went and aborted the child to hide it from her husband and he didn't want to have a child. That child never asked to be conceived, but paid the ultimate price. And now he is pro choice, and i cant help but feel that he is that way now to rationalize killing an individual. Just because a child isnt fully developed and is inside another human being does not cancel out its individual rights. To say that it does makes no sense to me and seems to be a loop hole in individual rights that libertarians prefer to avoid.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	"Pro-life" politicians generally want to outlaw abortion
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Abortion is violence against a person. One of the few legitimate functions of government is to protect your "right to life".
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is a morality issue and morality cannot be legislated. It should be taught; preferably by parents.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ Our God is Pro Life so I'm Pro Life. Only events of life or death to the mother during giving birth or complications that can be proven through test to pose death or harm to the mother. Christ died for the free choice of life or death but all souls should be taught to choose life as God has instructed for eternal life.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It seems redundant, but no harm in being clear.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I consider abortion Murder and will not budge from that position.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I am purely a pro life supporter and believe that abortion amounts to murder.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I don't think the extra wording is necessary. It seems to pander to one side or the other depending on your viewpoint.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The right of personal choice is paramount. The choice confers consideration of the consequence on each individuals conscience regardless of belief. For any reason, to deny the right of self determination is tantamount to a condition of slavery.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I strongly support the idea of making this change but don't agree with using the term "pro-life".
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	that child has a right to live.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Life begins at first breath. In all of nature all heroic efforts to sustain the nonviable ends. Lets join the forces of nature.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'm sorry, but the rights of the unborn child has to be considered.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Libertarians are shaped as the party of reason in my mind, if you do not create some context to correlate why pro-life and pro-choice groups to join the LP, then it becomes a throw away comment. And honestly by saying leaving the question to each person for their conscientious consideration, you basically alienate every pro-life member from the start as to them watching an abortion is like allowing a murder to happen right before your eyes.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Wording is bad. This is an issue that may Pro-Life libertarians as I am one would disagree with as to governments role since Libertarians believe that one of the major roles of govt is the protection of life. I like the first part, not the second or third parts. Do like the last statement.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I understand the party is trying to assuage more voters, but to undermine ccore principles is to abandon the party itself. Freedom does not accept tyranny. Which is what outlawing the right to manipulate one's own body, in any way the individual sees fit, is.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	To those proclaiming to be pro-life, pro-choice means "pro-death". The two viewpoints are, in my opinion, diametrically opposed. Pro-life advocates support government intervention wholeheartedly and without reservation.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Seems apologist, redundant, and therefore, unnecessary.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Thought the first way was crystal clear while avoiding the rhetoric.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Seems repetitive and pandering
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, when the CHOICE is to prevent or terminate no other individuals shall be compelled to support that decision. Likewise, no individual shall be compelled to support the consequences to any individual who makes the CHOICE to carry to term and deliver. In both cases, those who agree with the decisions may voluntarily offer support at the level they feel appropriate.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Redundant
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It's a good add, but it's not necessary. Though it makes the LP look more inviting
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I frankly think the term pro-life is too loaded although I could see many finding "anti-choice" equally as loaded. If we believe that it is a personal matter, then the anti-choice position has no place in the party (or keep it to yourself).
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	As the term 'pro-life' is abused by the rabid anti-abortion extremists, we should exclude that lunacy and instead find a better way to encourage non-extreme abortion opponents among our ranks.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	suggestion: we believe that "federal" government should be kept out of the matter... this may be totally out of line with LP views, but I believe there could be a distinction made between federal and state in some instances
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think this statement is not needed. It is not a statement of platform.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	We welcome everyone.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Abortion is a sticky issue. Perhaps we should reframe the issue not in terms of false descriptors like "pro-choice" and "pro-life" but in terms of a concept all libertarians can agree on. By this I mean the issue is not about privacy or a right to choose, but rather it is at its core about when do we say life begins. If one says life begins at 4 weeks then that person believes it is ok to abort prior to 4 weeks and not ok after 4 weeks as that would be a violation of the right to life. If another says life begins at 4 months then that person is ok with abortion prior to 4 months but not after. The more extreme positions are saying it begins at conception or that it does not begin until the baby actually exits the mother's body (of course I would like to think no libertarian actually thinks terminating the pregnancy of 39 weeks and 6 days is "ok" just because it happens to be on one side of an arbitrary invisible line). If a libertarian believes a human is alive then it is the role of government to protect that living being's natural right to life. So to say the government
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	not necessary
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Proposal 1 is about Liberty, which presumably includes the right to an abortion. This is necessarily at odds with "pro life" advocates who want government to control/prohibit abortions. Remove this entirely; the platform does not need to address every hot button issue. Furthermore, the issue is really an effort (mostly Republican) to distract the public from more important issues, and draw a (feeble) distinction between themselves and Democrats. There is no need to get between them; I find the subject tiresome! To paraphrase Napoleon: "Never interrupt the enemy while they are making a mistake."

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	The proposed plank implies that pro-lifers are welcome in the party, but their belief in the rights of the unborn is not welcome. I would prefer rewording along the lines of: "Recognizing that abortion is a sensitive issue and that people can hold good-faith views on all sides, we believe that the federal government should be kept out of the matter. We welcome both pro-life and pro-choice members into the Libertarian Party."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe the proposed statement is essentially correct for the federal level, however, I believe each state should have the authority as stated in the 10th amendment to make laws regarding abortion one way or the other if they so choose.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Great way to leave this contentious issue out of the attraction of new members and voters.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While I know that the Federal Government has no authority to rule in this matter, I do not think that the decision of taking someone else's life could be left solely to the decision of an individual. The state has to regulate at what point the people of this state consider the unwanted child to be a human being after which abortion would be treated as premeditated murder like it would be with any other individual's life taken.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Pro-life is a suspension of the rights of Pro-Choice individuals and is anathema to the Libertarian ideal. Pro-choice allows for Pro-life individuals to still choose not to have an abortion.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I am pro choice; and have always treated the pro life people with respect. On the issue. I believe that life begins at conception; but rights do not begin until a mother has accepted the child by giving birth or possibly earlier as her discretion.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Redundant.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It is a good addition, though it would be easy to mischaracterize the LP position as pro-choice. I suggest that the LP position should more strongly emphasize that government should not participate, facilitate, impede, or harass a woman (or a couple) in their decision to have an abortion. I think that, through emphasizing that fundamental point, the it will become more clear that the LP position is not merely a variant of the "pro-choice" position.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I just cannot support abortion beyond a few weeks into the pregnancy. I am as libertarian as they come; but to wallow in indecision for weeks and months before pulling the trigger is just not acceptable to me. I don't believe I have the right to tell a woman she CANNOT have an abortion; but I believe it's acceptable to insist she makes the decision sooner rather than later. Have you seen what a late term abortion is? Barbarian murder!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would support this only if Pro-life and pro-choice do not feel they have the right to force their belief upon others or attempt to do so.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The beauty and simplicity of the original statement is fantastic and very clear. Adding terms like "pro-life" and "pro-choice" only clouds the issues. (similar to any reference in the platform using unspecific terms like "Left" and "Right").
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Do we welcome persons into the party that would violate and women's right to control her own body?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Last part is rather implied.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Worthy topic, but I would not welcome extremists of either of the above groups (some abortions should be permitted, yet others should be banned).

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I dislike the Libertarian's soft stance on abortion. If you want to softball it, then state that the issue is when does a person becomes a person. If one believes it is at conception, then pro-life should be the libertarian platform. If one believes it is when one gains cognitive functions, then pro-choice is the libertarian platform. This is more of a personal philosophical question and should remain a personal choice. We should accept both sides, but always refrain from passing laws governing what one can do to their own body.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Wrong! Wrong! Wrong! First, it's grammatically incorrect. If you want to keep the sentence, change "their" to "his" or simply eliminate the word. Second, I do not believe this reflects what the Libertarian Party stands for. As a libertarian, I would welcome a person who believed that life begins at erection. I would welcome a person who thought it was morally wrong for a doctor to perform an abortion. I would welcome a person who believed that contraception is sinful. I would not welcome people who want to restrict the rights of those who disagree with them, as "pro-lifers" do.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This should not be interpreted by pro-life advocates as a willingness of the party to support their position.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Support of abortion takes rights away from fathers and children (the ones being aborted). Pro-choice is actually anti-liberty in this case.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We recognize that it is the responsibility of society to protect the right to individual life, liberty and property. There are times, however, that even the Constitution debates the power of the states to make decisions over life and death (i.e. - Congress has the right to declare war, with the possibility of loss of life, and the states have the authority to make their own laws on the death penalty, and laws that permit family members to make decisions about the extremely ill who need extra-ordinary assistance to sustain life) Further, we also recognize that there is considerable debate over the degree of sentience of the life of a fetus in the womb, and debate as to how much said life needs to be defended relative to the rights of the mother. Given the lack of consensus on the matter of abortion, and the Libertarian position that places individual Liberty on a higher footing than state authority, we believe - that the jurisdiction of authority for protecting the life (or lack thereof) of a fetus falls primarily upon the mother, secondarily on the father/family and not upon the state. T
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	By common understanding, "pro-life" implies a belief that government can validly prohibit abortions. No way, Jose'
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think the addition is unnecessary, and may be a little bit too provocative. Those who are pro-life and pro-choice can read into the unmodified proposal what they will; no additional language is necessary.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I think we need to say explicitly that the Federal gov't should be kept out of the matter. I see this as a state and local issue.
Oppose Support	Likely Unlikely	No No	Non-Member Non-Member	Redundant. As a pro life libertarian I really appreciate the addition of this language. I have not always had my opinion welcomed in discussion, and often told I was not a true libertarian. I believe that this validates the many pro life libertarians and will help get many to vote in our party over the GOP
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	...and take no political position on the issue.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Change sentence to read "The Libertarian Party remains neutral to this issue as we believe it is a matter of personal choice and shall be without governmental influence."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'm having a really big problem, squaring the Libertarian ideals of RIGHTS TO LIFE with any decision a woman might make with regard to her rights to convenience. I believe that we all have the fundamental right to life.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't know if that helps or will make both extremes mad??? I wanted to choose neutral/unsure, but didn't have that choice.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Although as interpreting human rights, abortion in itself violates the rights of the unborn child. A freedom of choice may imply freedom to consider the consequences of one's actions or in-actions. There are a wide range of birth control methods available, along with the option of adoption to consider. Life is and should be protected under any platform proclaiming freedom. A freedom to live and flourish is and should not be diminished. I'm not a zealot on this matter, but I think it is an important one to be pro-life, in that we are pro-life in majority concerning the death penalty, the use of illegitimate and illegal wars, the use of unmanned drones, et al...
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	absolutely agree!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Abortion and Social Security cannot coexist. Libertarians should chose to support one or the other, not both. It will take an additional 600 million people to support the 300 million plus people now living in the USA when they retire. This is unsustainable even with massive illegal immigration. I personally believe we should abolish Social Security (which has become an oxymoron to me), not abortion. Family values will return to those our great grandparents had for centuries.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	THIS IS WHAT IT MEANS TO BE A LIBERTARIAN!!!

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would support getting the Federal government out of abortion law, but I believe that some law reference will be required, and should come from the states.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It would seem that the original wording already allowed for the inclusion of persons on either side, or in the middle of, the abortion debate. However, if it is needed to be explicitly stated, this wording is sufficient.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is a dicey one, so the words had better be crafted carefully.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	redundant
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Bad English. "People" is not the plural form of person. Why not say "individuals" or "persons". Also, should say "his or her" instead of "their" after "each person". Also, the phrase starting with "leaving" is a dangling participle.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Abortion is the murder of an innocent person.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Its obvious that Libertarians would welcome both. Personal choice in all daily actions is kinda the Libertarian Idea. This proposal seems silly and a little redundant redundant
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Abortion is a defining factor in the way a lot of people vote, I'd go further and add some more clarity to the LP platform
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do not think the sentence is necessary but do not find anything wrong with it.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"Pro-life" and "pro-choice" are loaded political words that both have non-libertarian connotations.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Abortion as a convenient method of birth control is abhorrent. There must be consideration for the rights and lives of the nearly born!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The terms "pro-life" and "pro-choice" are often used in a political context, and associated with political action to push a particular social agenda. It's good to state that those with differing personal beliefs are welcome, but differing political agendas may blur what the party represents.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	the right to life should be protected.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree with the language but it does not address the LP's views on the legality of the procedure... Would this be an appropriate place to address that?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Abortion is the harming of an individual's person without their consent. Thus, in line with the libertarian philosophy of minarchical governance, that is the bare bones role of government to protect an individual's person or property.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree, government officials should make this a PRIVATE issue, not a governmental issue!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The first sentence already explains that we welcome both viewpoints.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I can never support claims that the view, that parents have a right to kill their children, is a view held in "good faith". This is the primary reason I don't donate money to the LP. Government is supposed to protect human life.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	But there are more than just the two stated positions
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is the only time when I fundamentally break from the LP platform. If a person chooses to end the life of another, that constitutes murder. We cannot and should not criminalize a miscarriage, because that is caused by a medical problem 99% of the time. We cannot and should not criminalize an abortion that is medically necessary to preserve the life of the mother. We cannot and should not criminalize an abortion where the child is conceived through the commission of a crime. However, willful and premeditated commission of the death of another human being is a crime since biblical times. Also, since a major plank of the platform involves personal responsibility for choices made, having unprotected sex that results in pregnancy is an example of a choice made and a child is the consequence. There are options, i.e. adoption.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Strongly Support this

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It makes the point that your political position on abortion can be entirely separate from your personal one, which is what our party is all about.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You don't need to pro-actively add distinction to a perfectly clear statement. You are inviting division. This one is really unacceptable, this whole issue is a one-human one-view situation with no imposition on any other human either way, so what is your agenda with the second statement? This is not a good way to grow membership, it's divisive and does not take us forward. If it ain't broke don't fix it.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Since I'm pro-life I like this change very much. I would prefer: Recognizing that abortion is a sensitive issue and that people can hold good-faith views on all sides, we believe that government should be kept out of the matter. We welcome both pro-life and pro-choice members into the Libertarian Party.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Libertarians protect the constitutional right to life and part of doing that is protecting the unborn. It is scientific fact the life begins at conception. However, the constitution delegates acts of violence to the state, so abortion should be a state issue.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While I support the proposal - as libertarians can have reasoned disagreement and therefore all should be welcomed into the party - the plank is definitely a pro-choice plank and it sugar-coats the issue to say that pro-lifers are ostensibly welcome. The plank states 1) there are reasonable views on either side, so therefore 2) we are pro-choice. If the party really wanted to welcome both sides, it would keep the language about recognizing it is sensitive and people can hold good faith views and it would had the language about welcoming both sides BUT should DELETE the language that "we believe that government should be kept out of the matter, leaving the question to each person for their conscientious consideration." If both sides are welcome into the party, the party should just state that and leave it as be. As it is, the party plank says both sides are welcome, but then advocates a pro-choice stance.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This plank is clearly a pro-choice plank. The addition is nice, but seem disingenuous.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But if government is kept out of the matter, the plank is inherently pro-choice.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Redundant, but we might as well make the obvious explicit.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The term "pro-life" was a direct result of the passing of Roe v. Wade and therefore is commonly associated with, if not defined by legislative action. If the party opposes legislative action, we do not welcome a pro-life individual's views on this subject. Of course, you don't have to agree with the entire party platform to be a member.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't think it appropriate to call out any particular group in the party platform. The same could be done via education and press.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You either support personal liberties, or you do not. You cannot provide a platform for both.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Suggest rewording: The Libertarian Party's membership includes both individuals who identify themselves as "pro-life" and who identify themselves as "pro-choice". BTW, I think these quotation marks are important since these are rhetorical labels. All Libertarians support both life and choices—we understand that the two are inextricably intertwined.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	No objection to the change, but I do believe that government has the authority to prevent people from extinguishing human life.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is right on!
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Remove the "sensitive issue" language. Everybody knows that and it places ambiguous language into the sentence.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do not agree with abortion but it is an individual choice to sin or not. Get government out of it.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The plank should recognize the libertarians disagree on whether abortion should be legal or illegal, but agree that governments should not fund abortion either way.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The "pro-life" and "pro-choice" terminology is subjective and divisive, and should NOT be used.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I am a pro-choicer, and I also welcome pro-life members to the Libertarian Party.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There is a fundamental problem. There is NOT a good-faith view in favor of abortion. Abortion is aggression, and is a violation of the non-aggression principle. While a person may be said to have an opinion in favor of abortion, which is a true reflection of his views, that doesn't make it good-faith. Furthermore, by means of coercion and fraud, women are being assaulted by abortionists, either through invasion of the body with medical instruments that cause grave harm to the woman as well, including physical, emotional, and spiritual harm, or through poisonous drugs. A substantial majority of women report coercion to get an abortion. This plank does not support a woman's right to be protected from aggression and fraud perpetrated by abortionists and by the father or grandparents of the child, or even by employers and others. The plank should read that the LP recognizes abortion as aggression and fraud against women and children, but that a person who supports abortion is welcome to be a member.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Furthermore, as long as government protects This is where I disagree with the Party. Abortion shouldn't be a sensitive issue. We have the right to freedom unless it restricts another individual from doing the same. Perhaps "individual" should be changed to something like "different human DNA" I feel spiritually or scientifically it's a different human and to terminate a pregnancy undermines the Libertarian stance on individual responsibilities and acceptance of consequences of one's individual choices and actions.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support this change but i think the best strategy would be to remain silent on abortion. I believe that the gov can have a role in protecting the rights of individuals and it is not in anyway un-libertarian to believe that an unborn fetus is an individual that has rights. I see both sides of the argument and i believe they both have a place in the Libertarian Party. For this reason i think we should say nothing and broaden the base of possible members.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Government can not stay out of the abortion issue as long as a considerable portion society believe that abortion is murder. The proper role for government is to give a LEGAL definition to the beginning of life and treat anything before that time as legal, anything after as murder.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think it should be made explicit that the contention between libertarians on this issue is the personhood of the unborn. Persons have the right to life, liberty, and property. We just disagree on who qualify as persons.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe government should be limited in how it intervenes in this manner. However, government should be able to intervene, on a limited basis, to stop certain types of abortions under a very specific set of guidelines. At some point, I believe, an abortion is no longer a medical procedure, but rather, murder of an unborn child.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	This makes platform even more cowardly and confusing.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't really care - but there is a great danger that a pro-life faction that isn't staunchly libertarian will try to use coercion to make it illegal.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Historically, traditionally, legally, life has always been measured from the moment of live birth to the declared time of death. That's why we celebrate birthdays and not conception days. Until 'life begins at conception' is codified into law, abortion is just another medical procedure to which a pregnant woman should be free to choose for herself.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Seems unnecessary, though.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The right to life is a fundamental right. this right should be extended to ALL human beings without regard to age, size, social status, health, location, etc. The fundamental right to life should not be so softly grazed over.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Remove this entire plank. There is not more than one legitimate opinion as to when the right to life begins. The pro-life position stinks of religious superstition without basis in reason, fact, or science. Any position on any issue that contradicts science or outrages reason is suspect, and the pro-life crowd spends it's time doing both of those ad nauseam. A woman owns her own body entirely and may do with it as she chooses right up until the unborn becomes a born individual. Life begins at birth when a child ceases to be a part of a woman's body. Any other interpretation gives men domination over women by subjecting them to the whims of their own ability to reproduce.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It's not unusual for a plank to reflect disagreement, but I don't believe it's necessary to have an "Abortion Plank"; we should simply refer to "life" and leave it to the individual as to their own personal definition as to what that constitutes and when it begins.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	unnecesarry
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It just seems redundant. It would obviously be either pro-life members or pro-choice. Unless there's a third viewpoint I'm not aware of.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The problem with "pro-life", is their tendency to press their opinion on others. If "pro-life" platform referred only to their own choices, there would be no conflict between pro life and pro choice.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Even though I support it, I don't believe it is needed.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I disagree with this because we just reviewed individual rights and differentiated between adults and children. Now here, we are saying unborn children don't matter and "government should be kept out of the matter". We are contradicting ourselves. Rather than call it "Abortion" call it Unborn Individuals. They have all rights of previous section. Abortion is violence against children so we need to differentiate their rights. The added language in blue makes us look desperate for membership. Change wording of "members" to "individuals" if you must keep this.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is meaningless. It's nice that you'll let anybody join the club but the suggestion that government shouldn't have anything to do with abortion just doesn't fly. For those who are against abortion, it's murder, and, as such, the state has a compelling interest in preventing it. Those in favor have a bit more leeway but until you've eliminated Medicaid and the FDA government will have a say in abortion. This doesn't say what you believe. It only says that you'll take anybody's membership dues. It's almost a plea.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Please add "so long as the do not try to impose their agenda on others."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If the purpose of the government is to protect life and liberty of every citizen, then abortion abrogates that right.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Unnecessary.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe this whole plank should be removed.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would rather that we amend to strike Plank 1.4 - Abortion in it's entirety. The Libertarian Party should break free of addressing divisiveness in the party regarding the specific act of abortion. It certainly should not further the divisiveness by labeling Libertarians as belonging to one of two diametrically opposing factions within the party. This plank is the meaningless fuzzy blabber of the politicians we want to replace. Libertarians aren't positive about anything in this plank as it stands or as amended. We Libertarians are stressing individual liberty in the other proposed recommendations and amendments. Without defining "individual," to whom are these proposals and amendments addressed? Without agreement on which individuals have the right to live, what is our liberty and pursuit of happiness worth? We need a Libertarian definition of "individual." With that accomplished, we can determine in other parts which individuals have their own life rights.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	However, those of opposing views might wish to make it a litmus test for the Party. It is a very thorny issue.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'd prefer to keep the anti-abortionists out, because in my view, they are not true libertarians.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	really its unnecessary
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Common sense to me.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do not oppose the sentiment - just do not think we need the language
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Where is the proposed platform language stating that "We welcome both anarchist and minarchist members into the Libertarian Party"? This proposal is one more attempt to make the Libertarian Party more conservative!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Legislative restrictions against abortion violate the inalienable Rights of the Woman.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'd prefer something like, "Both pro-life and pro-choice views are supported by the Libertarian Party"

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You can't call this a civilized society and accept terminating unborn babies lives. I believe we must find language that states we simply don't think it's the federal governments job to make these decisions.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It is good to be inclusive, especially on sensitive issues like this one.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Substitute 'has no legitimate standing in' for 'should be kept out of'.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	not a very important addition though
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Well written
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The loaded phrases "pro-life" and "pro-choice" are buzzwords designed for the purposes of parties of other persuasions than libertarian ones, and it's far better for our party's purposes to not say them.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Highlight the individual decision making process; don't use labels.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Pro-life people want to enslave women.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	we should not make a person's right to believe in pro-life not feel accepted by Libertarians.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I recognize the sensitivity of this issue and the implications on personal liberty. However, I support the government in defining what is a 'life' and enforcing its protection.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Viable human beings should never be aborted. The three important ideas of our constitution are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. The first is life.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Could LP look into Mises Institute Walter Block's 'Eviction theory'?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	but in welcoming we should keep all tax money from any institution that offers abortions....
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	This is an excellent addition.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe the party should support the stance to protect the lives and liberty of ALL individuals, including the unborn.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While I appreciate the fact that this inclusion will encourage membership among different groups, I feel that it works directly against the belief that "government should be kept out of the matter". In fact, I see this sentence as directly contradictory with the prior sentence. Libertarians are, by definition, pro-choice in that the choice is up to each individual, not the government. Pro-Life is not a synonym for being morally against abortion, it implies that the government should disallow choice. Those individuals who are against abortion, but allow others the freedom to make that determination for themselves are Pro-Choice. Including this sentence, in my opinion, directly violates the Libertarian Party ideal, and would be a grave mistake.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	It is very hard to straddle this issue, but the LP needs people to understand that we are trying.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Make no change.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Oppose welcoming specific groups unless we welcome EACH and every group where there may be a slight difference.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	While the concept is correct, the platform is not a membership recruiting document. This is not the proper place for such a statement although I agree with its content
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	enough said.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I am a pro life libertarian and definitely approve of this addition.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do not agree that having an abortion is a woman's choice over her body. I argue that it is a moral choice involving the initiation of force against someone who merely happens to be unborn and literally drawing their sustenance from their mother.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	In my opinion, people who identify as Pro-Life or Pro-Choice, believe the government is the solution to their problems, so this statement seems redundant. The solution to abortion is a private matter. Women should not be discouraged from getting sterilized, when they don't want children. Government should get out of media, so positive messages about responsibility for self and respect for one's body, could balance the message that big media controls, which encourages action without thought.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I personally add: While the party may support personal choice the party does not condone government spending for this issue.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Inclusiveness and encompassment will hopefully help, yet the fundamental policy issue concerns whether authoritarianism is to be centered within the individual or the exterior social group system(s). Higher enlightenment may be the enduring solution to this cultures conflict puzzle.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This 'cutting the baby in half' is a dodge. It essentially comes down on the side of abortion being legal. How about suggesting that abortion is killing but that in some circumstances it is 'justified' (just like self defense.) That would make the person 'committing the act' have to justify it the same as when people use deadly force to protect themselves.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Pro-life and pro-choice are politicized terms. To many of us, pro-life means support for infringing on abortion rights. Perhaps terminology that gets to the heart of the personal choice/preference would work better. We welcome those who would not choose abortion for themselves, but not those who would impose that preference on others (through the coercive power of government, other violence, extortion, etc.).

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	with the understanding that free people make responsible choices, and that the person facing the situation is the only one who can responsibly act according to his conscience.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We have no business involving government in this issue.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What about partial-birth abortion? This denies the life of a full term fetus! Need to rethink this.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	would add: Libertarians oppose government funding be used to either provide abortion services to discourage abortion.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't know that this last sentence is necessary, but obviously someone thought it was. If this sentence makes everyone feel welcome in the party, then I support it.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the revision. It makes our stance not confusing anymore.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This just reaffirms we welcome all.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The Party should not take either a pro-choice or pro-life stand. It is a scientific & philosophical issue to be decided in non-political arenas.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Keep Government out of the question and answer of abortion. This is a deeply personal private concerns for women. The individual (Female) can think, choose and act in her own rational self interest in such matters.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe life begins at conception therefore, terminating it by abortion is murder, a special kind called fetuscide.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Should be unnecessary, but points out the obvious to those who read too much into things.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	No change needed.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do not see that the bottom line here as proposed needs to be. My main objection to the government being involved with abortion is that taxpayer funds are spent on something that is an individuals choice to make. Funds that all of us pay into with no choice of how to use them. Taxation without representation speaks to me here. I do not want my tax dollars going to a precedure that I do not agree with. There are few circumstances under which I beleive that abortion should be allowed and to be used as a means of Birth Control is not one of them. When speaking to a prospective recruit or audience it should be apparent that we will except them all as we have common goals.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Abortion takes a life that is guaranteed as unalienable. I would welcome opposing views as long as the plank does not sidestep this unalienable right.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Strongly oppose! It breaks it down into TWO sides, rather than ALL sides (more accurate, IMO), and perpetuates the two common and IMO both inappropriate "buzzwords". The existing wording is more than enough! If it isn't already obvious without the proposed added last sentence, adding the last sentence isn't going to help. The *actions* of actual party members in interacting with new and potential members will trump the effect of this sentence, ten times over.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	No need to add that!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Yes, because technically a pro-life person can also support government non-intervention on abortion matters.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Before the last sentence, I would add: "We believe that government should make no laws that promote or protect one viewpoint over the other."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Is it not the purpose of the pro-life movement to criminalize a woman's use of an abortion to terminate a pregnancy?

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I support the welcoming statement, but the purpose statement "that there is more than one legitimate position as to when the right to life begins" assumes too much, and reads out of the libertarian movement those who question the competency or morality of a government or state to protect a so-called right to life.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Redundant. And using the terms that each side have coined is dicey as well. Why not pro-life and pro-death? Pro-abortion and anti-abortion? See, nasty getting into it. Strongly encourage skipping this one.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Personally, I am strongly pro-choice.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The last sentence feels out of place as part of the platform.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Either for life, or against taking a life, should be exactly that . . . across the board for whatever reason.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"We welcome both pro-life and pro-choice members in the Libertarian party who respect each others' different views on this deeply personal issue." As Libertarians, I am not sure we should even use the terms Pro-Life and Pro-Choice. We all recognize that abortion terminates a life. We object to the state taking part in that decision. I think that is naive. As people guided by objectivity with the maximization of personal freedom as our ultimate goal, we cannot just punt on this because it is difficult. Essentially we are dealing with determining the point up to which we ought to allow a woman to terminate a normal pregnancy. I am willing to let science guide me on this. The statement above would allow women to abort children at any time in their pregnancy. I cannot support that.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Many/most pro-life positions are contrary to keeping the government out of the matter.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Redundant, sounds a bit pandering.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I oppose the existing plank but the welcome message is just lipstick.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Never forget the foundation upon what we stand - Life, Liberty & the Pursuit of Happiness.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Assuming they don't want to try and co-opt the party to their particular point of view
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is a medical decision, not a political one.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Abortion is murder. A baby must have the freedom to live.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Social issues are becoming less and less important in my view, abortion is divisive so by not making that a main issue we can attract more people.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would add to the "government should kept out of the matter"INCLUDING FUNDING.....
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Although I find the "pro-life" and "pro-choice" terms obfuscatory, I suppose that they have become the unavoidable vernacular phrases.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do feel it should be made clear that the decision to abort is a very personal one and is the sole right of the individual. It has nothing to do with government or the opinion of others.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"government should be kept out of the mater" will be seen as pro-choice as the pro-lifers believe that life begins at conception and that the government has an obligation to protect that individuals life. Maybe that we do not support funding.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do not like the term "pro-life".
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Pro-life's goal is to criminalize abortions, period, so this plank is nonsensical. They dont want it left to each person, they are committed to denying it to others. The only way to do that is using the govt to enforce a ban. The best way to treat this is to leave it alone.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i like the sentence in the 'purpose'... "The platform already acknowledges that there is more than one legitimate position as to when the right to life begins." suggest fashion that sentence into the platform as well....
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Not necessary. The original statement stands alone.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This seems redundant.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	The Government should be kept out of matter because Abortion is a personal issue. It would also be one less thing for the Government to worry about.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Not everyone fits into the pro-life and pro-choice categories.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the new added language, but would strike all language in the first sentence after the first comma.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We believe government should not influence either the demand for or supply of abortion services, . . .
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	let them make that up for them selves- dont try to sway voters by adding that
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Since we are leaving "government" out of the matter, we do not need to make this a political party issue. It is clear that we respect all views. Enough said.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The government has a responsibility to define a legal definition of when life starts. This should be the maximum point at which an abortion is legal. Any time before this point is dependent on the persons' involved choices and has nothing to do with the legal definition.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I am in full and happy support of this amendment. Being that I am myself opposed to abortion while knowing that it's not my right to force my belief on another woman's very personal choice. I would thank you for this addition.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The issue that should be addressed is the point at which a fetus is considered developed enough to be a person.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	This clarification could help bring Ron Paul supporters into our party, though I do not expect or want Ron himself to seek our nomination again.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I have real trouble supporting this. I support this only if the first platform applies to individual choice. The choice to have sex has as one of it's consequences pregnancy. If a woman did not have a choice to have sex, then I support, although I grieve, her choice for abortion. I will not argue the merits of abortion or life as those are viewed tenuously by the opposite belief. However, the fact that pregnancy is a consequence of choosing to have sex cannot be opposed. How can we say that a thief who needs the object to survive should be made to accept the consequences of her choices but, another woman does not have to accept the consequences of hers? Any logical argument must be constant even at the most extreme, and possibly opposing, inferences. Please remove my support if the above will not be logically consistent with our belief of individual freedom of choice being bound by consequences for those choices.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This may be the most rational statement I have seen on the subject .
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It is imperative that the federal government stay out of the abortion issue and give the states the ability to decide how to regulate or classify abortion.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i support the change, but believe libertarians should support fetus rights at conception.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think the addition clarifies that the party itself takes no stance.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Nice. Absolutely agree.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This verbiage is unneeded in my opinion. Would I still be welcome if I don't care one way or the other? To many statements starts to limit the scope of the concept.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Since my mother died as a result of my parasitism (in the womb) I firmly believe that abortion is a form of self defense, even though not all (obviously) pregnancies end in death. No we should not dilute the principles of our membership as a whole by admitting anti-choice (for anything, not just abortion) people. We have buttons that say "We're pro-choice on everything." Do you really want to change that to "We're pro-choice on everything except what that slogan is usually taken to mean."? Hard to fit on a button.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Excellent, reiterate!
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Do not like the wording to be added. Suggested wording: We welcome all members regardless of their personal beliefs.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The whole point of the pro-choice movement is to bring in government to prevent abortions because it means the taking of life. This proposal just skirts the issue.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	At some point along its development, a fetus must be recognized as a person.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The rights of individuals should be protected. Fetuses are human beings that have a right to life (they are human, I know this because both parents are human). They have a right not to be murdered just as you and I do. The libertarian position should be anti-abortion, that does not mean we would support any government involvement, however.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support this, but am somewhat concerned - the government has no business in what is clearly a family, religious and personal decision.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'd eliminate "both" from your sentence. That's seems like extra wording.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	As long as it is understood that the party does NOT support government intrusion into the matter either way.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is disgusting. A zygote is not a human being. It has no rights, natural or legal. There is no compromise on this issue; it is absolute. It is completely anti-libertarian (and downright un-American) to respect the legal interests of a fertilized egg over that of a living, breathing, thinking human being.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The issue of abortion is indeed sensitive, but it is wrong to pretend that there isn't a right and wrong to it. If libertarians have and support the right to life, that means even life in the womb -- the most helpless and voiceless and "involuntarily" dependent of all. It is an incontrovertible scientific fact that a separate, unique human life begins at the moment of conception. The joining of a human ovum and human sperm can produce nothing other than a human being, and that human being is alive and will fully develop one day if it is not murdered. If it is wrong for children outside the womb and adults to murder, it is wrong for children inside the womb to be murdered. The "sensitivity" to the contrary is nothing more than a utilitarian, Machiavellian, Orwellian discarding of the most basic, inborn, innate, inalienable human right: to life. A "libertarian" cannot accept anything less than a complete acceptance of the non-aggression principle. Anything less is not libertarian. It's time to end this charade for the sake of party membership numbers. There is no room in a
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Redundant.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	although i am in favor of both sides being welcome, i feel like the terms "pro-life" and "pro-choice" tend to imply anti the other position and working against it.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Roe v Wade was an overreach. If anything, the Constitution protects human life, even before birth. But the S.C. should never have accepted the case.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Preceding the new sentence, I would add "in light of their personal philosophical and religious beliefs." after "consideration." I believe we should also indicate that we are not hostile to religious beliefs on the matter.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think the words "pro life" and "pro choice" are powerful words that catch peoples' attention, but I hesitate to add it because I feel like it is such a mess already, and that while I support the current plank that the government should be kept out of the matter (aka PERSONAL FREEDOM), I feel like people would try to change that based upon their own beliefs. I feel like welcoming both sides openly like that would create a single issue battle ground.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think we should be against aborting any fetus that is sufficiently developed such that it can exist outside the womb unless the mother's life is at definite risk.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	No need to add the extra verbage.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	the added sentence sounds more like a sales pitch than a philosophy
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Keep it simple. That last sentence is a given. Fact is, we welcome pretty much anyone into the LP.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Pro-life and Pro-Choice are contentious political ideals and do not belong in our platform. However, the statement does. "We welcome those who oppose and those who support abortion equally"
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Realistically, the only Libertarian position is pro-choice because the pregnant WOMAN decides what to do about her fetus. The evasive "each person for their" should be replaced by "pregnant woman decides with her" conscientious consideration.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is the only thing about the LP that I do not like. We are all about everyone having the freedom to do everything -- except be born?? We should take a stand, and it should support the right to exist.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think it sends the wrong message, maybe "The Libertarian Party includes both pro-life and pro-choice members.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	AMEN!

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Competent adults have dominion over their own bodies. However, it is the government's role to protect human life. In cases where these principles conflict, health and viability must be considered first by concerned individuals, and subsequently by the government.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness. We must protect life, All Life.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Abortion should NOT inhibited nor supported by the Govt. It is a matter of PERSONAL belief. Morality CAN NOT be legislated.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Leave out the pro/con language, maybe... "The Libertarian Party welcomes all freedom loving people."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	excellent
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is an effective way to state inclusion without bias. Is it necessary to state that organizations (i.e. medical clinics and family planning groups) also bear the right to "conscientious consideration"?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I am both pro-life and pro-choice. I am against all abortions, but it is not my decision, therefore, I support the woman's right to choice. These terms are confusing, because both camps are anti-choice. The "pro-choice" camp does not believe that not having an abortion is a valid option. Look at their outrage of Tim Tebow's mom's choice to give birth. I would suggest the following: We welcome members who hold differing views into the Libertarian Party.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It is impossible to keep government out of the matter. Whether infanticide is legal or illegal, government is inextricable "in" the matter.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree with the proposed addition more than with the original sentence. I would much rather we take a stand on this, even at the cost of votes / members.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is an excellent addition

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I sadly have to disagree with this solely on the fact that we are dealing with the sanctity of life. As I understand the issue, the (federal) government has but one purpose, and that is to "wield the sword." Therefore, if we allow this issue unchecked, we will be allowing the needless "execution" of thousands, perhaps millions of innocent lives. Why should an unborn child need to suffer for the sins of the father. Adoption is always an option.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I disagree with this, it should be against the law to harm another life, this has been twisted to a point of no return. The baby has a right to live just like if someone took your life, they should be punished for murder.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Although I totally agree with this statement, I see that this will cause many people to say that this position is "on the fence". I know many ultra-conservatives will have a fit with the wording. As I've told them, it would be counter to the Libertarian ideal if we take a position for or against since it is the INDIVIDUAL WHO MUST DECIDE on this issue. Abortion is a wedge issue and this position makes us look like we are "sweeping it under the rug."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'm pro-life and believe life begins at conception. I believe life at conception should be protected and all rights and privileges should be conveyed to individuals in the womb.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"leaving the question to each person for their conscientious, religious, or moral, consideration."
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Abortion is killing a human life, therefore it is murder.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i think the science needs to be addressed as to when life begins. that does not necessarily mean the gov't.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The Declaration of Independence says we have the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. A woman does have the right to her body, and her morals in how she uses her body are her business. If she becomes pregnant though, now there is another body, and she does not have the right to use force against that body, other than cases of rape or health of the mother.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	addition: the rights of the individual and thier Doctor to make the decision as a medical one without interference from government.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	With prejudice, "we welcome both pro-life and pro-choice members into the Libertarian Party."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	To do otherwise would undermine the spirit of freedom and the philosophy of the party
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is saying the party is both for and against abortion. Abortion is a privacy issue.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Unnecessary. Seems like it is begging both sides to join.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Sounds like a complete cop-out on the issue. Badly worded.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The added sentence seems redundant to me. I would instead say that, while there are valid reasons for abortions, the Declaration of Independence, as the moral grounds for the existence of our country, declares a natural right to life that should not be denied or taken without just cause.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I oppose "pro life" and "pro choice" at face value - most "pro life" people are also "pro death penalty". How about "we welcome all people who oppose the use of force for personal, political and financial gain into the LP"?
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I hate the terms "pro-life" and "pro-choice". To me, I AM "PRO-LIFE" -- the WOMAN'S life. If you must add a statement at the end, perhaps something like "We welcome members of all viewpoints into the Libertarian Party."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'm kind of nuetral on this one, either way.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The "Pro-life" movement is about government restrictions to abortion access, Pro-life movement is not about individual freedoms and respecting people who are pro-choice. If the Libertarian Party was going to add this sentence, at a minimum why would they not list pro-choice members before pro-life members in the sentence structure?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Accepting pro-life individuals defeats the purpose of being pro-choice. Being pro-choice means supporting the right to choose either way. Pro-lifers don't believe in the choice so allowing them in is hypocritical.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Government should not interfere with personal health decisions.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i like the direction of the idea and concept - letting adults choose for themselves - but we could tighten the language a bit.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is an improvement. Abortion, national defense, and immigration are the 3 issues keeping many people from fully embracing the party.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Openly stating that pro-choice members are welcomed is likely to drive more pro-life members away rather than just stating that individuals have the right to make the decision.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	a FETUS is "literally" a PARASITE ... and MEN (and everyone else) needs yo get out of an individual WOMAN's choice as to whether to HOST or ABORT this said PARASITE from HER body (fer gawds sake)
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It might be worth mentioning the danger of having the government policing right to life. Future parents in their most distraught moment could be questioned by government agents as to what food they ate or their behavior to determine whether they should be charged with murder or manslaughter. Or perhaps we need a separate document that elaborates on the meaning of the platform.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This plank has kept me from committing to the party. This change would help many liberty minded evangelicals, like myself, feel more comfortable joining the party. There are many Christians fed up with the Republican party who agree with every plank of the Libertarian party save this one. I am in favor of getting rid of the plank entirely, but this is a step in the right direction.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Libertarians must be for rational policies. Libertarians must be for the constitution, and that includes "life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness"... life means that no one can be murdered by anyone at anytime. Life begins at the point of fertilization, destruction of that life is murder. Pro-life only.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	No. It was fine in the original. And, if we are going to make this change, don't use the loaded buzzterms "pro-life" and "pro-choice": they really only serve to set one camp against the other. Use "We welcome anyone to join the Libertarian Party, regardless of their personal beliefs about abortion."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I have an ambivalence about this issue, believing that each individual should choose. And at the same time believing that the government should protect human life, and criminalize the taking of a human life.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This plank is a cop-out. There is a Libertarian issue here: If the unborn is a person with human rights, then they cannot be killed without due process. If the unborn is not a person, then it is entirely a personal decision of the mother. The question of when a fertilized egg becomes a human being with civil rights determines where the line is drawn. The LP should take a stand on this underlying question. If we do not, then there is no principled rationale for any policy. I prefer the simplest approach. After long national debate, it was determined that a person may be considered "brain dead" in the absence of certain measurable activities in the brain. The Karen Ann Quinlan case led to this determination in the case of already-born persons. This standard should also be applied to determine whether an unborn entity is legally a human being with civil rights.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is the one area where the Libertarian party fails to recognize the value of life and goes against the principle of protection from harm.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	leave the recommended last sentence out of the proposal. Less is more.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The real problem is the first sentence. If abortion is a killing of a human being (which it is), then the government does have a responsibility to protect that life from destruction. Since this is a no-win position, I recommend dropping Item 1.4 altogether.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The desire for government intervention is inherent in the "Pro-Life" position. Word it like this instead. "We welcome as members any who hold with this ideal regardless of what their personally choice regarding an abortion would be."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	although at some point it really must be decided when life begins.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	In principle, this is reasonable, but I would contend that in our federal system of government, the federal government is properly excluded in that no power over the issue has been delegated thereto; however, the states themselves within our system do properly have constitutional control of the issue, whether or not they should or should not be excluded as governments from control by libertarian principle.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The problem is that the key goal of the "pro-life" agenda is government involvement and prohibition of abortion. Hard core pro-lifers do not want to allow the woman to be able to decide for herself.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	To say that government should be kept out of the matter of protecting human life from conception is to acknowledge the pro-abortion position. It is not truly neutral. A truly neutral position would state that some Libertarians believe that life begins at conception and should be protected by government and others do not. Ideally, when a sufficient number of Libertarians are educated to such an extent that it would not seriously damage the party to do so, we should adopt the principles which Doris Gordon has presented so brilliantly on the Libertarians For Life website, www.l4l.org
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The issue is already covered by 1.2, privacy and self-ownership.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Good balance! Of course this will be unacceptable to both rigid camps...which means we're probably on the right track.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would acknowledge that since protecting citizens from murder is generally recognized as a legitimate role for government, that Libertarians can be pro-life.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Drop the proposal. Abortion is too small of an issue to be specifically called out and draws attention to a personal choice supported in the first plank.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	...can hold good-faith views on both sides...to each person for his/her conscientious consideration.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	LOVE IT!
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Absolutely not. The thesis of the statement is that government belongs outside of this very personal decision. Adding this sentence afterwards takes away from our truly principled position & is indeed redundant, given the opening of this paragraph.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If you accept the premise that a fetus is a life, then government has the duty to protect that life.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	To the extent that "pro-life" includes the belief that the state should protect the lives of the unborn from the moment of conception, this appears to be inconsistent with (my understanding of) the Libertarian position on abortion.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It adds nothing, The Libertarian Party already accepts both so should not be spelled out.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Remember pro-life is anti-choice. This is not compatible with Libertarianism. Don't fall into the trap of trying to placate 2 groups with irreconcilable demands - it can't be done and will result in internal factionalism - just what we don't need.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The preamble of the Constitution states, "...secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity...", therefore the unborn (beginning at conception) should be protected as any other individual.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Good in theory, but I would be afraid of anti-choice people taking over the party for their own gain. Granted he's running as a republican, but just look at Ron Paul.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	OK, but not necessary. The platform is not an advertid=sing vehicle. It is a statement of principles. The origina text does that very well.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Would stipulate that this is a limitation of Federal power, and that Constitutionally, the power to enact a law regarding abortion rests in the individual states.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like it.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I am pro life. No scientist can state with definitive certainty that life does NOT begin at conception on the other hand, I am not a scientist full of certainty so, for that reason, I believe that government should stay out of the process of a woman making a decision whether to carry a baby or to abort. If she believes otherwise than I do then I do not have the right to stop her.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Not a plank modification but rather a talking point. Since the most common justification for limiting abortion is based in religion, let the churches influence their congregations, rather than forcing the government to be involved (separation of church and state concept.)
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This makes matters worse by stressing our confusion on the issue and effectively saying "we give up; we can't figure this out."
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I would recommend an introductory sentence that speaks about life and liberty. For example, "The Libertarian Party strongly believes in the right to life, however, reasonable people can disagree as to when life begins."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A sticky wicket to be sure, but if we are to be true to our core beliefs re:the individual freedom to make choices, then this is proper way to go.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If one leaves this decision to the individual and does not protect the lives of those too young to have left the womb, one must also leave the decision to kill a newborn, child, teen, or adult to the individual. This is a fundamental failure to protect an individual's right to life. There is not "more than one legitimate position as to when the right to life begins" in the context in which that phrase is typically meant. No scientific description of biological life would deny that a fetus of any term is a living being.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Perhaps something could be added around this point about social issues are not government issues.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If "pro-life" means those opposed to the legal availability of abortion, then I do not see how that position has a place in the Libertarian Party. Pro-life people are welcome in the party, but that particular position is not. If a pro-life plank was ever adopted in the party, it would no longer be the Libertarian Party, IMO.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Find a replacement for the phrase "good-faith" that doesn't include the word 'faith'.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Individuals rely on their families and close friends to help with life and death decisions. Libertarians are committed to increasing every family's freedom and resources to solve every day problems.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe that life began billions of years ago and that no one, mother, father or the state, has the right to take a life. Contraception is fine, but once the fetus is established, then you don't have a right to terminate that life.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If abortion is murder, as some believe, then it is the government's matter. We could say that libertarians have not come to agreement on the matter, but I don't think we can say that it is up to personal consideration.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A pro-choice position potentially violates the individual liberty of the unborn child.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You may want to put something in there about whether you are referring to the federal government or state government or both.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would like to see a stronger explanation of states' rights here. Any law regarding abortion should be made at a state level; a national law must be arrived at by amending the Constitution, not by the Supreme Court. The above statement sounds too much like a dodge.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I THINK YOU NEED TO TAKE A STAND, ADDING THE NEW SENTENCE SEEMS WISHY-WASHY. I THINK THE ORIGINAL SENTENCE STANDS ON ITS OWN.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, as you put forth in the previous items, CHOICE is the individual person's right!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Should remove this whole plank.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I personally oppose abortion and believe that the act of abortion is in violation and opposition to the Libertarian position that an individual is free to act in any manner they desire as long as they take responsibility for those actions. An individual is free to engage in whatever sexual activity they deem appropriate. If they wish to avoid pregnancy, the means to do so are readily available. Abortion requires that another human being pay the price for the irresponsible behaviour of another. If life, the most basic right we have, can be taken for the convenience of another, any right can be taken under any pretext.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Abortion is an issue of not just freedom, but life, as well. Abortion is such a hot button issue that I can understand why many do or do not want government say so on the matter. But, in my personal opinion, this is something the government should be involved in. My reasoning is because I feel abortion is the killing of an innocent being. Some can argue that it is just cells you are destroying and it hasn't had time to develop to a human being. But, I strongly disagree. In the Catholic faith, life starts at conception. And when you choose to disregard life, you choose to disregard LIBERTY for the child! They do not get to choose whether or not they would like to live. Regardless of the mother's mistakes or those of others that caused the pregnancy, by having an abortion you're taking away LIBERTY in itself!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	No opinion...I feel that this plank contradicts the individual rights plank as it ignores the right of the unborn. I only clicked oppose as the survey requires a choice.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The arguments for abortion are basically: It is murder, or it is not murder. Murder is a STATE crime, defined by a particular state. Each state has its own definitions to it. That is, one state may define a limitation on harm done that eventually causes death if it takes over a year for the person to die. etc. So...let states define murder as they please. You may have abortion states, and abortion free states. People can choose to live in either which they prefer.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What part of abortion is good faith?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Abortion is not the business of the federal government unless it is to guarantee availability.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support this but the statement is bogus anyway. By stating that "we believe that government should be kept out of the matter" of abortion is like saying the same thing about slavery, or murder, or child abuse. I'm sure we shouldn't exclude any opinions from the Libertarian party but why not just say: "Recognizing that abortion is a sensitive issue and that people can hold good-faith views on all sides, we welcome both pro-life and pro-choice members into the Libertarian Party."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While this makes a great deal of sense, and is the view I personally agree with, it seems to imply the following: "Alright, well, since both groups have good points we're going to concede with the Pro-Choice individuals and just welcome Pro-Life members."
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	There is no need for this in the Platform as we are already recognizing that there are multiple sides and Libertarians can come down on any of them. With that being true, the added sentence is repetitive.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Only because the term "pro-life" is frequently connected to those who believe abortion should be illegal or otherwise government regulated. We need to be more clear about what WE mean if we are going to use those terms. Members who are personally "pro-life" but accept that the government has NO appropriate role in regulating reproductive freedom are of course more than welcome.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This will inflame the wedge-issue anti-abortionist epsilon-minuses who are so common in conservative circles, and will whip their fundamentalist handlers into a rabid rage every Sunday.
Oppose Oppose	Unlikely Likely	No No	Non-Member Non-Member	free choice covers it There is no need to pander to either extreme on this topic. Nowhere does LP policy state anyone is unwelcome (provided they agree to the nonaggression pledge). We don't feel the need to say "We welcome both gun owners and non-gun owners members into the Libertarian Party" or "we welcome pornography customers and non-pornography customers into the Libertarian Party." IF "pro-life" people feel unwelcome, that's not the fault of the platform, which already makes clear that the LP supports their right to govern themselves in accordance with their beliefs. The plank is excellent as is. Do not change it.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While individuals should have the right to decide pro or con on this issue, there is no position stated here regarding government tax supported clinics. A tax supported abortion clinic is the same thing as coercion exercised upon one who opposes it. Statement 1.4 is not an issue position, its only a thin attempt to accrue members.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The above is clearly a "politically correct" statement so as not to upset pro-lifers. The LP needs to find a way to avoid such "platitudes" lest the platform be watered down.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Do you actually know of a pro-life person who wasn't more than willing to use the government to force their personal beliefs on women? I don't.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I understand the difficulty with this issue. I was once pro choice, but now lean to the pro life side. The laws are inconsistent. When a woman voluntarily kills her baby in utero, legal via medical procedure, when an in utero baby is killed by an act of negligence or intent by another, it's homicide. How can this be reconciled?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Recommend adding a distinction that the Constitution currently does not give the federal government jurisdiction over the matter, and the states, comprised of both pro-life and pro-choice individuals, should be encouraged to approach discussion about this sensitive issue in a way that respects the good-faith views of everyone.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Pro-choicers aren't forcing women to bear children, pro-lifers are. You should consider adding: "Recognizing that abortion is a private matter, we welcome both ..."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	it seems redundant
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Or should it be up to each state? Is it a state's rights issue? This is a tough one... not sure if I agree with the proposal.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I know what its meaning has become, but I object ti the term "pro-life," and would rather it not be propped up by this document.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	No need to add...it is redundant. ..."leaving the question to each person for their conscientious consideration" includes those whose conscientious consideration is pro-life, pro choice.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Abortion is genocide, period.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe there is always a victim in abortion, and thus meets the party's definition of legitimate crime.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	sounds to much like hawking. come one come all to the libertarian tent and see the amazing, . . . besides I don't really want to be reminded that the religious troglodites are even here under the same tent.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I feel as if this added line will turn prospective members away. The way it is currently written leaves it open, but adding the last sentence may hurt our chances with someone passionate on each side.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The recognition of a woman's right to choose what to do with her own body is basic to libertarianism and it is the woman's decision alone to make with, or without, consultation with her mate.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If we change what we say, in order to gain members, then we are doomed to face the same hypocrisy of the republicans and democrats. There is no need for this statement, and it does not improve upon the stated moral.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I feel abortion is murder and therefore should be abolished outright! There is no middle for me on this! We cannot break the laws of God!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Government has no business in the area of abortion.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It is already implied and does not need to be stated
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While it is true that abortion is an emotional and sensitive issue, the right to life is the first and most basic right and deserves to be secured. If a mother's action ends a child's life (which abortions do) it is a criminal act, and can rightly be prevented/punished. Just because we may not be absolutely sure of when life begins, that's no reason to infringe the right. Mothers & fathers have rights too, but you just stated a plank that says we have the responsibility to deal with the consequences of our actions. Having to raise or adopt out a child is merely one of those. No child should have to pay for the consequences, even misdeeds like rape, of another with his life. The thing we should say is that this kind of security should be handled at the state level (where they already punish theft or murder, etc.) and there need be no federal legislation about it at all.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Rewrite the whole issue ... make it more positive on the rights of individuals to decide so long as 'no one' is harmed. The real issue is that at the moment, we don't know who 'no one' really is.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	life is life. the unborn should have the same protections as everyone else. They being unable to defend themselves need defense no more so than some elderly, or infirm adult might.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Everyone is "pro-life". This is a biased term long used by those opposed to abortion and to avoid the issue of when a human being exists, not merely human life. One is either "pro-choice" or "anti-choice" on this issue.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe the rights of the unborn should be protected.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Declaration of Independence says you have the right to life. It is a natural right than only you or God has the right to decide. A mother killing her baby doesn't give that baby a choice. The mother already had one, don't have sex, you slut.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	God's law is the supreme law. He creates and determines life and death. Abortion is murder, my tax dollars used for it make me an accomplice.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It is not a mother's right to "choose" to destroy the life of and unborn child at any time. This is murder and infringes upon the rights of the unborn child. The mother's "choice" comes in the option to use contraception.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There needs to be some definition of what level of development defines the point where government needs to recognize personhood in the developing human being. Is this the time of natural birth or some time before? I think that currently-recognized standards (six months of gestation) are pretty good.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The proposed edit is redundant.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think your goal of open membership is clearly stated already.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If taking no position why include? There is no obligation to include this why not stick with what we Libertarians believe? Rather than what we are indifferent/undecided/ or split on?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	strongly so!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Don't fall into the label trap. Libertarians are pro-choice. That choice is for women to make with the advice of their doctors. Some women will choose to keep their babies, others will not. But, it's still not the government's decision in any way. A Platform is a document of how we would GOVERN, should we come into power. We also have to recognize that, at some point, the child has natural rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and therefore must be protected; even at the expense of the mother's right to privacy.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Being for both still means we are pro-choice. This issue will never be solved or get a solid majority behind it. I am pro-choice and always will be. I believe in certain restrictions on abortion (against partial birth, against any abortions after 1st trimester where woman is not at risk)
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I agree with the sentiment, but that doesn't sound like platform language to me.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Pro-lifers abrogate the rights of other individuals. They are incompatible with Libertarian principles of freedom of choice. While it would be good to swell the ranks of our members, do we want to do it with those who carry contrary values? The only way a pro-lifer could also be a Libertarian is to keep their belief entirely to themselves and not try to impose it on others.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Though I always support abortion when the health of the mother is at risk, I oppose late term abortion for reasons other than "health of the mother", therefore I think the government does have to draw the line somewhere and that would be it. I do agree with the addition of the last sentence however, its the "we believe the government should be kept out of the matter" part that I oppose.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	It is a mistake to fall into the trap of viewing the abortion issue as binary. The overwhelming majority of Americans have moderate views and find abhorrent both the extreme pro-life and pro-choice positions. We should re-adopt the 100 day language from our 1972 platform.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	yuk
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't believe that pro-life/pro-choice members would allow abortion to continue and would constantly and consistantly try to have laws passed to infringe on the rights and decisions of others.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support legal limits on abortion. Too many people use abortion as a form of birth control. I support contraception vs. abortion. I support abortions only in restricted cases
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I am really on the fence about this one. I think it adequate to state our position of leaving it up to the individual. However, proactively announcing our acceptance of anyone who believes either way might attract more members and/or supporters. It might be better if we could make it clear that we welcome both pro-life and pro-choice members as long as they accept that (1) the party itself will take no stand either way, and advocates that government do likewise; and (2) they are willing to accept that other party members may not share or agree with their position.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	The adition of the above wording is a good start, but it still leaves me wondering when the libertarian party will finally recognize the inherant personhood of the unborn and the natural rights that derrive from that personhood.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Strike 1.4 entirely.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Rephrase the sentence as follows: "We welcome all members into the Libertarian Party whatever their stance on abortion may be."

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	life began on earth 2-3 billion years ago. personhood starts developing at birth and is fully complete at age 35 when one can become President...not sure how to deal with it but it seems the two groups are not talking about the same thing and talk past each other. Wisdom probably says do not jump into the frying pan and to let time work it out.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The labels "pro-life" and "pro-choice" reinforce the false dichotomy promoted by the establishment.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Patronizing. Don't we welcome *anyone* into the Party?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It's sad to see libertarian feminism flushed down the drain...
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Support the wording but question the need for this in the platform.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Libertarians are always "pro-life", and cannot be any other. The question is, "when does life begin"?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Leave it alone. Libertarians can't win over single issue pro-lifers who support govt control over womens' right to choose.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	You might append to that sentence: "... if they share that belief". Because, at first reading, this seems to take no position, but considering how many progressives want government to fund abortions, and how many "conservatives" want to fund "abstinence teaching", etc, it really does.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Not true. If you can be charged with murder for killing a fetus in the womb, yet not charged with murder for performing an abortion then you have not answered 1.4 Abortion statement.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Add: providing that the pro-life side does not advocate legislation IMPOSING their views on EVERYONE. (Ron Paul has now lost my support.)(And I have personally counselled, successfully, against abortion in one case.)(The only time my advice was requested.)

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I personally believe we should be proactive and suggest new options (suggest, not impose) for women and if we correct the fundamental economic flaws in our systems then many new options will become available. Much to say on this approach.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The proposal seems redundant and pandering.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	NOOOOOO!!! Why would you use such misleading, trite, populist labels in the LP platform? Omit "their" and the entire last sentence -- adds nothing but polarization. Throughout, please recognize that "their" is a plural pronoun and individual is singular!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	No...if someone calls themselves "pro-life" or "pro-choice" they set out to define themselves as a "me-against-the-other-one" position. The idea is that your position doesn't matter because everyone is free to decide, and nobody is wrong. So they must leave their "labels" at the door if they want to be libertarian. Therefore we should welcome "ALL INDIVIDUALS", not pro-life and pro-choice.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The addition conflates the personal preference of each person with their wanting for government action. Pro-life has little meaning other than its reference to support for a government ban on abortion.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Self determination is a vital part of a free society.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This clarifies perfectly and I think it will definitely make it easier for the Ron Paul conservative libertarians to make the transition to the LP
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	When a person is being killed why should the government stay out of it? We need a measurable definition of when life begins. Beyond that is murder.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Just muddles up a very succinct document.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would like however, to see an additional sentence favoring the right of both men and women to have access to contraceptive devices of their choice as a way to minimize the need to consider abortion to prevent the birth of unwanted children.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Also a triplicate vote.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Leave it alone. It says exactly what we believe without the additional verbiage.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While it's nice to see an attempt at compromise, I don't think this genuinely addresses the real concerns at issue. I propose *deleting* this plank (from the national platform: states could have a plank in state platforms if they wanted to).
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Pro-choice is the only choice. You are just trying to appease fundamentalist christians.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Addition is obvious from the previous statement.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	No need to expand
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The terms are wrong. My understanding of "pro-life" means they oppose the letter and spirit of this plank. If someone supports my right to decide for myself, then they are "pro-choice". "Pro-choice" doesn't imply anything about whether a person would themselves choose an abortion or not. Consider adding "... as long as they recognize the individual right to choose".
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	PLEASE DON'T MESS WITH THIS PLANK. We spent a lot of time on this one in either 2006 or 2008, as I recall.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Saying that the government should stay out is pro-choice.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Well said

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Sorry, it just isn't that easy. Abortion is an issue that keenly cleaves us. Government is here to protect contracts and to prevent the use of force against individuals. When is the contract between mother and child forged? When is abortion the use of force? These are very difficult and painful decisions and we must decide. Can we say that we recognize how difficult this is and that we need to resolve it as a nation? We can't support a late third trimester abortion? Can we? That's surely a use of force against an individual. Likewise, we can't make the "morning after" pill illegal. We must have a formal debate and produce a compelling argument for when a protectable person is formed. Is it medically, spiritually, or diagnostically dictated? I don't know, but to shy away from this debate is cowardly. Individual rights are the essential backbone of our beliefs; thus we must determine when those rights begin. What a wonderful flag to plant. We should lead the way.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	but I think it is unneeded
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	In addition, I feel that the LP should recognize that Row v Wade was an unreasonable stretch of the Constitution and should be reversed allowing individual states the freedom to allow or prohibit abortions within their boundaries.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Weak support... The platform is a statement of political principles, and I don't think we state anywhere else anything about membership acceptability. In other words, this is a good statement, but I'm not sure the platform is the place for it.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I do believe we should welcome all, however, I think that abortion is anathema to freedom and liberty and cheapens the currency of the word Libertarian.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Abortion should never be a political issue. Strike the whole plank.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While it seems neutral at first, this statement adopts the pro-choice position. The offered welcome will not prevent the alienation of pro-life libertarians from the Party. We cannot afford this loss. A better position would be to let the States legislate abortion, just as they legislate murder - which they do not leave "to each person for their conscientious consideration", but punish to varying degrees and sometimes allow, depending on circumstances and moral philosophy. A strong constitutional argument can be made that the Federal government has no role to play in facilitating or preventing abortion, and that the definition and legislation of crimes (except for a few such as treason and piracy) are the domain of the States.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	freedom means from any gov interests in the bedroom-freedom is freedom!!!mgm
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Inclusiveness is key. We have bigger fish to fry than trying to get everyone to agree on pro-life vs pro-choice. That debate will continue long after we are dead and gone.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is already obvious from the first sentence. You could go either way with this one but to me it just seems redundant.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	YES!!!! You can be right on both sides here.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The addition of the second sentence is redundant, since it can be easily deduced from the first sentence. Repeating the idea may make it seem (to non-libertarians) that Libertarians are fishing for acceptance.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The LP should be absolutely pro-choice, as the existing plank suggests. This change should not be made.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	As a Gandian Libertarian, I think we should err on the side of life and non-violence toward the unborn. I propose that we abolish government above the village level, but I realize this will not happen any time soon.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You can't win by jumping into that political quagmire.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I feel that there is no need for this sentence.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think the best thing to do would be to recognize that each state has the right to make the decision regarding abortion. Some would legalize it, others would not. In either case, the issue should be decided by the proper amendent process to state constitutions. As long as we leave the plank the way it is, we will not obtain the critical mass we need of those who oppose abortion. Our position should be to let the people decide and be done with it. We have more important matters to attend to while the Republicans and Democrats alike use abortion as a wedge issue to keep themselves in power.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Sure. I believe that pro-"choice" is the only acceptable libertarian definition, but having this on the platform is likely better.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The "pro-life" stance is better termed anti-abortion. The proposed language violates a core libertarian principle. I am opposed to abortion, but I respect others enough to decide for themselves.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	excellent addition
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Since I first read this section from the prior year's platform I saw it as a cop out. If I recall the very next section discusses the requirement of the government to protect the RIGHT to LIFE, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. One of the very few true responsibilities of our government, and every individual in society, is to protect the life and liberty of those who can not protect themselves. I truly do not care if someone wishes to engage in behavior that I may disapprove of, but they should have to face the CONSEQUENCES OF THEIR ACTIONS. Didn't we just talk about actions and their consequences?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A woman's right to her own body trumps all other considerations.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Makes it VERY clear that both viewpoints are welcome; therefore makes the party more attractive to more potential members. the more the merrier as long as they are responsible, thinking adults! Speaking as a new member, once I found this general sentiment in the platform, I was all but hooked.....
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But would prefer not specifically using the "pro-life" and "pro-choice" labels, both of which are riddled with ambiguity. Keep open the viability of options which do not fall cleanly in either camp, such as Walter Blocks "expulsionary" ideas.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Possibly include "federal" in the phrase "we believe that the federal government". This language allows states or even local government the freedom to make illegal if they see fit, all the while keeping the federal gov' entirely out of the issue.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Individual rights and liberty do not include the right to take the life of another.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Here, here!
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Problem with many people who support abortion is that those people also support the death penalty - which gives government and judges unfettered discretion over personal liberty.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	we welcome all. to welcome "both" could be construed as a limiting term. whereas, I feel the point of this amendment is to be open.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Add that we welcome both pro-life and pro-choice members but do not believe this is a government decision.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This change has the additional benefit of being true.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	As there are valid reasons to view the unborn child as an individual (being entitled to the right to life), and the medical science is unsettled on the issue. I believe we must defer to protect the right to life over the right to privacy. I recognize I am in the minority of the party here, but that is my view.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Excellent! Common sense!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	(Change the word "their" to "his" or "his or her".) Let's keep it brief.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The Libertarian party needs to understand that if we don't protect the life of the unborn we are not acting on the best interest of Liberty.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe the added language is unnecessary but would not object to its inclusion.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	IMPORTANT RESTRICTION: Please note that under both traditional Jewish law (Halakha) and traditional Islamic law (Sharia), the fetus has NO RIGHTS WHATSOEVER until "quickening" (independent movement by the fetus), which usually occurs around day 40 of pregnancy. Since all anti-abortion legislation is based on the precept held by most (but not all) Christian denominations that personhood begins at conception, ANY EFFORT TO BAN ABORTION BEFORE QUICKENING is a violation of the Establishment Clause, since it accepts one theology over all others and is thus an establishment of religion. I am surprised no one has ever made this point publically, and I believe the LP should take a firm stand, based on the Constitution, that abortion may NOT be restricted in any way before quickening.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Thank you thank you.... I was abandoned by the Republican party when they became so radical on this.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If you want pro-lifers, it needs to say we believe that *the federal* government should be kept out of the matter As those who believe abortion is a violent crime will want state regulation.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It is difficult to not recognize the right of the unborn, but otherwise viable, fetus, who, if born or delivered, could survive outside of the womb to become a fully functioning adult with time. We have no right to kill a viable child. Then the discussion should be held about viability and the responsibility of all adults to ensure that viable children are protected from harm. Then, who will be the arbitrator of the time of viability.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	As long as the pro-life libertarians recognize it is the mother's right to have or not to have an abortion and do not interfere with that right except by non-violent persuasion.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The party should adopt protection of the weak and that would include protections of unborn. Regardless of the intent of defining life there is at some point life exists prior to birth. Government has the obligation to ensure the rights of all citizens and that includes the unborn. The party in trying to be inclusive is violating the rights of the unborn.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Good clarification
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Thank you! This is not a simple issue with a simple one-size-fits-all-situations solution. As a woman, I would prefer this to be between a woman and her doctor, individual to her situation, not legislated by bureaucrats.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Saying it is a sensitive issue skirts the problem. If you define self-ownership by the boundaries of a physical person, then you are saying the government cannot force a person to use her body in a certain way. It shouldn't be called abortion. It should be called something related to women's rights.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think this redundantly states the last clause of the prior sentence.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It makes the point while also reaching out to members of both sides. My only fear is that this would open the door to people who support pro-life legislation, which I am strictly against. I believe, just as the party does, that it is a complicated issue, and as such each individual should be given the right to choose their own morality on the issue, rather than making it a legal matter. I do, however, see this as an excellent way to potentially draw more support to the libertarian cause, which is clearly the main goal of proposed changes to the platform, therefore this one gains my support.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	How can government be kept out, given that abortion seems to fit the definition of murder?

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I'm a pro-choice libertarian. If the party says that abortion illegal, it makes the parties other stances on freedom of ones own body illegitimate. I see no reason why someone who is pro-life can't join the party. Now someone who votes on that issue alone will not join. But, the party needs all the new blood we can get.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It would probably be even better to drop the plank.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Abortion used to be a "States Rights" issue. The FEDERAL government should be kept out of the matter. All states prohibit murder. See my website: http://bosonline.com/ehrhart/libertarian/abortion.html
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would change the phrase to be simply: "We welcome both pro-life and pro-choice libertarians."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You have to be more specific like "I WILL GIVE TO EACH AMERICAN A \$75,000 LIVING CARD IF YOU ELECT ME FOR U.S. PRESIDENT"; "I WILL ISSUE \$50 TRILLION NEW FIAT MONEY ELIMINATING THE FEDERAL RESERVE"; "WE WILL MANUFACTURE ONE HUNDRED PERCENT IN AMERICA USING THE FEDERAL LANDS CREATING 100 JOBS". If you need help call me to 571-288-7383. My family could donate also \$100 million to your PAC. Thanks Alberto Lopez WWW.EBLM.US
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I dislike the terms "pro-life" and "pro-choice", but would be happy to see something added with the same meaning expressed in different words.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support this, but I think you could do a HELL of a better job on this. The abortion issue depends on what premises a person uses. You should mention that. Frankly, I think you should consider something more bold: that premises of when life begins certainly involve conscience, but, as we know, conscience often works as a precursor to tyranny, etc. Such a determination, at least by the state, should involve biologists and physicians, and not other, unqualified, individuals who often have a conscience that seems semantically equivalent to "feeling."
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Added sentence is unnecessary. The important point here is that it is personal choice, not government's role. The second sentence can be part of campaign materials, web page FAQs, etc. but not needed in the platform.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	it needs to be re-worded as pro-life and pro-choice implies that you can't be both. A more accurate wording is anti-abortion rights and pro-abortion rights. Or even better, We welcome all people seeking personal conscience as guide and rejecting government interference on this matter, regardless of how they would exercise their own personal rights. With this change, I would support this.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Emphatically support!
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	We should recognize the liberty of each individual from the moment of conception. We now have medical prove that life does begin at conception and this should be considered.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	At some point, abortion is infanticide. The party should allow for differences of opinion on where that line is. The party should oppose abortions that end the life of a potentially viable child.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the last sentence but I can't support the first sentence because I believe abortion is killing an innocent life for mostly purely selfish reasons.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I absolutely agree that government should be kept out of the matter - the injection of political debate has perennially added more heat than light to the subject.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Both 'pro-life' and 'pro-choice' have become statist buzz-terms with no relationship to individual decision making.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	While I agree in principle, I believe most pro-life individuals favor national laws banning most or all abortions. Adding the statement may emphasize that it is government intrusion, not the abortion debate itself, that this plank is about.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Suggest: "...leaving the question to each person for conscientious consideration."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Should we mention that people shouldn't be taxed/forced to pay for other people's abortions?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Abortion is a state or local problem and none of the feds business.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There should be language that specifically mentions that individuals are responsible for the children they bring forth into the world and that it is their responsibility alone to financially support that child.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Very good idea! This would help draw from the Tea Party Republicans by allowing pro-life as well.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	They way I read this is that government should be kept out of the abortion issue and that the decision should be left up to the individual. That's not a pro-life stance. I think it is pointless to add this.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"pro-life" and "pro-choice" are loaded terms. No need to include them here.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Cut the crap.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It seems contradictory to ask members to sign a pledge to oppose the use of force, and then say it's OK to accept members who condone the use of force on other human beings.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Already said "can hold good-faith views on all sides", leave it at that.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Why do we even have to acknowledge it. Its seems to be making an issue out of it either way. i don't see why we take this one issue and put it out there by itself. I do not like putting this on its own "plank."

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It would seem that a fertilized egg contains all the necessary components for life. Libertarians suggests the individual has a right to their own body, in this case the body concerned starts as a single cell but is indeed fully alive and should be protected.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Unnecessary. I also oppose this because it promotes the silly and misleading term "pro-life". Life IS choice! To be anti-choice is to be anti life. this has nothing whatever to do with abortion, which may or may not be the taking of a "life". Libertarians can be said to be "pro-choice" on everything -- provided that does not initiate force against another person. However, the definition of personhood is something about which individual libertarians disagree. Leave the plank as it was! No need to pander to this silly terminology.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If you believe, as I do, that life begins at conception, then leaving the issue to each person for their conscientious consideration is identical to allowing murder. Even we Libertarians support laws that prevent others from infringing on our rights. We support laws against murder. If you believe that life begins at conception, then life in the womb has the right to be protected. Just as we accept laws against murder, many believe that laws against abortion are just as valid. I vote that the LP take NO POSITION AT ALL on this issue. The plank as currently stated is a pro-choice plank and prevents many members from joining us. An acceptable compromise would be to state that it is not a FEDERAL government issue. (Thus allowing that it IS a valid STATES issue.) Ron Paul's position is the correct one.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Although different viewpoints are best for a democractic society, perhaps it should be made clear that arguments should apply to all people and should not be based on personal conviction.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	This is waffling. It would be better to be silent.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We should only say something to the effect that we don't believe the government should fund abortions or contraceptive use. As to the legality of abortion itself as a procedure and practice, we have no position as a party.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This seems like a cop out to play to both sides of a sensitive issue. In espousing personal liberty AND responsibility for ones actions, I think we should be trying to discourage abortion and encourage alternatives such as adoption.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Unborn capable of survival outside the womb should be protected by government and deemed to be individuals.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Ignorant. Keeping the government out means it is allowed. Keeping the Federal government out and leaving it to the states seems more neutral.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I would add to the above, "and strongly urge each to refrain from seeking to use the power of government to implement their beliefs."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Government protects life, however when life begins needs to be defined. Is it at conception, a heartbeat, viability, or birth? Not taking a scientific position on this issue is an insult to those on both sides. As a Libertarian, I'm disgusted the national platform refuses to defend life. I define life at heartbeat. If you do not define life, and when you need to protect it, it's akin to saying "I don't support illegal Mexican immigrants." The Libertarian Party MUST define life.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	First, society in general needs to decide when life begins. We should not let government do this. After society settles this issue, then we can rationally talk about abortion. In the meantime, it should be avoided.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The libertarian party professes to be against the initiation of Violence against individuals, but thes says abortion is ok?? WTF how bout sticking up for the unborn who can not defend themselves. There has to be a line drawn somewhere of we end up with anarchy leaving us with no real freedom at all.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support this conditionally. There should be room for opposing viewpoints within the larger definition of Libertarianism, but pro-life usually mean pro-fetus/anti-woman
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Der
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It is the individuals right to free choice. (adult)
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think the first sentence says exactly that and the second sentence is not necessary
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Pro-life by definition means they want to impose their view on others. "pro-choice" means each situation should make their own choice. If they are "personally" pro-life...and are ok with others making their own choice....they they are really "pro-choice". I think it would be better leaving this as is with "government should be kept out of the matter".
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	too specific as to viewpoints
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	BUT!!!! For the last sentence I would add something like "While we welcome both pro-life and pro-choice members into the Libertarian Party, we as a party wil support an adults civil liberties first and foremost."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	good.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Necessary to have people working together!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe that states do hold the legal authority to decide this issue and this modification sounds like stratling the fence.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	How can you choose when it is illegal?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	As long as it does not effect my wallet...
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't have a position either way, but have to answer to continue. I am not sure how this issue should be handled, but I am sure there are many too many abortions today.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This comes under personal liberty. It is your body you can do what you want, but you accept the consequences. Neither church or goverment has a say.

5.0 - Abortion - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
Commenters	39.6%	60.4%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I am on the fence. We libertarians want people to take responsibility for their actions. I am not entirely sure that abortion in the third trimester is an option for conscientious consideration. A fetus that is viable without the mother should not be allowed to be aborted.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Pro-choice is no choice. As a libertarian who supports the rights and freedoms of all, until they infringe upon the rights of others, I believe that the killing of another individual is the ultimate infringement. Libertarian should mean pro-life.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Those terms are come wife baggage, few people understand the Libertarian versions of Life or choice.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do not welcome pro-life individuals anywhere within my sight.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Pro-life individuals can not accept the concept of pro-choice.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Kinda windy
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Too wishy-washy
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Either is fine. I oppose the FORCED CHOICE of this questionnaire. What happened to Swiss neutrality and NOTA??
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We are not supposed to do harm to other individuals, when does a concieved zygote, embryo, etc, become an individual? I do not want to discourage pro-choice members, I just don't know if I am comfortable with this statement.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	the libertarian party is not pro life or pro choice

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	See also my comments on the previous proposal.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If government is helping anyone pay for health care, abortions should be available as well. Voluntary abortions can reduce reliance on other existing government programs.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	If government is kept out of the matter in the first sentence, then mentioning taxpayer funds in a second sentence is redundant.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	No LP comment on Abortion
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You miss the whole point. Like conception, O'Bama will just mandate that Insurance Cos' pay for them... Again, why convoult a strong one-sentance belief statement.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	In the case of rape or where the mothers life is in danger, the government should help support those women who are unable to afford the procedure on their own. Abortion used as a form of birth control should not be covered.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Are we going to list all of the medical procedures that taxpayers should not be funding, or just those that pander to/ solicit memberships from the right? Unneccessary.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support only the last sentence: "Taxpayer funds should not be used to pay for abortions." The first sentence should be adjusted as described in my previous answer.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Those taxes come from everyone in this nation and should not be used to fund abortions, or contraceptives.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would still prefer the clarification of Federal and State level but I could support this.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Agree with amendment but preceding language should indicate "keep the Federal gov't out, allow States to decide."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Six of one, half dozen of another. Honestly, taxpayer funds going for abortions should be among the least of our concerns, when it comes to where our taxes go.

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Why single out abortion? Too sensitive. If the plank were to say "taxpayer funds should not be used for contraception, abortions, discretionary procedures, lifestyle drugs, etc." then maybe I could consider it.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	prior amendment, was more than enough to satisfy the question.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think this makes good sense. It's also a good point of compromise. It removes this highly personal act out of the area of 'we the people' as it should be.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, it is pandering. . .as a party we are against government intervention which would include paying for such services (or any other services that are a result of personal choice).
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like this addition but as an (a) or (b) under the main pple.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Correct.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Its a personal choice, so why on earth should others have to pay for someone else's actions?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Taxpayer funds are NOT used to pay for abortions already.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I only conditionally agree with abortion as forementioned; but in EITHER case, taxpayer funds should NOT be used to pay for abortions. A personal choice with personal consequences requires personal payment.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If the fate of a human fetus is merely a property issue, I think Libertarians should just bloody well say so and accept the bloody consequences of that choice. You bunch of blood-thirsty chickenshits.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Ideally the government should be kept out of healthcare matters including abortions or paying for medical care of pregnant mothers and children which do not pose third party externalities. In the present state where medicaid will cover maternity costs it should cover equally other treatment options including abortion
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It is a step in the right direction.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would rather say "Government funds should not be used to pay for abortions"

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Nor should they be used to prop up failed businesses, pay for pharmaceutical drug addiction, support failed education programs, build more jails, fund undeclared wars.....never mind.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	This is a more sensible amendment. If you want to keep the government out of it, keep the government all the way out of it and don't force people to support something they find morally reprehensible.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	There are some instances where abortion may be needed with really indigent members of our society. In that case I would rather the government pay for an abortion than pay for years with other financial aid.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Groups that advocate for abortions should bear the financial burden of Abortions rather than advocating for the Government footing the bill.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We do not need to rehash our financial position in each and every issue brought up in the platform. Repeating a position does not make it more valid and with each repetition the platform becomes less readable, and thus less likely to be consumed by the uninitiated. keep financial matters to those planks which directly address proper government financing and funding for programs.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'm not pro choice i'm really pro abortion, but tax payers should not pay for them
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This encroaches on states rights.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Fairness reigns.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While I agree with the sentiment I think it draws needless attention to government-funded health care. Yes, libertarians don't want taxpayer funds to pay for abortion, but we also don't want taxpayer funds paying for any other medical procedure either (at least most libertarians don't).
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	see previous comments

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Individuals must be responsible for thier own health and choices. the only exception I could support to taxpayer funded abortions would be in cases of forcible rape, where victims are reimbursed from funds gathered as fines to perpetrators of crimes, used as compensation to victims.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I thought we added this provision years ago. Maybe the Platform Committee was a bit too quick with the scissors?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Double Right On!!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	during political speeches supporting statements such as "just as they should not be used to pay for other elective surgeries" or something akin to it should be used. This is one huge sticking point for the left.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What does "good-faith view" mean? Taxpayer funds should not be used for most of what the government is doing, so why single out abortion, which is currently constitutional?
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I do no like the fact the statement is negatively worded. It should be positively worded. Such as Individuals should bear all financial costs themselves.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	This is probably better than the prior version since there is a range of opinion on the life/choice spectrum.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	...to pay for abortions that were the result of free choice. (don't we need to protect in the case of a crime resulting in an abortion?)
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It does not fit into this section. This could be added in elsewhere, if it isn't already covered.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Support!!!!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Strongly
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It's not fair to separate out this issue when there are so many other things (most/all of them?) that Libertarians don't want taxpayer funds used for.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Added sentence should read: "As a personal choice, no such decision, pro or con, can be financed with taxpayer funds."

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	In concert with the change recommended in the previous question "have no voice in the matter", add to the proposed sentence, "As such, taxpayer funds should not be user to pay for or subsidize abortions."
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	While I'd rather see us preferably be no compramise pro life, or forget this plank altogether, this is certainly better than what we have and I think all libertarians can agree its true.
Support Oppose	Unlikely Likely	No No	Non-Member Non-Member	note previous argument What about women in prison, or in the military? Don't they even get exceptions if raped by guards or fellow soldiers? -- If you pay for people's healthcare, you have to pay for whatever they want.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Abortion is violence against a person. One of the few legitimate functions of government is to protect your "right to life".
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	This is better than most. However, I believe the party should adopt a stance of rejecting abortion across the board. From conception forward the fetus has no viability to become anything other than a human being. To allow the destruction of any potential human being is an act of vilence and should be spurned by the party.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, this is a morality issue and taxpayers should not have to support the issue.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	With respect to women in life or death situations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	In keeping with previous planks, when you make a choice the responsibility is yours and not the government's. I would consider cases or rape differently, however, the perpetrator should be the one footing the bill if at all possible in that case.
Support Oppose	Unlikely Unlikely	No No	Non-Member Non-Member	Good luck with this one. This immediately puts us in the position where only those who can afford an abortion are then allowed to have one.

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This issue is the main reason I refuse to vote for Democrats and will stop what limited support I have given this party if this type of statement is left in.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Abortion is a sensitive AND PRIVATE issue. Government is anything but private.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	no government should fund or inhibit abortion. You need it you fund it. I will not financially support the unwanted child. If the child doesn't eat the parent doesn't eat! There is nothing worse than to be unwanted!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support this, but it needs to stress the reasoning why taxpayers shouldn't pay for abortions so it better flows with the first sentence to the degree explaining why it is a sensitive issue.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Same reasons as previous question.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree. No one should be forced to fund something that is not spelled out or at least alluded to in the Constitution. This theory simply supports smaller government.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe that taxpayer funds should not be used to pay for many things, but I would not limit my opinion to abortions.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Seems redundant with "government should be kept out." Keep it simple and clear.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Redundant, "gov should be kept out of the matter"
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, while I agree with position.. I think the statement is inflammatory.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While I support this, I am of conflicted mind in the case of medically necessary abortion for a pregnancy that arose as the result of rape. Pregnancy that results from freely engaged in sex (participants chose to have sex) do not qualify.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What other "medical procedures" should taxpayer funds not be used for? ...all of them! If individuals have privacy rights to their health, then they are also responsible for paying for their own care. This proposal seems to open the door for government to pay for everything BUT abortions.

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	it's redundant, since it says that government should be kept out of the matter
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I oppose this addition for the same reason that I oppose the government providing a tax break for religious organizations (churches, church schools, etc.)
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But what about birth control, RU-486, etc.? Seems like you are headed down a slippery slope. Cover the issue of taxation and paying for morally objectionable government activities elsewhere.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Tax funds should provide coverage for health issue abortions (where the mother cannot survive a full term pregnancy, etc) and temporary coverage for pregnancies resulting from criminal impregnation like rape and pædophilia (and recovered from the rapist's estate when he's caught and convicted). 'Birth control abortions' beyond use of 'Plan B' or RU486 should be on a patient-paid or supplementary paid insurance basis.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There are a lot of things taxpayer funds shouldn't be used for -- don't see why this should be singled out here.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There may be legitimate health reasons for paying for an abortion for someone who can't pay themselves. It's rare, but could happen. One thing I don't want to see happen is libertarians turn into a pro-life party, and get hijacked by the kooky fundamentalists that have made the Republicans more unbearable than normal. I'm personally against abortion, but think it needs to be legal, and I am sick of it being a huge election issue.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think that if we separate this piece of monetary funding and being to restrict it, it will cause more problems in the end with the requirements of overseeing that funding is not misappropriated and used toward abortions. It would cause a legal point which could result in devastating funding cuts to many low income family medical treatment facilities.

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe again that this is not needed. Government should be kept out of the matter is very clear. That automatically includes taxes.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Taxpayer funds should not be used for a lot of things and you don't list them
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There are many things I'd not wish my tax dollars to be used for. In each such case my goal should be keeping the government from doing it at all, not merely using another's money.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Please remove the plank entirely - the party does not need to address abortion. It is counter productive to respond to hot button issues. By definition, a large portion of your audience automatically disapproves of your decision, regardless of what that decision is. Presumably this is a platform, and should not address details.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I support the additional language about "taxpayer funds", but still find the second part of the first sentence to be dismissive of the beliefs of pro-life libertarians. This is one platform plank that should be kept vague and not go too far in defining the party's position, as the party is so divided on this point.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Clearly, tax payer should not be used for abortions or any other medical procedure.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Great, maybe even speak about why we oppose this on philosophical grounds in the future.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree with this stance on the issue, but I am not sure if adding this specific language would help garner more support for the party.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Though I agree with the direction of the amendment, it is stated way too simply and leaves way to much to interpretation, debate, conflict, and misunderstanding.

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Whether this means direct or indirect financing is unclear to me. For example planned parenthood which provides many health programs for a diverse group of females receives government subsidies which are only used in direct support of programs other than abortion yet this could still be viewed as funds used indirectly.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Oppose. Theft is never acceptable. And pointing out that the use of taxpayer funds for abortion are antithetical to libertarian principles in pandering to the religious right. I am opposed to tonsilectomies be funded by taxpayer funds. But if I were in charge of a private charity; I would not preclude the use of funds for either.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Tax payer funds should not be used for any medical purposes.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We as a party should only refer to functions that taxes SHOULD be used for (if, indeed, we advocate taxes at all).
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It always annoys me when people assume that if taxes can't pay for something it cant be done--such as stem cell research, etc.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would reword it to not show a side. Such as "gov't should not intervene in such issues with taxpayer funds."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Need to draw a line, but not exactly where these words point.

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This takes away the option of abortion for low-income families. This policy would do more harm than good in the long-run. By outlawing this, low-income households would not be able to afford abortions, thus giving birth to an additional child. This means the family would need more support from the government to feed, clothe, and educate the child. The cost of this would far exceed that of the abortion. So by adding this, we continue the vicious circle of poverty. Furthermore, we should not promote the idea that because we disapprove of something, we should not pay for it. For instance, I dislike the American education system and think there should be massive reforms. Does this mean I do not have to pay for it since I disagree with its foundation? No, that would be absurd. Likewise, refusing to pay taxes because they support something you disagree with is ludicrous.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A true libertarian would not want to use taxpayer funds to pay for abortions or for breast cancer surgery or for PTSD counselling for returning veterans. But as long as we use taxpayer funds for any health-related reasons we must allow their use for abortions.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is a difficult position to take as you can argue that the use of taxpayer funds now, to terminate a pregnancy, will result in a taxpayer savings in the long run because of the socioeconomic consequences so often associated with unwanted pregnancies. I think making this statement is too narrow in a platform.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There are many things taxpayer funds should not be used for. I do not think this particular specific should be in the platform.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This implies that "taxpayer funds" can properly continue to exist. The can NOT. However, I'd approve a modified version, such as "While taxation survives, its funds should not...."
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	combine this with the previous addition

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	"Regardless of an individual's position on abortion, we agree that the government should not use taxpayer funds to pay for (or subsidize) abortions."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	too binding. local organizations should have this discretion. the blanket statement also precludes situations where tax-funded procedures are optimal
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the concept but would rephrase: Since this is a personal decision, the cost should be born by those making the decision or family, friends or groups supportive of that decision.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Would support if this were added: "...nor should they be used to prohibit abortions."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	see previous comment.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	...Unless such funds are used to pay for really-late term abortions of those presently serving in Congress and the White House.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Should say federal taxes, I am not bothered if states allow for this with there funds
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	That should generate some consensus.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Definitely, taxpayer funds should not be used in any way to support abortion or groups such as Planned Parenthood. Governments, i.e. State governments may have a role in the issue, e.g. the 10th Amendment. The issue should definitely be taken from the hands of the Feds and Roe v. Wade should be overturned as illegal intrusion upon State's venue and people's rights. To say that States have no interest in protecting life is a far step though. There will be a natural process where the people in some states determine the mother's choice exceeds the rights to life and self-determination, whereas, the states that determine that the right to life and self-determination should not be thrown out of the platform.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree with the addition, but it is sort of just slapped on at the end and does not flow well.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Grants to private non-profits for services should not be interfered with.

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This should say "and" and include the previous revision.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	to avoid to much wordiness perhaps "funds" should be followed by "generally"
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do not think taxpayers should be liable financially for something they believe is morally wrong.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Also the government must not coerce individuals or religious institutions to support actions that violate their consciences through insurance mandates or other requirements over private funds.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There are many things tax funds should not be used for. If you want to list them do it somewhere else.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would support prohibiting taxpayer funds to be used in abortions, however I would still prefer the overall abortion issue to be a states right area.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This additional comment can, and probably will for pro-choice supporters, be viewed as anti-abortion language. The statement that government should be kept out of the matter is sufficient to avoid delving to deep into the issue while still clearly stating the Libertarian viewpoint.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The only way I would consider supporting this is if no taxpayer funds were to be used for any medical procedure for any person male or female.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't like either of these proposals. I would prefer something along the lines of protection of an unborn child that has reached the stage of viability outside of the mother. Prior to that it is clearly a parasite but after it is clearly a person with its own rights.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	why schould taxpayer mony be used for this?????
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Taxpayer funds should be the last option for abortion as with other types of medical care.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Couldn't have said it better myself.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	'Taxpayer funds' are used in many places today (foster care, military/govt worker insurance etc) I believe this is a troublesome, but certainly fixable addition

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree with this proposal, but believe that abortions that are a medical necessity should be treated as any other necessary emergency treatment and not denied due to lack of ability to pay
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Great change.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	better, but should go further
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think this is a good addition - I think you could combine this and the previous additon so that the platform would state that we are open to either side but not the funding from the taxpayer.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This implies government could pay for other things, such as medical related things. This should be covered in a more general proposal covering everything that the government should or should not cover;
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	only the last outlined section
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Why say this specifically about abortions? There are a great many things for which that taxpayer funds should not be spent, but mentioning abortions explicitly panders to a certain crowd instead of stating principles broadly. Instead of modifying this plank, it would be better to have a broad statement about what tax revenue is for, and what it is not.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Generally in agreement. It is a doctor-patient issue. My only hang-up is in the case of sexual assault. Perhaps there is some legal precedent for assisting a victim who wishes to have the procedure done. Tough to say. Generally, I guess the plank makes sense. We don't specifically support or oppose the operation, but we do not see it as a function of government to cover the cost.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'm on the fence about this one. Although I am pro-choice, and less government, how would not supporting those who don't want a child, who are living on the government already help the country? I'd rather see gov't support on birth control and assistance for the needy rather than more unwanted children being born.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The first sentence already covers this point. "we believe that government should be kept out of the matter"

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Unnecessary. This is implied by "government should be kept out of the matter."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This still allows parents to kill their children, which is not a right. Government is supposed to protect everyone's right to life. Until the LP supports this, I won't donate to the LP.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	If we have any form of taxpayer funded medical system, then some abortions (like for the life of the woman) have to be covered.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the idea, but I don't want someone to misinterpret it as a single exclusion such that they would believe Taxpayer funds should be used for other things as long as they are not abortions.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would add that taxpayer funds shouldn't be going to a lot more medical issues than just abortion. Perhaps that is deserving of its own section, however.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think this alienates too many of our possible members. I would prefer "The only taxpayer funds that may be used for abortions are those voluntarily contributed via a line item on a tax return" (such as money for state parks, election spending, etc.)
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	except for rape and incest.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Combine the two options to: Recognizing that abortion is a sensitive issue and that people can hold good-faith views on all sides, we believe that government should be kept out of the matter. We welcome both pro-life and pro-choice members into the Libertarian Party. Taxpayer funds should not be used to pay for abortions.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If we, as Libertarians, believe that each person is responsible for their decisions, they need to also accept their own consequences.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	no money towards abortion, but the right to life should be protected.

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Definately support, but in additional to my last comment, the plank should DELETE "we believe that government should be kept out of the matter, leaving the question to each person for their conscientious consideration." The party plank ostensibly states all sides are welcome, but then maintains a pro-choice view. If the party truly welcomes all sides it should have a plank stating: 1) reasonable views are on both sides, 2) all sides are welcome to the party, and 3) taxpayer funds should not be used. Then let individual libertarians decide how much government intervention is warranted in line with their own views on abortion and vote accordingly.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Perhaps this should be extended to indicate we feel the same way about all medicines and medical treatments, not just abortion. I.E. Like any medical service, taxpayer funds should not to pay for abortions.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like this modification much more than the previous one. I might add "nor should government mandate that insurance companies include abortion-as-birth-control as a covered procedure, or that any health care provider be compelled by law to provide services that violate their conscience."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Taxpayer funds should not be used to pay for medial anything anyway...
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Redundant if government is out of the matter
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is redundant with the fact that government should have no say in abortion. Adding this supports one group over another and will only cause polarization.

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Taxpayer funds should, I suppose, not be used to pay for anything. I think this does not address questions arising in cases where the mother's life is in danger, and where poor women, who have already had money taken by the tax collector are left defenseless. Like issues raised by the prospect of taking presidential campaign funds, I think it best to just leave the sentence off. It adds little to the debate.
Oppose Support	Unlikely Unlikely	No No	Non-Member Non-Member	taxpayer funds are not currently used A no-brainer! Perhaps emphasize this point of agreement within the Libertarian Party about one aspect of a matter that is otherwise so highly contentious: "Regardless of their views on the morality of abortion itself, Libertarians agree that taxpayer ..."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would agree with that IF government were not paying for ever other thing at this point, since they are, then government should also pay for womens health care which does include birth control and abortion. The statement should include something like that if it is going to be made. Much better to just leave off the blue part!
Support Support	Unlikely Likely	No No	Non-Member Non-Member	Simple and logical. again, remove the "sensitive issue language"
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	government has no place in this, as stated.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Keep goverment and Taxpayers money ou tof it.
Oppose Support	Unlikely Unlikely	No No	Non-Member Non-Member	Redundant. Governments duties do not include paying for abortions.

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is insufficient. It still doesn't protect the woman from aggression by abortionists and boyfriends, parents, etc. But this wording definitely should be in there in addition to a recognition of a woman's right to be protected from harm, and to have a cause of action if she is defrauded (not giving her informed consent) or harmed beyond what she has been led to expect. It is important to note that with most other procedures, there is a medical condition that can be weighed against the proposed action to determine which is more detrimental. In the case of abortion, there is no counterbalancing harm in the vast majority of cases. Abortions are almost always done on healthy women with healthy pregnancies. Abortion is NOT a medical procedure. Informed consent means that the woman is entitled to FULL DISCLOSURE of ALL the potential risks, which is not being given because the vast majority of women would never choose abortion if they were told, and the result would be that the abortionist would go out of business. His right to make money is elevated above the woman's right to bodily int
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	See previous comment
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	This goes without saying, and makes us sound like Republicans
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	As long as government continues to pay for people through the welfare system, abortions should be MANDATORY. Ok, I'm kidding. Half kidding. But I'd rather pay for an abortion than raise another welfare baby, and her welfare babies, etc.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Libertarians don't think taxpayer funds should be used to pay for much of anything, so this seems a bit redundant. Perhaps it would help to explain why this case is of particular importance.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I wholeheartedly agree.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Sentence disconnected. this plank needs major overhaul.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	suggest a slight revision: Taxpayer funds should never be used to pay for abortions.

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Taxpayer funds should be used for damned little. But in today's society, I support taxpayer funded abortion over years of taxpayer support of welfare brood mares' baseborn bastard babies.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Unnecessary. Taxpayer funds should not be used to pay for any healthcare, according to Libertarians.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I oppose nearly every single action the US government takes when using my tax dollars. Taxpayer funds should not be used to pay for wars either, but I get no say so on that matter. Why should the religious zealots in the pro-life movement get special treatment under the law? Their superstition organizations already don't have to pay taxes. Do we really need to give the religious more special treatment. This is absurd. If this enters the platform, I will resign the party and cease contributions.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Taxpayer funds should not be used for any medical procedure; no need to reference abortion.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i would counter with language: Government is left to the implementation and enforcement ONLY of laws the greater majority can agree to.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Memberfunds SHALL not be used.....
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think it is pretty evident that our platform is strongly against for using taxpayer funds for abortion to anyone, who bothers to read it. This language is more likely to alienate than to attract.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If you add, "except in life or death situations", then I would support it because I believe there are rare occasions where it would be warranted to pay for the abortion with taxpayer dollars.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The additional language is unnecessary. Saying that government should be kept out of the matter already illustrates the logical conclusion that taxpayer funds should not be used for abortion services.

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Better, but it still doesn't address the matter of law. Even with this statement you'll still have the Medicaid crowd saying you discriminate against poor women who can't get abortions any other way. Just extend your right of self-ownership to the moment of conception and be done with it. It'll do wonders to improve your image among those who think Libertarians are all about live and let die.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is worded badly and will make the party look Anti-abortion instead of neutral. If it were rephrased then it will be more palatable.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Taxpayer funds should not be used to pay for HEALTH CARE generally. Abortion is a sideshow if we actually stick to our principles in this matter.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Although I think the whole plank should be removed, I would support a statement saying tax funds should not be used to pay for abortions.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Taxpayer funds should not be used to deny any right of any individual without due process.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What about taxes at the state level? If one state wishes to outlaw or limit abortion, as before Roe v. Wade. 50 states, 50 testing grounds of democracy. Vote with your feet, etc..

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is a clear concession to the anti-choice right. Like it or not, we have a system currently in which the government pays for some people's medical procedures. If I were a Christian Scientist, in which case I would believe that healing is God's prerogative and should not be undertaken by humans, would I have the right to a deduction in my taxes for the percentage that would be spent on Medicare and Medicaid? Of course not. If I have no children or my children are home-schooled, does that give me the right to say that none of my taxes should ever be spent on education? Again, no. If I am nonviolent and disagree with war under any circumstances, can I veto expenditures for national defense? Preposterous. So why is abortion different? It's not. If we have a pure Libertarian system in which government is in no way involved in health care, then great. Otherwise, it's not logical or appropriate to pick and choose which specific medical procedures we should apply libertarian principles to, and which we leave alone.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Congress declares war. Female soldier is captured and raped. Military doctor does abortion payed for by taxpayers.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	It's redundant - this is already covered by the "government should be kept out" clause.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	confusing. I'm a taxpayer; therefore dollars in my pocket are "taxpayer funds". Some are collected by government, at which time they become "public funds" i.e. cannot be called taxpayER funds any more. Keep it short & sweet.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Needs more information. There could be times when funds should be available.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Too specific. Then what about after morning pills, contraception, or other medical procedures? Don't like this at all
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Taxpayer funds should not be used for many, many things. I do not believe this is the one to single out.

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	In the context that government should not be in the medical profession yes. To specifically exclude one element seems odd.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	This needs to be balanced by language stating that taxpayer funds should not be used to subsidize organizations that discourage sex or counsel people not to have abortions. As the proposal includes no such balancing language, it constitutes yet *another* attempt to further conservatize our platform and our party.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If taxpayer funds are used for common medical procedures then abortion should be covered. While opposing government healthcare if it is to exist it should pay for common medical procedures without religion based bias. Most opposition to abortion is religion based.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This concept should be expanded to; The federal government should have no authority in this matter, and extended to; the federal governments authority should be restricted to protection of our freedoms, and all other powers be reserved for the states!!!!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	... pay for abortions, excepting medical necessity [save mother's life]
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	That is a tough one.. what if we have a rape? Someone on government healthcare, we can provide birth control but not comen sence.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	insurance companies/employers should be free to decide weather it is covered
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think this addition expresses libertarian principles regardless of your position on "beginning of humanness" questions, and it's good to include it.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Too specific. Tax payer funds shouldn't be used for a lot of things. It should be implied elsewhere in the platform but placing it here may draw unnecessary negativity.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	When taxes are no longer used to kill people in foreign lands, I'll agree to stop using them for poor mothers' health care.

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Forget the people already in the Party. Among those we want to attract, this addition creates controversy.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Insomuch as taxpayers should not be funding people's medical care, this goes without saying. But I'm not sure that saying it pointedly like this servers to do anything but make us appear to align with the religious right.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	will the with-holding of funds make such a life altering decision impossible? Does withholding funds actually overturn Roe V Wade & therefor make abortion impossible?
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Taxpayer money should not be used for many things. We should not list them here. Shorter list is what tax money can be used for.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Abortion of viable human beings is should never be performed. It is a more basic idea principle than taxpayer funds.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	nor go to organizations that offer them.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the second half of the wording and not the first half.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The freedom to choose not to support abortions must be protected. Forcing those morally opposed to pay for abortions would breach individual liberty to make a true determination. Personally, I would like more detail and would include a sentence like "In order to protect all individuals right to choice, Libertarians believe that the federal government should protect nationwide legalization of abortion, while disallowing the use of taxpayer funds to pay for abortions. Taxpayer funds in the use of abortion would prevent those morally opposed to abortion from being removed from the issue, thereby diminishing the true liberty of their choice." I think this promotes the idea that the choice should be up to each individual, not the states or federal government. It's assumed that "government" in the first sentence implies all levels of government, but I think the first part clarifies that freedom of choice will be protected.

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	That's digging deeper into the issue than we need to. It sparks a "what if" debate in the reader's mind.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Why single out abortion for exclusion from being paid with taxpayer funds? In my opinion, taxpayers paying for abortions is no different than taxpayers paying for any other type of medical procedures. I am opposed to using taxpayer funds to pay for ANY procedures that are not medically necessary to protect the long term health of the patient.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Contingent on the part of our Federal and state governments to refrain from any regulation or restriction
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Why single out one health procedure in whole document? There are thousands of others they shouldn't pay for. What's next? They shouldn't pay for contraception? How many Rick Santorum fans will that bring into the party?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Redundant--are you going to list all the things taxpayer funds should not be used for?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Damn straight!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think it should be obvious from other parts of the platform that this is true.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	tax money is there to help all people of america regardless of thier choices on abortion
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	please ignore previous comment.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Yes, and can we add ... or war, or crony capitalism, or any services to economic (including financial) determinism, and, and, and.....
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is a touchy issue, this could effectively ban abortions by keeping them out of all tax supported facilities. For this reason it would be best to be silent on this issue.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Too simplistic. What is "taxpayers funds"? What if it is paid with borrowed moneys, printed moneys etc?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Taxpayer funds should not be used to pay for medical services, but as long as they are, abortion should be available among those services.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	These are better wordings than the previous.

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do not believe taxpayer funds should be used for multiple abortions per patient. Then again, taxpayer funds are used for births If America had a realistic and appropriate adoption process, perhaps the issue of taxpayer funds wouldn't be an issue. Perhaps if America didn't make it lucrative for some to become parents, taxpayer funds wouldn't be an issue.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	add: nor to discourage abortion.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support, this is a clear statement on liberatarian principals.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If a woman wants an abortion, I shouldn't have to pay for it. That's her choice, so will not use my money.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	...oppose, mostly because there are a lot of really, really poor women who get abortions
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Already several place's where stating we do not support tax dollars being used to give free medical care. Making this last statement may be taken as a prolife statement.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Too specific. To single out and point up one single controversial use of taxpayer funds misdirects people from, and dilutes, the underlying fact that involuntary taxation is theft - IN EVERY CASE. Taxation is stealing money from your neighbors in order to pay for your good causes. To add this wording is like saying, "Well, it's wrong to tax people for purposes that might be deeply divisive. But as long it's a purpose that a larger majority agree on, then taxation is O.K." No it's not O.K. Don't dilute the message that it's not O.K.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Err on the side of compassion, taxpayers are in many instances the same players. Lets not pay for war.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	So rather than fund a poverty stricken woman's abortion of an unviable fetus (e.g. a child with anencephaly or some other equally terminal condition), we'd rather force her to give birth to a child that will suck many thousands of dollars out of an overburdened health care system before it passes away?

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	With this point the statement about pro and anti may be needed. More work required on this statement.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I feel, as previously stated, that this language is better for this proposal.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would suppose this proposal if you add the words " or fetal stem cell research.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	see previous regarding unalienable right to life. The purpose of government is to protect life and property.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Perhaps... "While we welcome both pro-choice and pro-life individuals into the Libertarian Party, we believe that under no circumstance should taxpayer funds be used to pay for abortions."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I continue to bristle at reducing the distinction to the two options only of "pro-life" and "pro-choice" (even just here in the introduction). I have no strong objection to the proposed added statement, other than it seems to single out abortions, when my understanding of the reality is that "Taxpayer funds should not be used to pay for Any medical procedures." Singling out abortions sends a "secret message" that, to use the limited two-sides terminology being used here, the Libertarian Party accepts everyone, but we're really in truth "pro-life" under the hood.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Municipal governments should have the right to subsidize safe abortion procedures if they so do wish.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	As a taxpayer, I would rather pay for an abortion now, than pay for the justice process and incarceration costs of a criminal 20 years later.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But than don't we have to allow pacifists the right to not have their funds used to pay for war? Even a defensive war which is a proper governmental use. Where will this lead?
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I agree with the proposed language, but that's because there should be no such thing as "taxpayer funds." Why should abortion be singled out for special exclusion when far more taxes are appropriated to other much more tyrannical uses?

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	YES!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	taxes should only be used for the collective good, paying for that protection which is cheper in the colective. anypayment for an individual is coresion and makes the individuale recieve those funds an extortionest and a crimanal.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think mixing tax policy with social policy is too Republican. I don't necessarily disagree with the statement, but in the context of a plank let's not mix the 2.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This would be interpreted as meaning that the LP is pro-life. There are lots of things taxpayer shouldn't be used for. I think it's a mistake to single out abortions.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	All reasonable people should find truth in this.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, this statement doesn't belong as a part of the platform. By saying Taxpayer funds should not be used to pay for abortions, it implies that the Govt is taking a stance.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Taxpayer funds should not be used to pay for any form of health care. Singling out abortions unjustifiably raises abortions above other forms of health care.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	To the extent that an abortion may be a medically necessary procedure to protect the life of the mother, or in the case of multiple pregnancies, the life or lives of the most viable fetuses, it should be treated like any other medical issue.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would suggest additional clarifying language as to why taxpayer funds should not be used - it's not that we are against abortion but rather that we are against government subsidization of any personal choice.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"Pro-life" boilerplate.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I thought the gov't was to be kept out of it!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Taxpayers don't fund other procedures, so this should not be an exception. The government needs to stay out of it.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While I dont think that abortion should be on the plank, cutting wasteful tax spending should. Still dont want to see too much attention here.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	yes....this is very good!

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It should be up to each state to decide if taxpayer funds should be available to low income women desiring an abortion, particularly in cases of rape or incest.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This becomes a confusing area when either side of the issue wants to define taxpayer funds. Research grants can be traced back to taxpayers some how. Or programs for women's health may get defined that way.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is the only way to treat this issue and allow inclusion of Pro-Lifers.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Agree with "Taxpayer funds should not be used to pay for abortions." However, I believe that the right of the individual begins at conception. Thus abortion is no different than murder.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Along with individual choice comes individual responsibility - in choice and payment.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I am only opposing the wording because it implies that someone who may be seeking an abortion and cannot afford it and/or has no insurance cannot get help. I actually think our tax dollars would be better served paying to abort an unwanted pregnancy than paying for a welfare mother to have another baby she cannot afford and then consequently paying to help provide food, shelter, education and healthcare for that child.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Preventing unwanted children from coming into the world will ultimately reduce the tax burden. I've met adults, who grew up as unwanted children, and they are trouble.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	By withholding funds you are making a judgement that abortion is wrong.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Add to the last proposal about welcoming pro-life and pro-choice people to the party....don't just replace that new language with this new language. Combine the two.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This addition is just sneaks abortion back in as a political issue. It is also redundant since we clearly oppose the use of taxpayer funds for medical care of any kind.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Absolutely!

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	It would be stronger to say "never" instead of "not."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Though I generally support this stand I would support an abortion that would prevent the death of the mother.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Already stated that government should be kept out of the matter. A statement of Taxpayer funds invites confusion and debate -- not necessary!
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I recommend drafting and adding language related to an important issue in this year's campaign: No employer or insurance company should be compelled to provide medical benefits or services that violate their consciences.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Taxpayer funding necessitates that even those of conscience pay a portion. That is clearly an act of force Libertarians should not support.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Redundant
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Individuals should be responsible for providing the basis for funding any healthcare needs, through savings or insurance.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	This concept used to be in the platform before the 2006 disaster.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Personally I agree, but..... if there are no other options--perhaps MINIMAL tax-payer funds can be used for certain cases.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Or...."taxpayer funds should not be used to subsidize the choices of individuals".
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Well, OK, I agree. But this sort of implies that there should be taxpayer funds, which there shouldn't. As you all know already.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Keeping government out of this for being a matter of personal choice, then government would not be in a position to use taxpayers monies to fund abortions. No need to restate the obvious.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the last sentence.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	obviously

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Please see my previous comment on this proposal. And what's with "taxpayer"? Under libertarianism, there are no taxpayers, because there is SELF-GOVERNMENT, and no taxes! You see, you cannot be libertarian and also be against libertarianism; taxation is not libertarian, it is against voluntaryism and SELF-government. The reason this political party languishes is because its claimed philosophy is inconsistent, and people don't really know what it stands for and what it means. You've tried to "include" so much that you exclude the very thing you claim to represent: liberty, freedom, personal SELF-government. It is impossible, both philosophically and practically, to both BE governed by others AND also SELF-govern. It's either one or the other. How about you decide to make a stand and be honest and clear about it?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	definitely shouldn't use taxpayers money to fund something they may be morally against!
Support Oppose	Unlikely Likely	No No	Non-Member Non-Member	Absolutely! I liked the earlier version as i modified it. Also, under our constitution, local governmental entities may do as they wish. The Federal government, however, is not given the power to do so.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If the government should be kept out of the matter, then taxpayer funds (aka public money via the government) should not be used to pay for abortions.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A "medically needed" abortion should be treated like any other medical condition. Taxpayer funds should not be used to pay for "optional" abortions.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, I think the initial text is best.

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Neither should taxpayer funds go to support unwanted and likely neglected offspring whose costs are imposed on all of us by restricted or denied abortion funding. I have a global solution for all these disputed tax funding issues--dollar for dollar tax credits. Contact me for details and perhaps a presentation to elaborate the concept. Such tax credits are also an ideal TRANSITION mechanism for reducing gov't funding by substituting private/voluntary support for worthy projects.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I support this in theory, but there has to be a softer sell to this one!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is a hot-button issue that the party should avoid. Candidates may find themselves in a situation in which use of health insurance funding may be construed as taxpayer funds, even though we don't approve of government funding of health care.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	See my last comment. Expectations for fetal survival and quality of life will improve as technology advances. The government should not regulate abortions. Rather, the government must protect the unborn to the degree they are recognized as persons and/or citizens.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It's time to take a stand. Protect all life. Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness. You cannot have liberty or pursue happiness without life.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	redundancy
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It seems like a specific statement about taxes unnecessarily complicates "government should be kept out of the matter."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Because of the widely differing views of the taxpayers.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree with the amended sentence, but from my previous comment, I disagree that the government should stay out of the issue entirely, or for that matter, at all. Protect all life. (Until that life needs to be removed for crimes it committed.)
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It should be against the law to murder.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Correct!

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree taxpayer funds should not be used to pay for abortions. I believe the government should protect the life, liberty and pursuit of happiness of unborn individuals.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	agree with the concept but wouldn't write it
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	An individuals choice over their bodily functions should not be the domain of government. Accordingly no government interference / funds should be warranted.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Using government largess to fund abortion is abuse of Sovereign citizens on several counts: 1) it funds an abhorrent and barbaric practice ending helpless life and thereby abuses tax payers of religious conviction by forcing them to pay for the murder of the unborn. 2)The funding of abortion abuses religious liberty protected under the first amendment. Abortion is between a woman, her god and her physician. It is a personal decision of conscience, not a right protected by the Constitution. 3) America was founded on English common law and the moral precepts of the Judeo/ Christian religious philosophies. Use of largess to compel tax payers to fund this hideous practice undermines moral authority and morality. 4) An indirect consequence of tax payer funded abortion is the attrition of our unique American population and culture. Our birth rate is declining. American couples produce 1.5 offspring as compared with Muslims who produce 6 offspring per union. America will not survive such statistics. And, we are in effect committing suicide as a populous and culture.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I only oppose because there might be certain circumstances with taxpayers funds SHOULD pay for abortions.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	and merge with the previous plank
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	To do otherwise would again invite government intrusion.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	That's a very broad and vague statement.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	if the government is truly kept out of the matter, the statement is redundant. how would "court costs" be not taken from "taxpayer funds"?

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think it leans too much to one side of the issue. Stating that government should be kept out of the matter is sufficient and implies the addition and no funding for anti services either.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	The addition just seems so abrupt. The paragraph is talking about rights, and suddenly it's talking about taxes. Maybe something should lead into that, such as "Whatever the decision of the individual, the Libertarian Party believes that taxpayer funds ..." BTW, Is "taxpayer funds" clearer than "tax money"?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree that Taxpayer funds should not be used to pay for abortions or most other medical procedures. Why are we singling out abortions being funded by Taxpayer funds? Reducing taxes is an overall theme of the Libertarian Party and it is redundant to spell out no taxes for abortions.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Duplicates the previous statement that "...government should be kept out of the matter,..."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This may be better than the we accept both pro-life pro-choice... Sounds less wishy-washy.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I worked for the WELFARE Office (INDIANA) for 24 years ... I never knew a WOMAN who chose an ABORTION who was NOT profoundly effected by the operation ... Planned Parenthood does a GREAT JOB and needs the support of any & all FUNDS it currently receives ... if the CONSERVATIVE "right" (who are generally WRONG) would leave Family Planning & Birth Control alone ... there would be a substantial drop in the abortion numbers ... wait until an unplanned pregnancy happens to their 13 / 14 / 15 / 16 year old DAUGHTER ... then SEE who wants a FREE or Low Cost D&C Abortion ;-(
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Or any form of social advice.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Abortion is murder, plain and simple, and we must be for Life.

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Redundant-- we already state that in the previous sentence. Moreover, it cracks the door to treating abortion differently from other medical procedures, and thus creates a party stance on the matter, which is what we're trying to avoid, right? [Should abortions be offered at military medical facilities? The VA? If taxpayers are going to pay for medical care (which, I think we all agree, should NOT be the case, but is offered in some current programs), should certain beliefs limit the nature of that care? Are we going to address euthanasia the same way? Prescriptions that involve narcotics?]
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Well, taxpayer funds shouldn't be used for lots of things - I think singling this out makes it seem like there's a real pro-life twist, and dilutes the power of the first part - that people should decide for themselves.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Taxpayer funds should not be used to pay for ANY medical procedures. Singling out abortion weakens this fundamental Libertarian position.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Abortion is the termination of human life and is contrary to the Libertarian principle of not doing harm to anyone.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But both proposals in.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	See previous item.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think taxpayer funds should only ever be used for the following six things: 1. Education 2. Contraception (including abortions, to reduce the population) 3. Roads 4. Courts 5. Postal Service 6. Border Defence
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	nor should we pay for the opposite consequence, having children
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	good to add this.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The platform is philosophical. This addition relates to policy and should not be a part of the platform, as it is an application of the LP platform concepts.

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I would think that any health administered by the government should include paying for abortion should the individual so desire it. To have the government not provide for abortion under a government administered healthcare plan would be a violation of separation of church and state. Those not wishing to have an abortion have the right not to do so, however if you take the ability to pay for an abortion away from an individual you are in essence taking away their right to choice to do so.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	No one should be forced to pay for something they do not approve of on moral or other grounds.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Opposition is because singling out abortion implies taxpayer funds should be used for other medical procedures.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I see both proposals as good changes.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree with the statement, but I feel that it panders to the social right. I don't think that taxpayer funds should be used for MANY personal issues. So I don't think flagging this one helps create a balanced, detached stance on the abortion issue.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Drop it.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again..."to each woman for her consideration."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While it's true that taxpayer funds should not have to be used for abortions, it's also true that doing so will almost certainly decrease rather than increase the tax burden over time.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It is up to elected officials to have that choice.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	This is absurd and redundant! Do we think taxpayer funds should be used for a root canal or neurosurgery? Why don't we just put a sentence in for every specific instance if we really think our platform's principles aren't enough to stand on???
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the last sentence. Oppose the previous sentence. See comment above.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Taxpayers should never have to pay for "voluntary" procedures.

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Taxpayer funds should not be used to pay for any medical procedure; abortion should not need to be called out for special attention.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Does not add anything, Taxpayer money should not be used to pay for personal choices period, why only single out abortions.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Please consider the following; "Because abortion is an individual moral consideration, in consideration of those who are against it taxpayer funds should not be used to pay for abortions.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Correct - liberals aren't taxed to pay for my guns, we shouldn't be taxed to pay for their actions.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Rape victims, not fortunate enough to have the financial means, incest or abortions of MEDICAL necessity, should not be penalized for lack of funds.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Too straight-line conservative. Better, if you must add anything, "As with all medical treatment, taxpayer funds should not be used."
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	While somewhat redundant, this addition makes our position on this very important point abundantly clear. I consider this to be very important.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Since the basis of Plank 1 focuses on the individual, this wording may best be attached to planks dealing with governmental responsibilities.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	And add "or any other medical treatment."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If the government were kept out of the matter, there would not be taxpayer money involved.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	This is a no-brainer and should be added to the previous proposal on this plank.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Why should taxpayer funds be allowed for other procedures that some may not like and not abortion?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like this addition better.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If we are to leave the decision to murder another human being open, the least we can do is not force others to pay for it, thus denying them their right to decide how their money (fundamentally, their time, and thus their life) is used.

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I know I am an outlier here, but I am a Libertarian who believes in publicly funded and cost-controlled universal health care coverage. Since an abortion could conceivably be a health care need, that should be covered.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe the focus should be on the policies that would result from our beliefs. The previous proposal would "advertise" for Libertarians but this one would do a better job explaining what the result of holding liberty above all values
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Don't see a need to state that specifically on the funds as was already said an individual decision. Just invites more argument not central to the idea of personal choice.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Add "In order to prevent individuals from having to pay for abortions that they fundamentally disagree with, taxpayer funds should not be used to pay for abortions."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It is very obvious that we have a very short list of things that the govt is good at. The phrase is redundant. See my suggested language in the previous comments. Eliminating the fed income tax and lowering other taxes will give each individual and family the resources to follow whatever path they choose.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This statement picks a side. Taxpayer dollars should not be used for or against abortions
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Better.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Very important statement.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the last sentence, but again abortion violates the rights of the unborn child.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	should never*
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	At the end of final sentence: "as taxes come from individuals both with and without moral opposition to abortion."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree, but I don't think such a statement belongs in the plank. This is far too specific.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	SEEMS REDUNDANT TO ME, IF THE GOVERNMENT IS OUT OF THE MATTER THEN NO TAX PAYER MONIES CAN BE USED.

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think there needs to be stipulations as to those persons who could not afford , however, I think this should be done on a local level
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	yuk.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While the new sentence is somewhat not needed in the context that taxpayer funds should only be spent on defense and infrastructure, I have no problem with its inclusion here.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	That is self explanatory being that "government should be kept out of the matter"
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If abortions MUST be allowed, though I feel it should be a criminal offense, taxpayer funds should not have to pay for it.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Absolutely!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is the only part of this plank I can accept.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	As this is just a subset of the many things for which Libertarians believe taxpayer funds should not be used, this is not the place to make the point.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Public funding for places like Planned Parenthood are a small price to pay versus having the government raise and financially support unwanted children.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	And again the better editing should read: "Recognizing that abortion is a sensitive issue and that people can hold good-faith views on all sides, we believe that taxpayer funds should not be used to pay for abortions."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is one of those "depends" answers. As long as taxpayer funds are used for medical care, there should be no restrictions.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would suggest changing the rhetoric there, that sentence seems to come out of nowhere.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Again, it's redundant. If government isn't involved, taxpayer funds will not be used.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Taxes paying for abortions means government involvement in reproductive freedom, and that is not appropriate.

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Taxes properly enacted for the financial support of proper government functions would not, cannot and should not provide any individual mandate as to what revenues should be spent on - PROPER government funding and taxation would not provide an opportunity for government revenues to be spend on health care of any kind at all.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	As long as taxation exists, some citizens will oppose certain expenditure. If we adopt this sentence as a platform item, then we in good conscience should also adopt language that says "Taxpayer funds should not be used to pay for invasions of foreign nations resulting in the killing of tens of thousands of innocent civilians." And "taxpayer funds should not be used to furnish lavish offices of party majority leaders in Congress."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	same
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Add to the end of that sentence- "pay for abortions nor should taxpayer funds be used to support YOUR children." I believe that the government should allow taxpayers funds to be use for contraceptives free or at a reduced rate.....after that the responsibility should fall to the parent who failed to prevent pregnancy
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It seems to me that in singling out only ONE controversial medical procedure, you're just caving to the pro-life crowd here.

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The primary tenet of the Constitution is separation of church and state. If a religious group is opposed to abortions, it is their right to do so. But that it completely irrelevant to government duty to protect the citizenry. If an abortion is required for some reason, then the gov should be allowed to do what it needs to in order to protect the person. Yes, there are grey areas beyond that, which brings up the entire abortion issue in general... but PREVENTING the gov from doing this is not the answer. Remember, the entire gov is funded by taxpayers, so by definition, if the gov allows it, then it is "funded" by taxpayers.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	This would need to be combined with the earlier recommendation. The addition jumps into a new subject
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There are no constitutional grounds for funding abortion.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think this should be clear to any libertarian.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Consider adding to the first proposal a clarification states and individuals have the right to prohibit taxpayer funds from being used to pay for abortions.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Why just abortions? Why not well-baby care? Births? Vasectomies? Federal taxes, state taxes? We shouldn't pay taxes at all, and government should stay out of healthcare period. This should not be mentioned at all. It's too specific and it sounds like you're placating the pro-lifers.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The Federal Government should not be involved in any type of moral legislation.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	except in cases of rape or other involuntary conception.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	For sure...Taxpayer funds should not be used to pay for abortions....or any other medical care for that matter.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Taxpayer funds for any medical procedure should be avoided, what's with all this pussyfooting?

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While I agree 100% with the sentiment, I actually disagree with the added verbage just because it could be interpreted (mis-interpreted really) that the Libertarian Party is anti-abortion and just doesn't want to come out and say it.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	victims of crimes should be allowed assistance from victims compensation programs
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree tax payer funds should not be used at all, but this would not be a consideration if abortion was made illegal, which it should be since it is murder!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Tax payer funds should not be FORCED to be used for ANYTHING private. This covers abortion, so this isolation of abortion is very UNEEDED.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	implied and does not need to be stated
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Absolutely. Taxpayer funds can rightly be used to protect life, liberty and property.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	... or any other personal decision health issue or any personal elective surgery, etc.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	That's already implied, and adding the wording actually requires that we list everything else taxes shouldn't fund. And that's not even considering the shockingly horrible construction "Taxpayer funds" to describe taxes or government receipts. Taxpayer funds would include all funds available to taxpayers, even a taxpayers own funds.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree with the addition, but the platform should remain silent on the matter.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	this is too black and white of a term to be stated like that.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Although I do agree with the last added sentence.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	redundant
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	One more change- drop should not and use shall not.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This addresses a specific issue where we there is a consciounesses (unless the results of the survey prove me wrong). Could this be worded in a more general way to address objections of moral conscious, so it could include other issues like the Catholic Church and contraception?

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	strongly so.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Taxpayer funds shouldn't be used to pay for ANY medical services unless it's the result of someone providing the Government their labor and negotiated as part of a individual compensation package.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Add this to the end of the previous one and call it good. We welcome all views... except those who view that taxpayers should fund them.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I especially like the addition of the last sentence.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Better left the way it was. What else will we be deciding "taxpayer funds" should or should not be used for? The statement stands alone without the addition. Also, by stating that government should be kept out of the matter, are we not already stating funds should not be used?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	In principle I agree. However, I recommend rewording this passage to eliminate any use of the word "should". I don't even see how pro-lifers and pro-choicers can have "good-faith views". Pro-lifers want to impose their limitations of other people's freedom. Leaving that aside for the moment, I would rewrite this way: "... we believe there is no place for government in such private matters that are within each person's individual conscience. Likewise, taxpayer funds are not to be used to pay for abortions."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Not everyone has health care or the money necessary to pay for an abortion. Denying low-income women access to an abortion due to lack of funds and health care is the worst form of discrimination
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	no reason to single out this one medical procedure over many, many others!
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I can almost support this, but it is worded too negatively. It should read something like "Abortion should be funded only by those who support it."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It is unfortunate that many abortions are needed by those who can least afford them. There may be a need for legislation (grrrr) to only allow a certain number of abortions per individual.

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree to the addition but not the main plank. See my previous comment.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	No matter what ones position on abortion it is not the proper function of government to be funding abortion. If someone engages in an act that causes the creation of a child libertarian principle would dictate that they be responsible for their choice and it's conciquences including carrying that child to term and seeing that it is provided the best shot at life possible weather that be raising the child and contributing to it's upbringing or finding a good family to do so via the adoption process.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Consider adding additional language that clarifies that we do not oppose subsidized or free abortions provided by private organizations.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Except for a case of rape to a low income individual.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	nor should taxpayer funds be used to prevent abortion. In my opinion the fetus is the mother until separated by birth and on its own as an individual being.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Taxpayer funds can be used, when appropriate, in cases of rape, incest, and harm to the mother.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Taxpayer funds should neither be used to pay for abortions nor to support protests against abortions.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Why pander to the anti-abortion crazies in this annoying fashion? All sorts of things are "sensitive issue[s]" that various folks find a violation of their religious delusions or consciences...
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Support the wording but question the need to have this in the platform.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Stay out of it.

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Well, it is an explicit restatement of what you already imply. See my previous remark for 1.4; if you are going to explicitly restate this, you could append: "Taxpayer funds should not be used to pay for abortions, abstinence or morality programs, or anything that is a matter of personal choice and conscience." And, in this way, show that you are even-handed about it, adhering to the fundamental principle of non-governmental interference in matters of conscience.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I don't like the absolute of this sentence.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I previously supported this view, but now that contraception has become part of the discussion, and so-called "Personhood", I am withdrawing my previous support. Add to that, the pending problems with invitro fertilization, and destruction of unused fertilized embryos.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	At the same time, my position is that there shouldn't BE taxation at all. Taxation of citizens is not necessary or logically sound.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	More to the point: No one should be forced through taxation to pay for benefits, medical or otherwise, of others.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The proposal seems redundant. In advocating individual rights and responsibilities, one must infer that the populous would not beholden to paying for good or services to a specific individual based on that individual's wants needs pursuant to a personal descision.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	In cases of Rape or for medical reasons, the gov't could subsidize the fee.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	See changes above. So where does it stop? Can taxpayers fund family planning? Contraception? Sterilization? Each of these gores someone's ox. Maybe this is covered elsewhere but I doubt it. Couldn't we change the topic to family planning and substitute "government should neither restrict nor fund any clinical prescription or service provided by a willing clinician to a patient" or something like that.

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Better to say something neutral...like "Taxpayer funding shouldn't be spent to facilitate or deter abortions."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is a stupid fight to get into. If the government is small, this question is moot.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The Hyde amendment must be enforced in all situations.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	And this is something all libertarians should agree on.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I gree with the addition but don't accept the original statement
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Change unnecessar, the funding already is implicit in the original wording.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But I would support amended language as follows: Taxpayer funds should not be used either to pay for or to prevent or discourage abortions.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is a healthcare issue. To single it out under the "abortion" platform will alienate pro-choice believers. True, under the overarching ideals of the party, this would be a given, but the wording has pro-life undertones.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If taxpayer funds pay for other medical procedures then it should not discriminate against abortions...
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Also a triplicate vote.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	should eleaborate more on taxpayer funds. If it lyes with in the standard of a true medical emergency to save the life of the mother some type of assistance should be allowed. Abortion is a very broad medical term.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It already says that without the controversial language. "We believe that government should be kept out of the matter, leaving the question to each person for their conscientious consideration".
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I still think it would be better for the national platform to be silent on this issue.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Government should not be paying any healthcare costs why specify?

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We should not single out abortion for this. Taxpayer funds should not be used to pay for health care. But as long as they _are_, abortion should be treated no different than any other health care.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I would prefer slightly different language that says the same thing, but support on the whole.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I have mixed feelings and nearly opposed this. I tend to agree with Ron Paul who says this should be left up to individual states, not the federal government.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I dunno here, what if a government employee has a medical need for one and it is wholly within their insurance coverage? This is a tricky subject indeed.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Unsure
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I agree with this statement, but I think that (to avoid the perception of us being anti-choice) the language should say something like "to pay for abortions any more than any other medical procedure."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Isn't this reasonably implied in the first proposal when stating that "government should be kept out of the matter?" I feel much stronger about the first proposal.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Strike the whole plank. Don't even mention abortion. Besides, it's covered in a previous plank.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"government should be kept out of the matter" Inherently implies a lack of tax support. Emphasizing the issue more seems to blend too closely to a typical Conservative rhetorical mantra.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Better, but same objection as before.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	not a gov concern!!!mgm
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Focus party on other issues. 1.4 will keep us from getting anything done and lock the party in a death spiral. Solve this issue outside the party and when the whole country agrees, we can join them.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Absolutely agree.

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If taxpayer funds are to pay for any health care, one cannot restrict what forms of "health care" are to be covered without taking a solid stance. With abortion, for instance, should taxpayer money fund abortions for victims of rape? Or where the mother's life is in danger? It's a discussion best avoided for a party platform where we respect both sides of the hotly-debated topic. Complete privatization of health care, should we discuss such a matter, belongs in a separate plank.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think tax payer funds should be used to pay for abortions. You are saying people on Medicaid cannot get abortions, which is ridiculous.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	add at the end "or pay for education favoring either position"
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Taxpayer funds shouldn't be used to pay for anything, so yes.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If taxpayer funds are paying for heathcare, they're paying for healthcare.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I can see the potential use of 'tax dollars' being used via LOCAL crime victims assistance programs in the form of 'the morning after pill'.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is a step in the right direction.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Perhaps add "or abstinence only education"
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think the word Federal may have been omitted.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Nor should they be used for contraceptives, (or any medical reason for that matter)
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	"government should be kept out" is adequate
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	this alienates the pro-choice crowd. Even though it holds up with the Libertarian ideals, this is a tactic that has been used by the right to attack the left for a while; and will be perceived by left-leaning libertarians as such. I think it's best to stay out of this particular detail and let the rest of the platform speak for itself.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	but would add "or any other medical procedures".
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Again - may say "federal" government

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If we choose to not protect the rights of the most vulnerable of our citizens, infanticide will be followed by eugenics for all.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Of course, if individuals have the right to disagree they should not be forced to pay for other persons decisions.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	we welcome all ideas - however, we do not believe taxpayer funds should be used to pay for any abortions.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think the other version is better. It's better to just say to keep government of it than to specify specific policy directives.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	To Me if the Govt is going to pay for a woman to have a Baby then they should pay for a woman to have a abortion.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think this is covered by the Libertarian ideal that taxpayer funds should not be used for all of the unconstitutional uses they are applied today.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Should be an undecided choice
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Let this funding come from people voluntarily. Only use force (taxation) critical national needs.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	See previous comment.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	anything short of a ban on abortion is a failure on this sujet
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Appropriate medical care should be equally accessible to all persons regardless of economic status.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	government should be kept out of ALL matters that are not in the constitution.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Singling out abortion among all medical procedures is discriminatory. Either oppose the use of government funds for ALL medical care, or shut up.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The use of tax-payer funds for both private and corporate welfare is adequately covered in other planks. Don't muddy this issue with the preipheral mention of taxes.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Taypayer funds should not pay for anybody's medical procedures.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support this proposal and also support government not forcing funding of birth control on dissenting institutions.

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	For those in need, there is a reason charitable organizations exist. It is not the place of the federal government to take care of every detail of life.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The issue is whether a woman owns her body or not. It's a lot bigger than taxpayer funds used for abortions.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support this, but also recognize that if abortion is equated to "murder", it is impossible to "believe that government should be kept out...". So, this will be inconsistent to many, on the same grounds as in any other murder, we cannot "keep the government out".
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I would also include something about leaving a police matter such as abortion to the several states.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Leave taxes out of it completely. It shouldn't be government paying for abortions period, no matter the source of the funds.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This statement has an extremely harsh tone and doesn't seem to have a human quality of sympathy to it like the sentence before it. I completely agree with the statement itself, but this shouldn't need to be said directly. Anyone who understands even just the basics of the platform would be able to deduce this libertarian stance on the use of tax money for abortion.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	In the cases of rape, incest or the women dying; I believe the Gov't should help the woman if she needs/wanted an abortion. Otherwise the Gov't should let a women choose, w/out help or interference.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Not helpful. There are lots of things taxpayer funds should not be used for.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Yes. This is good language to add.

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You have to be more specific like "I WILL GIVE TO EACH AMERICAN A \$75,000 LIVING CARD IF YOU ELECT ME FOR U.S. PRESIDENT"; "I WILL ISSUE \$50 TRILLION NEW FIAT MONEY ELIMINATING THE FEDERAL RESERVE"; "WE WILL MANUFACTURE ONE HUNDRED PERCENT IN AMERICA USING THE FEDERAL LANDS CREATING 100 JOBS". If you need help call me to 571-288-7383. My family could donate also \$100 million to your PAC. Thanks Alberto Lopez WWW.EBLM.US
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Overbroad. For an extreme example, many libertarians would support taxpayer funding of abortions for active-duty armed forces members stationed overseas. I like the addition in spirit, but it leaves us too open to nit-pickers, and the nit-pickers would be justified in this case.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Taxpayer funds should never get used for any medical procedure. Other, better, alternatives exist.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Strongly oppose. Leave Plank 1.4 as it is. If we believe that government should have no role here, then it is obvious that taxpayer funds would not be used.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Support, but it may or may not be a place to mention that lack of taxpayer funding does not mean lack of availability in this or any other area. Lack of taxpayer support only means lack of complicity.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe it should be much more specific to state that Taxpayer funds should not be used to support individual choice in the exercise of rights, including abortion. We shouldn't be paying for anything "elective." If an individual wants to do something, go ahead, but I'm not paying for it. I shouldn't be paying for people who overeat to get pills to make them lose weight - that's an individual choice. The examples are numerous.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, I support the second sentence and not the first for the same reasons as previously stated.

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"...abortions" because individuals should never be required to subsidize the actions of other individuals or bear the burden of their choices.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	It is not the role of government to dictate women's personal decisions or to discriminate financially against women who choose abortion. Some women may need abortion for valid health reasons and it would be illegitimate for government to deny them access in cases where financial assistance is needed.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I think the plank is better by staying focused on government intrusion as the issue--keep the monetary aspects out of it.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Perhaps expand with a reason why taxpayer funds should not be used, such as "Due to widely differing beliefs..."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Taxpayer funds should not be used for elective abortions.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Spot on!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If a woman on medicaid or other assistance needed to have an abortion to save her life, she should not be denied this option just because the government would be paying for it.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Abortions are medical procedures, treat them just like all the medical procedures.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Since taxpayer funds should not be used to pay for individuals' medical treatment, this follows logically.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	You're making something a flash point that is not really the point. Again, cut the crap.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	To be able to move forward in your survey, I had to choose support or oppose in each plank. But please see my comments with the last proposed change. I feel unsure about that one and this.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Believe a life is created, therefore abortion is taking that life
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Abortion is an individual choice, for the procedure AND for payment of such procedure.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Strongly support!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is an unnecessary addition. You can add this to everything - why just put it here?

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Good. I'd go so far as to change "not be used" to "never be used".
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You are mixing two issues. Yes, I agree that no taxpayer funds should be used for abortion. That is a no-brainer. But I DO NOT agree that the decision to murder should be left to "each person for their conscientious consideration".
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	No comment
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	This is waffling. Say nothing. Delete plank.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	As written, I'd oppose this since it could be used to ban any federal funds (even those from Medicare) given to any clinic or hospital if they performed abortions there even if the funds were not directly used to pay for abortions. If this were reworded to read "Taxpayer funds should not be directly used to pay for abortions" I could then support it.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	In many cases abortions are a life-saving medical procedure. Let's keep government out of the conversation between the doctor and the woman.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Abortions should be encouraged.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Der
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While good in theory, I think it should be left off of this platform. There are alot of issues that people can oppose on moral grounds - none of them should be funded by taxpayer funds - why just call out on issue?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do not agree. If they was also statement that said "taxpayer money should not be used to feed, educate, or medicate other people's children" than I would agree. But if the choice is between a medical procedure costing a couple hundred bucks and 18 years of food stamps, schooling, and medical bills totaling over \$100,000.....I want my money being spent on the abortion.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Leave it to the states.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Except in the event of rape, incest, or if the mothers life is threatend by continuing the precnancy.

6.0 - Abortion - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Commenters	43.8%	56.3%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Why not include both? Both sides are welcome in the party, and regardless of where you stand, taxpayer funds shouldn't be used.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	As long as taxpayer funds are used to pay for other medical procedures, abortions should be included.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Necessary qualifier. Will draw pro-lifers into the party.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Thats a touchy one. I may support taxpayers funds paying for rape, incest, medical necessities
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I wish to point out that minors should not be allowed to have an abortion without parental consent. As earlier stated a distinction must be made between adult and children in the platform.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i think it depends on cirrcumstance
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i like this one more than the previous one
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The phrase "government should be kept out of the matter" covers the idea that taxpayer funds should not be used to pay for abortions. The proposed change is redundant.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Agreed!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	except in the case of rape, incest or mother's life.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Redundant and unnecessarily inflammatory.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Taxpayer funds should also not be used to discourage abortions.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like this one better than the previous
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	This categorical language discriminates against the right of a poor rape victim to obtain an abortion that they cannot afford. In the hierarchy of rights, life comes before property.

7.0 - Crime and Justice

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	96.8%	3.2%	100.0%
Commenters	77.0%	23.0%	7.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This plank has the word "include" which, when used as a legal term, acts to *exclude* all things not listed. The Declaration says, "...among these are Life, Liberty, & the Pursuit of Happiness." Those three, being *among* the Rights, were not the *only* rights. You could say "...such as..." instead of "including" OR "...including, among others,..."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer the original language.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I didn't pull out my copy of Strunk & White, but I'm assuming whoever made this suggested change did.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	'also the justice of the law.' good point
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Only tort law is legitimate in the free market. Criminal law, a relatively recent phenomenon, takes incarceration for granted, growth of the state and imprisonment are directly correlated. The powers of imprisonment embolden the state more than any other political tool, including murder, imprisonment is the murder of the soul and truly evil. Torts offer a better solution.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support everything stated but would suggest that the first sentence be the statement of the pple and that the sentences following be listed as (a) (b) etc. This makes the format much more easily read.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't like the last line. Maybe i just need some explanation, but I don't believe juries should try to rule outside of written law. If a law is unjust, it should be changed.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The plank should read: "Government exists to protect the rights of every dividual including life, liberty, and property. We support restitution to the victim to the fullest possible degree at the expense of the criminal or negligent wrongdoer. We oppose reduction of consitutional safeguards of the rights of the criminally accused. The rights of due process, a FAIR trial, legal counsel, and trial by jury must not be denied."

7.0 - Crime and Justice

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	96.8%	3.2%	100.0%
Commenters	77.0%	23.0%	7.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It should actually read, "...to the victim IN the fullest degree at the expense of the negligent party." What is it with Libertarians that y'all can't write anything clearly?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The current wording is proper.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Further, The individual should be able to hold Government Employees Accountable for financial or Physical harm done to them. Even Legislators. should be held accountable for bad laws that harm the Citizen. If not, Citizens will continue to foot the bills of Schemes such as the Mandating of Ethanol Gasoline that ruin many gasoline engines. I realize that this would Open a huge Pandoras box of Litigation. However for many people that are financially unable to generate Income sufficient to purchase Auto, Trucks, Chain saws due to legislative incompetence. Further Government interference By the EPA, Army Corp of Engineers Zealots have harmed Too Many Citizens exercising their property rights. Sanity must be restored in land Management.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	including..."their rights to"...life, liberty and property.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would keep the original language, as indeed it is the victim who is being restored.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would also consider adding the word "compensation" to this plank, because I believe that restitution and compensation are considered different things in the legal world (not that I'm an expert but that's my understanding).
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	BRAVO!!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	well said, and the correction is... correct!!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Juries should not be given the authority to judge the justice of a trial--that belongs to the judges.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We support restitution to the fullest degree possible... (why have "of/to the victum" in here at all?). negligent wrongdoer --> negligent party

7.0 - Crime and Justice

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	96.8%	3.2%	100.0%
Commenters	77.0%	23.0%	7.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would like to see language that says once a sentence has been completed a person would get all of their constitutional right restored i.e. the right to vote and poss a gun the way it is now it says accused what about once convicted?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	They deserve their rights, and possibly punishments.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Need to add something clearly opposing government confiscation (especially pre-trial).
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Men nor Women should not Judge as God if they do not fully support the word of God=Jesus Christ Romans 6-13 Chapters of The King James Version Bible explains how We are to Live under a Governed authority that is submissive to the Law of Christ Referred to in Galatians 3 Chapter that explains in support of the Liberty werewith Christ has made us free. There is no Law for or against righteousness which can only be found through His Holy spirit not around it.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Def: WRONGDOER... to include the damages done by government agents such as: destruction of property. Government agents should be included because they most assuredly abuse their power.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Amen! :-)
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Would prefer to see stronger wording of opposing reduction of constitutional safeguards: It is better for the guilty to be acquitted than for the innocent to be found guilty.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Add the right to habeas corpus to the list. The rights of due process, a speedy trial, legal counsel, trial by jury, the legal presumption of innocence until proven guilty, and habeas corpus must not be denied.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Should 'Individual' be replaced by 'Adult,' as it was in the previous section?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	you are trying to restore the vicim to the "fullest degree possible"... restitution TO the victim to the fullest degree possible (to me) means you're going to give them all you can, whether it restores them or even if it over-restores them.

7.0 - Crime and Justice

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	96.8%	3.2%	100.0%
Commenters	77.0%	23.0%	7.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Very, very important!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Should sentence 2 say "physical, emotional, or financial harm"?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"Individuals retain the right to voluntarily assume risk of harm to themselves" ... I perform this act simply by stepping outside my home. If restitution is at the expense of the criminal or negligent wrongdoer... who is the wrongdoer for an early release or improperly released murderer or rapist if not the court that released him as well as the criminal? What good is restitution from a street thug who has nothing in the first place except his freedom?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But please omit the first sentence. Libertarians DO NOT believe the individual derives their rights from government or should be dependant upon government for those rights. Government should enforce criminal law (as worded) period.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Typo: "This preposition change" --- it is not a "preposition", it is a proposal. This is a long proposal, and it seems to indirectly assert what it wants. For example, if the objective is fewer laws, why not say that? If the objective is to have criminals reimburse victims, why not say that? If the objective is to allow juries to over-rule a law, just say that. For clarity, this could be broken out in to a series of bullets. Why is "Individuals retain the right to voluntarily assume risk of harm to themselves." included? What is the point of this sentence?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'm glad to see the mention of the common-law right of jury nullification. But, it may somewhat out of context here as the issue of this plank appears to be the rights of the accused. The right of jury nullification is not, however, a right of the defendant. It the right of the jury members to stand against overzealous prosecutors or out-of-touch legislators. it merits exploration in a separate statement of libertarian principle.

7.0 - Crime and Justice

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	96.8%	3.2%	100.0%
Commenters	77.0%	23.0%	7.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would support this absent the sentence relating to restitution. What a can of worms. If a criminal stole \$500 from me, no one would argue that he owes me \$500, so there is no need to refer to the issue in a party platform. There may, in fact, be issues in which the reasonableness of restitution is not so clear, but on such a case-by-case basis that it would be foolhardy to try to accommodate all of them in a party platform.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Mostly agree. However, I think it is important to specifically delineate the idea of "victimless crime", because the above wording is vague. An additional statement should be placed above that says, "Libertarians oppose state definitions of victimless crimes".
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	In case this is too vague, I still support some explicit language about "victimless crimes" and how we don't want government to legislate/prosecute "morality" or other people's ideas of how to act or be.
Support Oppose	Unlikely Unlikely	No No	Non-Member Non-Member	Restitution 'of' can be read paternalistically, True justice makes victims whole. Don't dilute that with weasel words. A better amendment would delete the first phrase: in reality, government exists to provide the governors with the enjoyment of power, period.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I hope it is made clear somewhere that the people who constitute government itself are not above criminal laws, even when acting as 'government'.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A fight of the recently passed and unpopular law, NDAA might also be mentioned that the executive, no matter the jurisdiction does not have the right to undermine due process or Habeas Corpus laws and the rights retained under natural law.

7.0 - Crime and Justice

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	96.8%	3.2%	100.0%
Commenters	77.0%	23.0%	7.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'm not sure I like the first sentence. I would merely state that "Government exists to protect the rights of every individual". Then let us decide what those right really are today. To some extent those rights change over time. What about "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness"?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This change is acceptable.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i suport the constitution as it is written?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Bad English. Split infinitive "to voluntarily assume"
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This particular plank is well-worded and absolutely correct.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think that this entire plank could be written in a less clinical manner, but as for this change, it works for now.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	deliberate actions that place others involuntarily at risk of harm.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Minor comment: Make sure use or non-use of the serial comma is consistent in this plank, and throughout the platform. Note, for example, first sentence does not have a comma after "liberty", but second to last has a comma after "jury".
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support this only because our legal system has gotten out of hand, with outdated laws still on the books and individual interpretations being unreasonable at times.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Please strengthen the wording about the rights of victims. Those victims who do not have the means to assert their own right to restitution require assistance. The government may provide that assistance, at least temporarily. Recognize that in many cases, there is no way full restitution can be made by any person who has committed self-harm. Government has tried to protect victims by acting pro-actively, and while the methods used are certainly open to question, preventing the harm in the first place is desirable.

7.0 - Crime and Justice

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	96.8%	3.2%	100.0%
Commenters	77.0%	23.0%	7.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Plank 1.4 on Abortion just said we won't take a stand on Abortion and that government should not be involved in anyway. Now Plank 1.5 says the reason government exists is to protect the rights of every individual ~ every ~ individual. We just contradicted Plank 1.4 and look silly. Plank 1.4 on Abortion needs to be reworded to say we don't support violence and if so, government should have criminal laws to protect victims. Plank 1.4 should be included in Plank 1.5, just differentiating between adults, children, and unborn individuals.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	In this plank I would like to see some verbiage against extreme sentencing, mandatory sentences (which take liberty away from the judge) and corporations running prisons (and slave labor) for profit. The prison population has exploded in this country to outrageous levels, denying the liberty of tens of thousands for trivial offenses like smoking weed. I don't know how to word all this into a plank, but I think we need something to address this pressing issue.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support this change. I do not like, however, how this plank aims to give a justification to government in the first sentence. I fear that may drive hardcore libertarians away from the party. Also, this plank should mention how we are opposed to victimless "crime" legislation, and how all true crimes involve an aggressing party and an aggressed party.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I appreciate no proposals or amendments to use the word "adult," but rather maintain the use of "involuntarily," "voluntarily," and "negligent" as sufficient to produce justice.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Other wording should be considered too. Leading off early with a sentence that begins "Criminal laws should be limited..." leads many to lump us together, incorrectly, with anarchists.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Good change of wording.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would also support language that calls for limitation of penalties above and beyond actual damages.

7.0 - Crime and Justice

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	96.8%	3.2%	100.0%
Commenters	77.0%	23.0%	7.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Should add in the language from 1.2? stating that the Libertarian party wants repeal all those laws that infringe on privacy.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	My understanding is that we would be saying the same thing in either case, since "making the victim whole" is metaphorical, not literal. Therefore, unless I'm missing some hidden legal distinction connected with replacing "of" with "to", this is an insignificant change that should be handled by the Style Committee. While I do not oppose the change itself, I marked "oppose" because I think to include it here is a waste of convention delegates' time. At least this is the one proposal so far which does NOT seek to advance a conservative agenda (although I notice it also fails to propose adding the stronger language that the conservative-leaning committee members want to delete from Plank 1.2, which is not a bad reason to oppose it unless it gets amended, since it changes nothing important).
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Addition: "The Constitutional protections enumerated in the Bill of Rights apply to any individual detained under the authority of the United States government."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	substitute 'guilt is proven' for 'proven guilty'. strike 'the justice of'.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	OK
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Kind of silly because those who commit crimes generally do not have the ability to pay restitution. That is why they commit crimes.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It is not a jury members job to judge the justice of the law.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	AND, please change the following sentence (sentence 5) to read "...of constitutional safeguards to the rights of the..." Because, safeguards to whatever X, rather than safeguards of whatever X.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The last sentence should specify the three aspects of the fully informed jury. 1) judging the facts of the case, 2) judging the application of the law to the case, 3) judging the law as a whole.

7.0 - Crime and Justice

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	96.8%	3.2%	100.0%
Commenters	77.0%	23.0%	7.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Which individual? US citizen or any? What government? USA or some Utopian ? The purpose of government is pretty well define in the Constitution
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Suggest comma after "liberty" in the first sentence for consistency of comma-delimited lists.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	not sure about the last sentence..."Justice of the Law"?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Yes, this is a clearer statement.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Doesn't matter to me.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Makes sense—no question.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Restitution may involve more than the conveyance of things to an injured party (which I prefer to "victim"), such as a public apology, in addition to other forms of restitution. I prefer the broader language of the existing plank.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Makes it sound odd with two to's close together.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Old one was either ungrammatical or a typo.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Add "In civil cases, the European custom of "loser pays" should apply."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Mention should be made of "jury nullification".
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Something should be said of the current practice of giving life sentences to children and making kids as young as nine life time sex offenders and listing teenagers who have sex with other teenagers as pedophiles.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Yes, definitely makes more sense, and modernizes the usage.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The first sentence is clumsy.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Excellent
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Illegal seizure of property. Assets may be impounded which would prevent a defendant in securing legal counsel.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I would change "to the fullest degree possible" to "at the fullest degree possible". To the victim... to the fullest ... sounds clumsy and repetitive.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Why are you trying to drive all the anarchist libertarians out of the Party?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Correct! Using "of" makes no sense. While "to" is good, "for" is even better.

7.0 - Crime and Justice

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	96.8%	3.2%	100.0%
Commenters	77.0%	23.0%	7.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would say we oppose the reduction of the rights of the criminally accused, whether they are citizens or not. A lot of folks use the citizenship idea to say that accused foreign-born terrorists should not have any rights.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would like to be able to protect my property as well as my life with lethal force if necessary.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Doesnt government exist to protect ones right to pursue happiness as long as it does not infringe upon anothers rights
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Since corporations are now "people" and since few individuals have the resources to indefinitely fight them, no matter how just the cause, this needs to be worded differently.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Once again you should keep out of the drug stance as it does more harm than good
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think the last sentence is a different point entirely. If given the option I would support everything else, but oppose the last sentence.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This whole statement betrays libertarianism. The issue IS outside "government," which presumes to determine for all what is law, what is crime, and what is necessary to prosecute and enforce the government's agenda. Libertarians would replace "government" with local arbitration boards, with the accompanying reality that therefore, "laws" would not be "made," but simply the libertarian principles of non-aggression, non-theft, and non-fraud would apply. Restitution - the duty and responsibility of wrong choices to be corrected to the victim's "wholeness," is therefore a given. It would be nice if you would make an effort to reference Rothbard, Mises, and the Tillmans in this. You reveal that you're not really for SELF-government with this proposal. You need to correct this completely if you would maintain the claim of "libertarian."

7.0 - Crime and Justice

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	96.8%	3.2%	100.0%
Commenters	77.0%	23.0%	7.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I would eliminate the words "criminal or the negligent" before the word "wrongdoer." Opening the door to "negligent" could open Pandora's Box"--but, I would not oppose adding "legally culpable" before "wrongdoer."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Flows much better.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Change to: "Criminal laws should be limited to violations of the rights of others. Individuals retain the right to voluntarily assume the risk of harm to themselves. We support restitution to victims at the expense of offending criminals and negligent parties. We support the constitutional rights of the accused such as due process, a speedy trial, legal counsel, trial by jury, and presumption of innocence. We assert the common-law right of juries to judge not only the facts but also the justice of the law."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would also change "must not be denied." to "must be protected." Those rights are not negative rights, but positive rights, therefore, make the statement positive.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Good grammar is more better ;)
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Please apply this to abortion
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The difference is great with the change of one word.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Crimes against property should be addressed more clearly
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Strike: "Government exists to protect the rights of ..." and replace with "LAW exists to protect the rights of ..."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Those who have comitted crimes and have shown "just" cause that their manner has changed should/MUST be restored their right to vote and their right to bear arms. To do otherwise invites the government to control the voting block and disenfranchise a whole class of citizens.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	yes on the "thing" that makes a victim whole, rather the act of making the victim whole.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	better word - agree
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Good section, with the proposed change.

7.0 - Crime and Justice

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	96.8%	3.2%	100.0%
Commenters	77.0%	23.0%	7.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If restitution means "the thing which is offered to the victim to make them whole," then including the phrase "to the victim" in the text is redundant. You should simply say "We support restitution to the fullest degree..."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	YES
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	We need to better articulate the premise that...if a law needs to be enforced, it shouldn't be a law...I recognize it is a stretch to believe that people, generally, support freedom but if we continue to make "laws" it will only create criminals.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Unfortunately, this plank is a potential challenge. "... deliberate actions that place ... significant risk ..." can easily become an anti-abortionist's reason to overturn Roe v. Wade, thus negating plank 1.4
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	And change "Individuals" to "Adults" in the third sentence.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Judges or lawyers should be forced to inform every jury of their obligations to judge the law and their options for nullification.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	there are too many CRIMINAL laws that should not be CRIMES (e.g. most so-called "victimless" crimes"). Had these been addressed in the revision I may have supported it.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would also amend the rest of the sentence to say "to the fullest extent of the law," because I feel that "the fullest extent possible" is too broad.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The former wording was grammatically incorrect as one cannot give restitution of an individual. The new wording is correct.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Awesome!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The final sentence is key...
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We now have the "criminal system". We need to covert it to the "victim recovery system".
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	In no instance should the criminals rights be greater than the victims.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	GREAT
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"must not be denied" should read "must NEVER be denied"

7.0 - Crime and Justice

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	96.8%	3.2%	100.0%
Commenters	77.0%	23.0%	7.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Life liberty and property is a very different thing, in a vry different legal tradition, than life liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Property is not a right
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"Restitution" is fine. In contrast, "punitive" damages are a penalty imposed by one private party against another, and invite frivolous and excessive litigation.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We should also have a fair and equal qualification test (rather than appointing a judge) of a judges ability to enforce the law equally and competently. Many judicial positions are "awarded" as prizes to the politically connected
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	yes we need more judicial review/jury negation of the laws that have been hastily passed such as the patriot act.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It parses better as changed.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	People MUST be assumed innocent until proven guilty. Otherwise government has the upper hand in your life.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Oppose because it allows folks to use hard narcotic drugs without any consideration to the effects on themselves,their families and soc iety in general.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Are you sure about the accuracy of the last sentence?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Strongly.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"restitution to" is descriptive of a monetary transfer rather than the broader "restitution of" which could include an apology.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I notice that in "Purpose," someone wrote: " it is the thing which is offered to the victim to make them whole," not "make him whole." Someone is using PC word usage! ;-)
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Only need change the 1st sentence to: "Government exists to protect that every individual is allowed to pursue life, liberty, and property."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Since this does not currently exist in our justice system, it would be a real novelty.

7.0 - Crime and Justice

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	96.8%	3.2%	100.0%
Commenters	77.0%	23.0%	7.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I recommend rewriting to eliminate all uses of the word "should". Where it has "Criminal laws should be limited to...", just say "Criminals laws apply to..." The first sentence would be better as, "Government exists to protect the rights of every individual, including the right to life, liberty and property."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think that rule should also apply to tax court
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Should add phraseology to the phrase: "place others involuntarily at significant risk of harm"and involuntary servitude!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Bad grammar: We support restitution to the victim to the fullest degree possible at the expense of the criminal or the negligent wrongdoer. "to the victim to" is using "to" too many times too close together. How about this: We support restitution to the victim at the expense of the criminal or the negligent wrongdoer, to the fullest degree possible. Algebraically its the same equation, grammatically it works better ;)
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I cannot support dumbing the platform down from 8th grade English to 4th grade English. It is correct as is.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	change appears to be gramatical in construction with little change in intent or perceived meaning.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We assert the common-law right of juries to judge not only the facts but also the justice of the law. Strike the rest.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	maybe this is addressed later, but since corporations are fictions, then it should be stated that all members of the corporation from officers to stock holders should be liable for 100% restitution to the victim(s) of the corporation

7.0 - Crime and Justice

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	96.8%	3.2%	100.0%
Commenters	77.0%	23.0%	7.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Persons held for trial w/o bail or who cannot make bail are innocent until proven guilty and their interment while waiting trial should not resemble punishment except that it keeps them for trial. They should not be mixed into a general prison population and should be given the best accomodations, food, medical care, family visitation rights, and access to legal resourese as are practical. It is the governments responceability to protect them from harm while awating trial.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Better usage for sure...
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Since you changed the language on privacy, I kind of miss explicit support for both medicinal and recreational use of marijuana.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Very good.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Just a grammar correction.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"We assert" sounds like we're the only ones -- are we? I would say "reaffirm" or "support" Also very funny lack of grammar in sentence 2 -- "laws should be limited to violation..." I think you mean "laws should address only..."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	innocence until proven guilty, MUST REMAIN
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	No strong opinion. I tried to abstain but the survey software wouldn't let me.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I always bemoan the lack of grammar education in schools. I wish so very much that I would have been taught grammar in high school.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The last sentence is absurd. If you don't agree with a law, work to get it changed but juries are to decide on the facts of a case not whether a law is just. This would reduce our system to "Judge Judy" where opinion becomes the law. Much more BS like this and you can have my membership card back.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I strongly support this paragraph.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would go further and add at the end: "and we call for the removal of judges who instruct juries in denial of this right and for the appointment of judges who respect it."

7.0 - Crime and Justice

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	96.8%	3.2%	100.0%
Commenters	77.0%	23.0%	7.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Support even though the language is clumsy: "to the victim to the fullest degree" -- too many to's.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	change "must not be denied" to "must be upheld". It's simpler.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I am particularly passionate about the last sentence of this plank. Perhaps we could expound upon it bit. I have served on several juries and the judges instructions have always stated that we were not permitted to judge the law. Simply stated, i believe in "No harm no foul" regardless of whether the defendents actions violate the letter of some obscure law. There is the concept of jury nullification which could be mentioned as well as FIJA.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Add to it the convicted criminal must pay the electric bill for his execution.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	1) Think of the application to the abortion plank: If an unborn baby, say a 6-month-old fetus, is an "individual", as many believe, isn't the protection of its life a proper duty of government? 2) Letting juries judge the justice of the law is a downright anarchist idea. Once a law is passed it is the law. The last statement must go.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	leave criminal law to the lawyers
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	consider also "restitution for the victim".
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is fine but you should put 'should exist' after the word 'Government' in the first sentence.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Sure
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	more accurate language
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"Government exists to protect the rights of every individual including life, liberty and property." Ah yes, that line I was referring to on the previous proposal. Sticky, isn't it? As for this proposal, yes, that makes more sense.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	more clear.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	There should be "N/A" options.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Fines should not go to the government but to the injured party.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	it's important to make grammatical sense.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This change is close to negligible(not sure of spelling). It makes very little difference.

7.0 - Crime and Justice

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	96.8%	3.2%	100.0%
Commenters	77.0%	23.0%	7.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is clearer and is also how attorneys use the term.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think it needs to say that we support prosecution of politicians who break the law. Equal protection under the law means equal prosecution.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	maybe "of and to" or such other wording expressing the duality of meaning
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Simple change, much clearer meaning.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Perfect
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You have to be more specific like "I WILL GIVE TO EACH AMERICAN A \$75,000 LIVING CARD IF YOU ELECT ME FOR U.S. PRESIDENT"; "I WILL ISSUE \$50 TRILLION NEW FIAT MONEY ELIMINATING THE FEDERAL RESERVE"; "WE WILL MANUFACTURE ONE HUNDRED PERCENT IN AMERICA USING THE FEDERAL LANDS CREATING 100 JOBS". If you need help call me to 571-288-7383. My family could donate also \$100 million to your PAC. Thanks Alberto Lopez WWW.EBLM.US
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	How does the last line about juries deciding the justice of the law work? Can different juries just ignore or repeal a law because they don't believe in it? Would this benefit the cause of liberty or harm it? Not everyone on juries will be libertarian minded.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This seems like more standard, comprehensible English.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support this in principle, but the wording seems exhaustively verbose. You really must change it to something more concise and not so ambiguous. Plus, what does the "right" to "life" mean, exactly? Why open that can of worms?
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	good plank, change is correct
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Not sure.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A very small but well-thought change.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The jury's function is decide the case based on the law being applied. Higher courts are in place to decide the justice of the law. Many laws need to be modified or removed.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Better wording this way.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Maybe: "We support payment of restitution to..."

7.0 - Crime and Justice

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	96.8%	3.2%	100.0%
Commenters	77.0%	23.0%	7.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	You have no idea the can of worms you're opening here. Shit happens. Good God, you're all sounding like progressive Dems.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	No comment
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Not clear. Too wordy.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Not to "the fullest degree possible." (Lawsuit settlements are already often too large.)
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	all juries should have the right of nullification. no ifs ands or butts.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think this should be expanded to include the rights of children issue. I think this is a great opportunity for the Party. I am no expert - and I can see it is a difficult to determine issue.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Needs revision
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	to the victim is the thrust, not to any other party.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We need to do away with mandatoty sentencing guidelines/laws.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Third option: restitution for
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	No substantive change. Dubious new grammar.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I cannot support the idea of so called 'hate crimes'. Crime against a certain group should not carry more weight as far as severity of the crime nor sentencing

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The list of rights, as stated here, seems to be meant to be exhaustive. Wording such as, well, "...such as..." would be helpful before "...life, liberty, and justly acquired property...."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I see no need to strike the text you propose deleting. If the Founders had included such a proviso in the Second Ammendment, we wouldn't be in this mess today!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the addition of the new final sentence ,but would prefer the other substitution not be made
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Why would we drop the opposition to registration from this plank?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	keep the red words
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the right to defend my self anywhere! I am in Total opposition to weapon free zones.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Remember your rights don't end at your property line
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Initial statement stronger. Also, revision limits said freedom to Private Property owners. Should I, as a renter, not be afforded the same freedoms as those who own land? I know this is not the intent, but the wording is confusing. Revision not needed.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"there own conditions regarding" is added verbiage and confusing.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Oppose soley for the deletion made, that is one thing in this plank of the Libertarian Party Platform I respect above some others, I do not agree with this deletion.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You should just add the last sentence. This would allow for registration and excessive regulation.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is confusing. What does being a property owner have to do with it??? So people who rent their apartments or houses aren't afforded the same rights?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'm a hardcore libertarian but I'm not an anarchist. I don't see how we can have a plank that opposes even "regulation" of personal defense weapons. Felons can have them? Minors? Definition of "personal defense weapons?"

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Maybe it's the way it's written "Private property owners should be free (to establish their own conditions regarding the possession or use of personal defense weapons on their own property.) I believe people should be free to train with their weapons with other people on their own property. But to 'establish their own conditions' seems wide open. If this for instance is what one might call a 'hate group' and one who was hated were to accidently cross their property unknowingly, their "own conditions regarding the possession or use " might be to shoot at them, kill them, then this is not good behavior and their "conditions" are a danger to others. On the other hand if a government acting on bad and unconstitutional laws, were to cross a persons property with the intent to kill everyone there because they have weapons, then the people have the right to defend themselves as they are Americans. There is a big difference between the 2 circumstances that needs to be recognized and defined.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Suggestion: Libertarians affirm the Second Amendment to keep and bear arms. In this regard, we: (a) believe that the only legitimate use of force is ... (b) believe that property owners should be free (c) oppose the prosecution of individuals.....
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Although I think some of the stricken language should be retained...
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The french case in point they knew all to well how abusive a bad government can be and there needs to be a deterrent to keep the buraeucracy in line
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	No distinction is here mentioned about WMDs and personal defense weapons but I'm not sure that to define the difference here would be wise.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer no change to the last sentence or to just add the new one.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Stay with the original wording. Why should I be limited to bearing arms on my own property? Change "Private property owners" to or "individuals" to "citizens."

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	arguments to counter violence to the english language by re-labeling defense weapons as "assault weapons"?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The right to protect yourself and others shall not be infringed by the local, state or federal government, but we do accept that property owners can make rules restricting weapons on their property.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The Second Amendment only guarantees the "right to keep and bear arms" in the context of maintaining the "security of a free state" for which a MILITIA is necessary. I AGREE with the statement that "private property owners SHOULD BE FREE to establish their own conditions regarding the POSSESSION of personal defense weapons (of ANY kind) on their own property but CARRYING such (DEADLY) weapons should require registration though NOT regulation in PUBLIC places.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Define "transfer of personal defense weapons" in the context of "free to establish their own conditions?" Seriously? That's gonna fly like a lead balloon.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Do you really want to drop explicit opposition to firearms registration?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Possession yes. Use, not necessarily.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There are important elements in the statement being struck out, which out to be retained.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Excellent!
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Should keep the crossed out sentence, but remove "all", and add "except for those on probation for violent crimes".
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Subject to local firearms ordinances.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I agree that eliminating "all" and "any" from the platform is a good idea but I think it is important to stress that we oppose the government restricting the ability of (law-abiding?) people to defend themselves by passing laws requiring the registration of, or restricting, the ownership, manufacture, or transfer or sale of personal defense weapons.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	an Armed society is a Polite and Responsible Society.

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Add a direct reference to the "Castle Doctrine", i.e. the individual is NOT required to 'back down' in self defense. In a threatened situation (as recognized by the VICTIM) we have an inherent right to take assertive action in their own self defense or defense of others 'and their property etc.'
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You should include something about the right to come to the defense of another person you see being threatened, using "personal defense weapons."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the proposed striking and the replacement sentence but I would prefer not to include the addition of the new introduction.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	the way it already is seems much more clear then the revised one.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I am in favor of the addition of the last sentence, "Private property owners...", but I am not in favor of the addition of the first sentence, "Societies are safer...".
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Removing that sentence clouds the issue.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The right to keep and bear arms should not be limited to ones own property.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Perhaps something could be stated regarding government's right to infringe upon liberty of someone who infringes upon their own capability of being responsible when they ingest mind-altering substances such as drugs or alcohol, thus justifying drunk-driving laws, or possession of a weapon while under the influence.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Oppose!!!!!!!!!!!!!! Need to keep that line in there about gov registration of weapons
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Fantastic
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Your change suggests that laws regulating firearms ownership are legitimate and can exist as long as they don't abridge self-defense rights -- but regulations are never legitimate. The second part of the change eliminates the long-standing 100% of the right to own & carry weapons, and turns it into a right allowed in full only "on their own property." Shameful.

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Actually, I support the proposal, but, again, I don't understand why the "We oppose all laws..." sentence was deleted. This is one of the MOST important aspects of our 2nd amendment rights that is being blatantly misused by the goons on Capitol Hill. We must speak clearly to the people about this!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The second amendment does not restrict us to our own property, nor should our plank. The second amendment plainly reads "to keep and bear". This proposal supports the keep part but leaves the weasel language in that justifies the restrictions against bearing. Were it to be changed to "especially on their own property" I would be more inclined to support the altered wording, but the "bear" part when it comes to arms is unjustifiably overlooked.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I think that last sentence will really help appeal to those who disapprove of gun ownership by saying we support their right to keep guns out of their home or business.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support having both sentences. These do not read as either or propositions, having both makes more sense.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	This creates a hypothesis that is arguable and precedes the right of the individual. The right of the individual is not contingent on the argument of the value of the application
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Private property owners should only be allowed to use deadly force if there is reasonable assumption that their life is threatened. New laws allow property owners to pursue and kill mere trespassers--this is wrong.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Excellent
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The addition sentence (at the top) is good. The change (at the bottom) is not so good.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	to the extent that innocent parties are not put at risk. I.e; a kid chasing a stray ball is met with deadly force.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I dislike the first sentence addition, but appreciate the new closing sentence.

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do agree a simple background check to see if a person is a felon should be permitted.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	personally i LIKE the deleted item--MOLON LAVE!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"ownership, possession and transfer" should be "ownership, possession, and transfer" - the last comma is not, or at least ought not be, optional.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	weakly support
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Everyone should have legal access to any one who wants to. An enemy of the State who does not own property should not be denied
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The second amendment is the defender of the rest. why should the government and criminals be the only ones with the guns?
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Amendment 2 was intended to cover military weapons such as an infantryman would carry. Self-defense may be a natural right, but Amendment 2 does not guarantee it.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Don't really need last sentence.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Significantly weakens the plank. Now it could be argued that assault rifles aren't needed for personal defense.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would add after self-defense, "or requiring registration..et al..or ammunition.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This one is not really an either/or type of thing; I like the new language, but the old language should be kept as well.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The Second Amendment is about more than self defense. I do not oppose self defense, just want people to understand the Second Amendment better.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would support the proposal if the last sentence was removed.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I prefer the last sentence remains as it is. I think the new wording of the last sentence appears to limit our second amendment right to our own property instead of how it was originally intended. Also, WMDs are never used in self defense.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Much improved
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Retain markouts - No limits on ownership type or number and continue to oppose mandatory government registration.

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I agree with this statement so I support this but don't really like that it focuses the gun ownership issue solely on self defense. I have a right to own a gun. Period. My reason is not relevant.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"Property", at the end of the last sentence should be plural.!!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Too broad. We support gun ownership, not somebody planting personnel mines on the perimeter of their property. "Personal defense weapons" is crazy talk in the minds of most people.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree in spirit; however, I must oppose; this will never be accepted by the masses. We also must maintain some sort of basic rule of law. It cannot be that each man make his own rule on his own property. Maybe something like it is undeniably just to defend one's property, possessions, and family with just force against any intruder... Although that is still pretty vague.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Keep all of it including the text stricken through.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	With the caveat that the choice of weapons should be reasonably limited to what is necessary for personal self defense of person and property. Individuals should not be allowed to possess nuclear weapons for example.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	While I believe "peaceable" is an unusual word choice, I like that the writers put peace before conflict. If the LP is going to break free of its radical image and establish itself as a legitimate political party, it needs to have policy to support its claims of legitimacy. Steps like this will help provide that foundation.

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't like the first addition -- it does not add much other than extra words. I am conflicted about the second change: it seems clearer and better save for the qualification "on their own property." I see that as a needless limitation. What if I wanted to protect myself on public or another person's property? Unless they specifically forbade me from entering armed, I should be fully empowered regardless of whether I am on my own property or not.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The additions are fine, but I'm not crazy about the deletion. The 2nd amendment says "The individual's right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed" it does not offer any conditions or caveats. If an individual is deemed too dangerous to trust in society then he can be removed from society, but I don't see where the 2nd amendment allows any room for removing this right from an otherwise free individual - even though that is what is currently being done.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Should something be added to the effect that no person shall be required to retreat from aggression until such retreat is no longer possible, that people have the right to assume that an individual or individuals who commit aggressive acts can be considered an immediate threat and armed defense is, therefore, immediately acceptable should the victim or potential victim so choose?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It adds clarity to the Self Defense Plank
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Significant improvement.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I know its semantics, but I am concerned with the term "personal defense weapons." Who decides? The greatest argument against semi-automatic rifles, fully automatic machine guns, etc. is that they are "clearly not for self-defense." I get that you are trying to emphasize that this is about a right of self defense, but it should be MY decision what I use (short of a weapon that will inherently harm innocent others by its proper use).

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I feel this proposed wording goes hand in hand with the concept of personal responsibility, while removing the words I did not care for, registration and restricting.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If you want to allow weapons in bars, then we need a "Carrying while under the influence" law. The "aided by any group" implies the validity of gathering a mob to "defend" against perceived slights by an individual.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The only persons for whom weapons rights should be curtailed are those who have been duly convicted of abuse of a weapon in violent crime. The right of the citizens to protect their nation from outside invasion or inside treason should also be a legitimate use of personal weapons.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Although "manufacture" should probably not be completely excised.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I am not at risk of becoming a victim only while on my own property, so I would disagree with any wording that suggests this is the only place I should possess or be free to use a weapon if in need.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Restricting the right to "personal defense" weapons is too strong. Recall that during the Revolutionary War, crew-served weapons used by the early militia were routinely privately owned.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think it is too much like a debate point that needs research to back it up and was stronger without the edits
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"Private property" here sounds like real estate only. So renters would not be allowed self-defense? Or does "private property" simply mean "property"?
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Who is going to define "personal defense weapons"?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Correct until the last sentence. Individuals cannot be granted unlimited power over life and death at their own discretion (even if on their own property). At least mitigate the wording by adding when protecting their life, liberty or property against criminal felony.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	nice clarification, well done.

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	To long-winded. Keep it simple: "We believe the 2nd amendment right to keep and bear arms." What is the proposal driving at when it says "Societies are safer..."? It sounds like the weapons are for defending ourselves from government.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I'd like to see the following statement left in the plank, but reworded: "We oppose all laws at any level of government requiring registration of, or restricting, the ownership, manufacture, or transfer or sale of firearms or ammunition." Perhaps you could add something to allow for restrictions placed on those convicted of violent crimes? The new final statement about "private property owners..." and the "conditions regarding the...use of personal defense weapons" is needed, but sounds too vague. As currently worded, one could conclude that we would allow for violent crimes on private property as long as the perpetrator has the property owner's permission AND the crimes are committed with the same types of weapons that may be used for personal defense.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I took a gun course. The defense of another knowing them to be innocent and facing emeninate (sp) great harm or death.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Superb, this is by far my favorite change so far. I cannot type how great this change is- and it keeps the essence and message perfectly intact. This change really makes me feel November will be great for the LP.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Approve of the first sentence. Disapprove of the last.

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While I would support the elimination of the crossed out wording; I believe the added wording offer no greater clarity. The first addition makes a certain amount of sense; but I fail to see that the last sentence as helpful in defining anything. The reason I would support the elimination of the crossed phrase is because I do believe that a person who has committed a crime, especially if one involved a firearm or weapon of anykind including an automobile; that restrictions on their future access to such instruments of death are justified.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Unnecessary additions.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The final addition is overbroad, unrealistic, and unsafe. I cannot countenance the idea of hundreds of millions of people conceiving hundreds of millions of different concepts of what constitutes justifiable self-defense of their life, liberty, and property. The existing patchwork of state self-defense laws are unsatisfying and can be confusing, but a libertarian who arms himself in his home has the responsibility to ensure he is aware of the law as it exists in the jurisdiction he resides. If that law is objectionable, he must nevertheless abide it as he seeks to change it (Or relocate). The suggestion here does a disservice to the LP because it does not properly balance the obligation that the LP owes to the political dialogue at large or to the comfort and stability which settled self-defense law provides. Rather, it proposes an even more piecemeal system; rather than 50 such guidelines, it suggests millions of households should have their own guidelines. It is unworkable and unwise.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support it gingerly; I like the stricken sentence for its powerfulness.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	reinsert statement regarding registration
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"Societies are safer" is a justification catering to the left is not needed. The right to self defense does not need to be justified in this manner.

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Maybe add something about preemptive strikes should not be considered defensive
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would keep the statement up to the end of the sentence referencing the Second Amendment. The last two sentences begin to be too specific in my opinion for a platform.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would take out "peaceable" from the first sentence. Who defines what "peaceable" means? That could limit freedom if some government official tinkers with the definition of that word.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Does the adjective well-regulated mean anything to anybody? Private owners are connected by public space, much as one drives from place to place.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I vehemently OPPOSE this proposal. The 2nd Amendment is not just about "self-defense". I'm disappointed and surprised that this has come forward like this. This is the wrong approach, appeasement and backward thinking / groupthink of what people THINK is needed, but really is not needed.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Humans can own and carry weapons wherever they please, subject to the wishes of _other_ private property owners. While any "public" property survives, that right applies there too.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer the deleted language to the proposed last sentence. The deleted language is a much stronger defense of the Second Amendment.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The language : "Private property owners ..." brings the siege at Waco, Texas and the militia fringe with compounds and weapons caches. But maybe that's just me.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think 'aggression' should be more clearly defined, or change it to 'defense...against infringement of rights or property', or similar.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the first change, but not the second. All gun laws are unconstitutional, period. Libertarians should support that view to their fullest.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Just refer to 2nd Amendment and take a neutral stance.

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree with your changes, but can think of abuses such as someone shooting an innocent party for knocking at their door or walking across their lawn.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would also included the language about 'opposing any laws requiring registration....'
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't mind adding the new sentence, but I think you give up a lot by removing the old sentence. It is much clearer in what is expected.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Leave in the sentence, "We oppose all laws at any level of government requiring registration of, or restricting, the ownership, manufacture, or transfer or sale of firearms or ammunition. It is sound and just.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	add new language without striking old.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I see another instance where we are defining "our rights" as "life, liberty, and property". In this case we're qualify said property as "justly acquired". Why do we do this? Do not have any other rights that I need to defend? Secondly, I don't see the proposed wording as limiting the definition of "personal defense weapons" such that WMDs would not be included. What is the rational here. The constitution clearly gives us the right to "bear arms" and it does not define armament. Why should we? Am I free to have a single shot pistol or rifle or can I have a multiple shot weapon that are common today (6 shooter, 15 shooter, semi-automatic, etc). If I allow this, then what is to say that I can't have an Uzi fully automatic assault weapon? We can see how the logic continues from here. I can not see where we would for any "practical" purpose draw a line in the sand.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think that the old wording in red should be retained in addition to the new wording in blue.

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You need to drop this "personal defense weapon" idea. We have the right to own and bear "arms". It's not just about personal defense. It is also about defense against tyranny. A .22 doesn't stand a chance against an M1A1.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I cannot support the ending "Private property..." statement, as it is too open. It would seem to allow my next door neighbor to set up a shooting gallery in his front yard, endangering the neighborhood.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I wholeheartedly support the last sentence. The first sentence, however, seems to be making a claim that is in dispute by gun critics. Is the language "Societies are safer..." necessary? Could we achieve the same effect by simply deleting "Societies are safer when...", then capitalize the article "The" to begin the sentence there?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Private property owners still have neighbors, who get shot at on their private property, by neighbors who are negligent about safety issues and where their bullets go.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Waters down the freedom to manufacture, sell etc.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The proposed change, seemingly, would not give the same privileges, to renters, pertaining to ownership of weapons, as it would to property owners. Where does the Constitution restrict rights, to only property owners ? I have been a property owner, since my middle twenties and now, retired, am considering selling. where would that leave me ?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Very reasonable and realistic.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Fully support.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Pusillanimous silence on the use of deadly force against law enforcement officers committing aggression against innocent cocaine dealers.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Sounded better the firsttime
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the additional text, but would rather have the old text in there
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Somewhat poorly worded. This seems to indicate that only property owners may participate in the Second Amendment.

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It does not go far enough in recognizing the rights granted by the 2nd amendment and should not be limited to only possession on ones own property.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Removing the red sentence is a good move to allow for punishment of criminals with a history of violence etc.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Too vague as to what "weopons" are defined as meaning in this context. Guns - sure. Nukes - not so good an idea.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This seems to open up a can of worms and might be a bit radical--I'm not sure that the "USE of personal defense weapons" on your own property would be safe, as what if you are on a small lot in a residential area...does that mean you can be doing target practice right in your yard? What if you miss and hit a passerby? The wording on USE just seems a little too open and I think would scare some people. Although I completely support gun ownership and self defense rights.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Leave intact what is in red.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I oppose the deletion--don't water down the action items!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the blanket statement better.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is a better wording in support of the right to defend one's life, liberty, and property.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	We need to explicit in restricting the right of any governments to: registration of, or restricting, the ownership, manufacture, or transfer or sale of firearms or ammunition. We see way too many examples of government attempting end runs around the meaning of the second amendment. Keep that exclusion in the plank.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I 90% support this, I liked the old wording too, however "use on their own property" is a bit open - if I live on the 3rd floor of a building, I can't safely target my firearms in such an environment, however I should be able to keep them and use them in need of defense along with being able to freely transport them for targeting, hunting, etc
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The "private property" clause is vague and possibly too restrictive.

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I wish you would have broken this into two questions. I fully support the first addition I however oppose the the second change/addition. The new wording takes the teeth out of the plank and opens it up to interpretation.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Keep the original text plus the new proposed text.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	However, I believe that the stricken line should also be included, because it logically flows into the final line.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Adults should be free to establish their own conditions regarding the possession or use of personal defense weapons on their own property.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the strike through more than the 'possession or use of personal defense weapons'.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It should include language against blanket gun registration.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Would add adult limitation language
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the sentiment of the change, however it is a bit wordy and inaccessible.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Private property owners should be free to establish their own conditions regarding the possession or use of personal defense weapons on their own property...AS PROTECTED BY THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Are you f*cking kidding me? Private Property owners get to take away a person's right to keep and bear arms. Not mine.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	the last sentence needs to be worded better. it should say that . Private property owners should be free to establish their own conditions WITHIN REASON regarding the possession or use of personal defense weapons on their own property.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I feel the original is better, but do support the restriction of ownership to certain individuals who have been convicted of violent crimes

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the change to the last sentence, but I don't like the addition of the introductory statement. The first sentence is an assertion of fact, not of philosophical principle. As libertarians, we would not favor abridgment of 2d amendment freedoms *even if the first sentence were proven to be untrue.*
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Supported but may still be a bit too vague for some.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Last sentence is too broad in a way that would interpret murder as justifiable homicide. Every murder is justifiable to the individual committing it, who has established his/her own conditions regarding use of weapons.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What about people who rent? Hence, the wording the last sentence needs changed to the effect that: the bundle of rights in real property should clearly express the freedom to establish the possession or use of personal defense weapons...or something similar thereto
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I cannot support the right to bear arms for children, seriously mentally ill persons, career criminals, gangs, people with a history of violence and/or threatening comments, and convicted felons.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	2nd amendment does not provide for the categorization or restriction of arms.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Note serial comma issue again - appears after "liberty" in second sentence, but not after "possession" in (proposed) first sentence. I will not both commenting on this again.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Should keep the part in there about opposing registration, that ALWAYS eventually becomes a confiscation! The government is NOT supposed to be keeping these kinds of records!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	do not strike the opposition statement.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I could support this more if we kept the red language intact, with a slight rewording along the lines of "...manufacture, transfer, or sale of personal defense weapons or ammunition."

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Only on their property? What about the protection of your person when not on your property. What about reasonable defense and protection of your person and your family or friends when you are away from home on business or any other situation?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Not quite there. A person has the right to possess and use personal defense weapons ANYWHERE, as long as he uses responsive force. The law recognizes the right of the individual to protect himself and others with pre-emptive force in the face of a threat. This plank is actually weaker than existing law. Furthermore, this change does not acknowledge that in general, laws restricting the sale and possession of firearms and ammunition, are unconstitutional.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The new first sentence is good. The change in the last sentence turnss a clear statement into gibberish.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe that the second amendment should be absolute, Right to carry should be extended to all but private residences and should cover knives. The castle doctrine to me is a no brainer. People should not be forced into becoming victims.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Remove "peaceable" from the new first sentence. Even criminals have the right to self-defense. Restore the removed sentence. Keep the new last sentence (although it should be self-evident based on property rights...).
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I want to keep the language about ownership, manufacture and transfer!!! The proposal limits our rights to "personal defense" and "on our own property". Should NOT be limited in that way.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The changes are more legally correct with regard to the meaning of the ideology. Guns should not be FORCED upon people but rather should remain an option should the owner of the property choose.

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Why would we take that sentence out? That's the only sentence above that we need to leave in this plank. Any individual has a legitimate right to own any weapon that is currently maintained in the state's arsenal. If we maintain a standing army to oppose the people, then the people have a right to defend themselves using the very same weapons possessed by the state.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	again it seems unnccary to soften language or position. perhaps a return to the original intent of the 2nd ammendment would be preferred; the right of citizens through personal ownership to equal power with the state. this would mean that Ted Nugent (for example only) could own a nuke until the state does not and preserves the power of the citizenry to overthrow (and reestablish) the government (as contitutionally mandated) as the action may become needed. since any state must retain some (defensive action) military power (though not needfully standing) this would also affirm the rights of conscientious objectors
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I strongly oppose restriction of means to self defense.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree with it except for the last line. The last line gives the impression that we only support "real estate" owners. I recommend the following or similar wording as a last line for this amendment: "Citizens and legal residents should be free to establish their own conditions regarding the possession or use of personal defense weapons on their own property which would include their motor vehicle or other personally owned mode of transportation."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I generally support this, however, I would not eliminate the second to last sentence. The additional language adds meat the the second to last sentence.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Why limit these rights to "on their own property?"

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would strike the old last sentence, but I'm not sure what the new last sentence is giving us permission to do.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This doesn't seem to address the right to carry personal defense weapons when not at ones residence.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer the more explicit and forceful language of the original plank.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I oppose this suggested change for one reason only: I do not think we should remove the sentence that declares our opposition to governmental requirements on registration. I like the idea of adding the two new sentences, but I am strongly opposed to the removal of the other sentences. If you want to truncate the other sentence to read, "We oppose all laws at any level of government requiring firearm registration," I could accept that, but no matter how we slice it, the term "registration" or "register" should remain in the plank.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would rather the first proposed change read "The rights of peaceable individuals should not be abridged by laws prohibiting the ownership, possession and transfer of weapons." "Societies are safer when" is an unnecessary judgement. "Self-defense" may unintentionally limit "agree to be aided" or obscure hunting use for self or group preservation. A due process of checks and balances are achieved if "or regulating" and both insertions of "personal defense" is dropped and "aided by any other individual or group" is maintained. This would allow the regulated use of a weapon by a group of peaceable individuals. This would include weapon hardware that can only be operated by more than one person. The wording as proposed would inhibit the preparedness of individuals agreeing to be aided by other individuals in rebellion against foreign or domestic tyrants. I want civilian groups to have access to modern weaponry, but also to be as regulated as any other similar military group.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Clarifies our position well. I fully support this change.

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Prefer this: Private property owners should be free to establish their own conditions regarding the possession or use of defense weapons on their own property.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I do not agree with striking the second-to-last sentence. The additions are fine.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do not believe that convicted felons should be permitted the right of weapon ownership. Do you oppose all laws at any level of government that regulate or restrict the ownership of automobiles? They are less likely to be used to deliberately injure or kill another person than a gun would be.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This on the whole guts the entire stance of the LP against the state's many very restrictive gun laws. I don't think this adds anything and takes away strength of the position.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Keep the original.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	WMDs don't count as defensive weapons, Ok
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Plain and simple.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	In part- I would prefer to keep language that calls for deregulation on the sale and ownership of weapons.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is outrageous. The proposal makes it seem as if you can own an use a firearm on your own property. The original wording is much better.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Added last sentence needs removed. Too vague, and irrelevant to the main point. What about manufacturing or me setting up a target range in my inner-city back yard and shooting at all hours of the night? Too special interest, by whomever suggested it IMO.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	This proposal begins the plank with an appeal to *safety*, not freedom. Bad change. It also strikes out the clear libertarian language that "We oppose all laws at any level of government requiring registration of, or restricting, the ownership, manufacture, or transfer or sale of firearms or ammunition" and replaces it with weaker language that refers only to property owners and only to "personal defense weapons".

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I oppose the last sentence because it's a "License to kill" when lethal force cannot always be justifiable. A person does not have the right to kill someone that presents no personal threat and might be "stealing a lawnmower" from the front yard. There has to be a limit on when lethal force is appropriate.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the added text, but think the stricken text should be retained also.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	the added sentences are fine, but the strikethrough is awful.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Needs to be expanded beyond private property ownership and on your own property.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the statement of private property rights, but oppose the removal of opposition to gun control laws.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It is a mistake to hedge on the Second Amendment. Assuming lawful individuals do not initiate the use of force all weapons are defensive. Defining some as 'WMD' is a slippery slope not to be started down.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Don't delete any of the old; just add the new.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i would prefer both lines
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I support the first part: Societies are safer when the self-defense rights of peaceable individuals are not abridged by laws prohibiting or regulating the ownership, possession and transfer of personal defense weapons. I oppose the last part: Private property owners should be free to establish their own conditions regarding the possession or use of personal defense weapons on their own property.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The positive tone works for me.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	This plank should be toned down to broaden its appeal. Lots of people out there are afraid of guns. Let's not risk discarding them from membership.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would love to see that this explicitly applies to adult citizens.

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	limiting the property rights of individuals wishing to defend themselves extends far beyond the boundaries of their OWN Property. It is necessarily the responsibility of the other party; e.g. movie theatre etc... to limit the possession of personal defense devices in their respective establishments. They must also bear the responsibility of those individuals harmed in their establishments due to their prohibitions.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Good work.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i like the we oppose language would not be opposed to the the change as long as it still opposed restrictions or registration.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'm not sure that the first statement is a widely accepted fact, and therefore, I think we would either need to support it with evidence or remove it. In addition, these are intended to be a statement of the Libertarian position not persuasion. In prior examples we supported our claims by saying that they align with American values, which can also be taken as persuasive, but actually, they are more of a clarification on why we have adopted a position that aligns with the Libertarian principle of promoting liberty. I think that this is covered in the sentence which mentions the Second Amendment. I also do not support the claim that individuals should be allowed to establish their own conditions with regard to the use of weapons on their own property. If that were the case, an individual who trespasses, even by accident can be shot on sight by the landowner without repercussion. In my opinion, the government should try to prevent the use of excessive force where possible. If unthreatened, use of defense weapons should not be permitted. I agree though, that the line in red should be removed
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I like the first sentence of the proposal, but not the second part. Move to separate the question.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Doesn't this nullify the right to carry in public and isn't this a great victory for the anti-gun lobby?

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I strongly oppose this self-defense proposal. Second Amendment groups in Arkansas are now fighting for the right to store firearms in their vehicles while working. Current laws not allowing them to do so keeps them from being able to protect their lives and exercise their Second Amendment rights while traveling to and from their jobs. Also, adult students are not allowed to store firearms in their vehicles while attending universities. Both of these conditions are made worse during night-time activities. The private property rights should include the property rights of vehicles.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Sentence 1: a conclusion without evidence and unnecessary to the defense of the freedom to bear arms. The proposed new last sentence sounds vague and weird.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Keep the stricken portion, add the proposal in blue.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think this proposal is best implemented by including both the versions together.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i feel that the portion in red should be left in.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Basically, YES to this proposal... HOWEVER, as a RENTER am i also the "owner" of the property i am giving care to, or stewarding? Does the otherwise nice last sentence legally cover me? What about apartment dwellers? Would this mean that property owners would have the determining power to govern those to whom are renters in regards to possession or use of personal defense weapons on that property? Is there being created a new class of slaves? How about substituting "Legal tenders of private property should be free to..." as the beginning of this last sentence; and end the sentence with "...on their private property."

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This language is not strong enough. It should specify that Libertarians oppose the creation of endless laws that restrict gun possession, carry, transport, style, form, capacity, gun free zones, and all manner of designed to make ownership of guns onerous and impractical.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The proposed change is too confusing and not needed.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The additional material is acceptable, but the eliminated material is the most important phrase of the platform of defense.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Private property owners do not have the right to infringe on self-defense rights of those who enter public-access private property.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	In some cases, it will be necessary for a jury to decide whether an action constitutes "self-defense." I do not oppose the prosecution of individuals for exercising their right of self-defense. Such prosecutions are necessary to prevent abuse of this right and to define limits of its application.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Of course private property owners have the right to decide whether or not people are allowed to possess weapons on their property. The problems lie in the fact that governments claim ownership over "public property". I'd prefer the plank to read: "Societies are safer when the self-defense rights of peaceable individuals are not abridged by laws prohibiting or regulating the ownership, possession and transfer of personal defense weapons. The only legitimate use of force is in defense of individual rights — life, liberty, and justly acquired property — against aggression. This right inheres in the individual, who may agree to be aided by any other individual or group. We affirm the individual right recognized by the Second Amendment to keep and bear arms, and oppose the prosecution of individuals for exercising their rights of self-defense."

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I begrudgingly support....I think "personal defense weapon" needs to be better defined, but these statements still improve the plank.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The revised proposal should keep the original wording, in addition to the new sentence at the end.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Messy. Also sounds as if only property owners (as in real estate) have a right to own weapons for personal protection.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Could be simplified: "All individuals have the Natural Right to defend their lives and property using the most efficient means they can afford; and all who use force to defend their lives and property are liable for any mistakes they make.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The additions are good, but keep the statement that is struck out also.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe there is room for both statements.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do not see the need for the first sentence here. This is just re-affirming the second ammendment of the US Constitution. It should be apparent that our forefathers left us with the right of self defense against criminals to include those in Washington, DC. In the third sentence above, the word inhere I think would be better struck and remains placed where inhere is. This would make it clearer to those of us not from academia. I see no reason for the final sentence either. This position should be apparent to any and all that care.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would support this proposal if you add the words " or any type of Marshal Arts" The proposed second sentence needs to be removed. I think the national platform should be written only for the federal level.

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Another case where (for the last sentence) the wording is drifting from the specific and concrete to categories. It may be necessary, yet it does require people to think more carefully. "Guns" beats "firearms" as the former is one syllable and the latter two. "Firearms" beats "personal defense weapons" at two syllables vs. seven. No question that the latter is more accurate... just that it isn't going to be remembered nor spoken anywhere near as often. Fewer syllables always wins in the long run (so has been my finding over my lifetime).
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	No problem with the additions, but leave the portion that is marked to be deleted.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The problem with public policy and guns is that groups attempt to create a one-size-fits-all policy for the country, which doesn't work. The constitution supports the private property of a gun; though who can purchase one should remain up to municipal governments. Some areas without a doubt have issues of violence that are directly correlated with gun ownership; this is an academically proven fact. However, there are some areas that do not serious gun issues and should not be subject to the same laws that police those violence-stricken areas; rural areas with hunting industries are a good example of this. People should have the right to bear arms, but under certain policies to be adopted by municipal governments that is fitting to their weapons culture.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Support all of this, except the requirement to register weapons. I think all owners should be required to register their weapons, both as crime-prevention measure, and a crime-investigation tool.

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I propose: The only legit..use of force is in defense of individual rights. This right inheres in the individual, who.... The listing of rights may not be needed... An alternative would be to include "against aggression"is in defense of individual rights against aggression. The repetition of the word "rights" is more poetic so the next sentence follows easier...
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Stating property owners leaves out renters or visitors lawfully present on a propeerty. Only naming personal defense weapons narrows the intent and gun grabbers focus on things that seperate classes of gun owners ie, hunters, target shooters or self defense
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I support the new language, but I don't support striking existing language.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I agree with the addition, and think it to be a VERY valuable piece of information far too often left out of the gun debate. However, I STRONGLY dissagree with the deletion. I am adamitly opposed - as all Libertarians should be - to registration, and gun owner databases!!!! As to the issue of the silly Bush-ism "WMD's", if it is true libertarianism holds that all men are created equal, then either the government cannot own certain weapons, or the people can. This debate will not be resolved in an hour or two at a convention, and unless and until we all agree as to which it will be, this plank will never pass...
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The proposal neglects the fact that 40% of the population rents and doesn't own the property they dwell in.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	also, there should be mention of allowing states to set some rules

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe that the proposed (new) last sentence is heading in the right direction, but needs clarified or reworded a bit. On initial reading, it gave me the impression that, as a property owner, I could (for example) "establish [my] own condition" that anyone who set foot on my property for whatever reason could be shot at-will with my "personal defense weapon". I'm sure that's not the intent of the language, but that's how it read to me.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the change, but wonder if that last phrase "...on their own property." is necessary.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, do not remove the struck through language, but rather blend to give a more fuller view.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is much better but it should not be limited to private property. Children should not be bringing weapons to school. As a parent, I ought to be able to have my kids attend a college that does not permit weapons on campus or vice versa. Personally I am in the former camp, but I recognize and respect that other people feel differently about this.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Certain knives are illegal in NY, CA and likely other places I don't know about. Why not include swithcblades and tasers in so many words? Yeah, it's implied, I guess.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There should be no restrictions on the right of free people to own firearms. Also, the safe use of these weapons should be encouraged to promote a safer public environment.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There should be rights to bear arms, but the process should be regulated so that safeguards are in place to help insure or at least minimize the ability of felons with a histry of abusing the right to bear arms or those who have a medical history which makes owning a weapon a serious risk to the general public.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i like the deleted language
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This makes the plank a bit more palatable to the squeamish. What part of "infringe" do they fail to understand?

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All	
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%	
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%	
Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	not something I've studied. I do know that those who intend to commit crimes often go to great lengths to conceal the source of their weapons. Registering weapons will have little effect on this. I do support a "cooling off period" with regard to purchases though.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	My home is my castle.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Why strike-put the "oppose all laws..." phrase? I think we should keep it and still add the last sentence for clarification and emphasis
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"...their own conditions...." This leaves me a bit confused. What might "their own conditions" imply? Could this be clarified a bit.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think you should keep the red part in. It's more specific. We need to be very specific about the things we want so there won't be any misunderstandings.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i do like the directness of the original sentence, though..."oppose all laws, etc". there is no wiggle room. it seems that some levels of gov't are after ammunition, rather than 'guns', per se [even the epa is in on it] so maybe some of that language can remain.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Everyone (by the 2nd Amendment) is free to possess personal defense weapons. We should just strongly support the (existing) rights of 2nd Amendment. The Supreme Court has ruled such in cases brought before it (yet certain jurisdictions continue to violate the Constitution). Property owners are not free to chose their own conditions in violation of the 2nd amendment. They are free to chose to exercise those rights.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	readability is greater in current version
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	First sentence (inserted) and fifth sentence (deleted): while this inserted statement may be true, it is not as strong or as straightforward as the deleted statement, which could be revised to read "or sale of personal defense weapons or ammunition".

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Getting close, but we need language that plainly states we oppose gun control laws. period. not just that "societies are safer when..." Keep that, but let's not lose the plain language. The last new sentence is fine to keep. Good idea.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would support it if the first sentence were removed. It is a weak beginning, and we do not need to defend the right of self-defense.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't think I've ever seen the word "inheres". I suggest using another word with the same legal meaning. If lawyers don't have another word that fits, I'm ok with inheres.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would prefer that the sentence proposed to be removed would instead, remain with a slight rewording to read as follows: "We oppose all laws at any level of government requiring the registration or restriction of ownership, manufacture, transfer or sale of firearms or ammunition between those who have not abused this right by intentionally killing or maiming another person unjustly." This provides the strong 2nd amendment stance while creating a qualifier for what is meant by "all" and "any".
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The new language at the end is too ambiguous. And while you reference in your comments wanting to leave room for restricting the rights of persons known to be violent, I don't feel that you've accomplished that here.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I would support the new language, but oppose the deletion of the original last sentence.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Perhaps add "responsibility" - Private property owners should be free to assume responsibility for, and establish their own conditions regarding the possession or use of personal defense weapons on their own property.

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Personal defense weapons doesn't sound as though I could own a crew served weapon, i.e. machine gun, long range rifle, etc. Remember, defense of individual rights was important during our founding of the nation, but so was the aggressive action necessary to overthrow a tyranny. Military weapons are as important for the individual to own as are personal defense weapons if you take in consideration the possibility of national defense (militia) against a foreign or domestic enemy. Keep and bear arms says it all.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Add a serial comma after possession. If needed add to the platform: The King's English being indispensable to the clear expression of our liberty, the serial comma is sacred.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	good. Make sure that people also know for sure that since the only legitimate use of force is self-defense, offensive force is not to be tolerated
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	In my view, the last sentence directly contradicts the first sentence. While I respect the rights of private property owners to use their properties as they see fit, I see no reason to grant them a right to search visitors for contraband.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	That societies are safer is irrelevant. The second change is an obfuscation.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	OK but I would leave in the deleted words.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i still favor expressing the direct fact that we oppose laws restricting the use of weapons....the first statement says this in a more subtle way.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I find the second revision confusing. Perhaps it would be better said, "possession or use for personal defense.." Otherwise one might think setting up your own gun range in your backyard could be acceptable. Lead is environmentally unfriendly.

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do not have an issue with the addition to the beginning but the change to the end of the paragraph I find to be be vague. I think the last sentence as it is better expresses the idea which is trying to be expressed. Perhaps simply adding "and other defense weapon" would accomplish this goal.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There's no need to delete what is suggested for deletion; but what is proposed to be added is fine.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Good but keep the struck portion also.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The 2nd Amendment gives us the right to bear arms & so one who has property already has established their own conditions. No need to add words that are redundant or can be misconstrued by another party.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Leave the red sentence too.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The added sentences are fine - HOWEVER - the statement that we oppose all laws at any level of government is a critical statement.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	In regards to the part being proposed to be omitted, what will it lead to?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Adding the first sentence is a terrible change. It dilutes the true principle - there is only one principle, really, which is that individuals must be permitted to do anything that they like except initiate force against others. Otherwise the proposal is fine.

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The new sentence should be the third, not the first. Amend the current third sentence to: "We affirm that under the present Constitution and Bill of Rights, the individual right recognized by the Second Amendment . . ." Once again the language presupposes some form of external government, rather than SELF-government. And it would help to also clarify that "personal defense weapons" do not include anything other than what you mentioned in your introduction to this proposal. Why didn't you include it? Clarification is key. Leaving that key unaddressed in this proposal begs the question of logical conclusion: who can say what a "personal defense weapon" is? If an individual REALLY wants to lay down a perimeter for his "personal defense," why shouldn't he have and use WMDs?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Inappropriate to include "use" -- courts must be able to evaluate whether a particular instance of use of force was in fact defensive.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Like the proposal except for the addition of the starting sentence.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I think the existing language is stronger and therefore better. The main message we need to convey is the idea that free people do not have to ask permission to do things such as defend themselves, nor do they have to ask permission what tools to be allowed to use for that self defense.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Keep the sentence in red. Add the new sentence.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I love the first new addition but don't see the reason for the second. The line in red is a semi-arrogant statement but the suggested replacement is not much better (and only raises questions). Isn't the whole thing settled with affirming "the individual right recognized by the Second Amendment to keep and bear arms, and oppose the prosecution of individuals for exercising their rights of self-defense."? Less is more in this case.

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	We must also restrict the right of governments to require firearms registration since a totalitarian government could then easily confiscate our weapons of self defense. See the Federalist papers and Nazi history.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	As a woman, I think it is extremely important that all women be able to carry some sort of personal defense weapon, especially in the context of being at a place that serves alcohol- she should be armed with something to protect against sexual assault. I support the first half, but oppose the last part about private property owners being free to establish their own conditions about personal defense weapons. I feel the same about men- they should be armed in case of a mugging or some other common attack they may face when walking alone at night or in a bad neighborhood. If either a man or woman has to walk home, or stand outside for a while at night, possibly inebriated, s/he is exposed to a possible attack and must have their weapon with them. Also, if the attack is to happen inside the private establishment, s/he should be able to reasonably defend themselves there.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer leaving in the words RE: opposing all laws, etc.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the initial text best.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I suggest that the deleted sentence be retained, but substituting personal defense weapons for the reference to firearms. I am also concerned that the reference to regulating weapons on their own property is limiting and doesn't contemplate the freedom to possess or use PDWs on "public" property.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the changes of the last paragraph but not the first. It is an unclear and unnecessary addition.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Perfect.

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Not sure that the assertion "Societies are safer when ..." can be defended. Also whether property owners can deny their employees weapons in their parked cars on company property is being contested by the NRA.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	remove "societies are safer" and the rest is good. "The self-defense rights ...should not be abridged..."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	the last sentence is awkward.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	new language is ok but don't take out the red line It's fundamental and constitutional. Considering the tenor of the times. We may need every weapon to defend ourselves as "terrorists". aka Syria
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Change "Private property owners should be free to establish their own conditions regarding the possession or use of personal defense weapons on their own property." to "Owners should establish conditions regarding possession and/or use of weapons on their own property."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't see how the last sentence is an appropriate rewrite. It makes a good point, but I don't think the term 'conditions' goes into enough detail regarding the rights of people to personal defense weapons. I think it would be wise to keep "registration of, or restricting, the ownership, manufacture, or transfer or sale of". If anything, the rewritten sentence should be included along with the previously existing one, and small changes to the previously existing one should be made (such as clarifying that 'all' or 'any' does not apply to those with a history of using their weapons to harm others, and using 'personal defense weapons' in place of 'firearms or ammunition').
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would not remove the part about prohibiting government from messing with the right to arms.

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do not see the need to eliminate the "We oppose all laws..." sentence. It is not in conflict with the "Private property owners..." one. I would consider changing the lead of that sentence to be "Owners of private property". I think it reads better and emphasizes the person over the thing.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Personally, I don't believe this amendment goes far enough. The government should have no right to "tie the hands of the law-abiding citizen." All laws requiring registration of any firearm, ammunition, or the carry of a firearm be it concealed or open, should be abolished.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	That last sentence makes the issue a free-to-interpret-my-way-so-screw-you concept. I used to be opposed to registration. But, I find useful in case the weapon is stolen. It won't get my gun back in most cases, but at least its on the wire.
Support Oppose	Likely Likely	No No	Non-Member Non-Member	totally against registration Too unyielding. "Transfer of personal defense weapons" is problematic. Have to define who the transfer is going to otherwise seems unreasonable. Also cannot support the right of a "private property owners . . . to establish their own conditions" with regard to personal defense weapons. Premise liability established in the common law is against this. It should be set at a reasonable standard. Allow private property owners to establish their own conditions but hedge this statement by what is reasonable at the least.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	registration probably is a good idea, prevents premeditated crimes. i don't like "who may agree to be aided by any other individual or group" it sounds like you are expecting to have to bear arms, however organizing is a good thing and the govt currently may not like that armed coalitions are being formed, but this is a good thing. What about including the right to organize in terms of self defense?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I am uncomfortable as written but would support it.

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Although "inhere" is a perfectly good verb, I would prefer the more common style of "is inherent." Secondly, the new last sentence restricts possession and use OFF one's own property--big mistake!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	agree to change in the last sentence as long as the private property owners accept the responsibility/consequences of the use or misuse of the weapons allowed.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Consider whether "peaceful" might read better than "peaceable."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The Constitution is enough. You are saying too much and giving every tin horn, shingle swinging shyster lawyer from New York to San Francisco too many "loop holes" on which to hang tort law cases. The U.S. Constitution is quite clear on this point in the Second Amendment, "A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed." What more needs to be said than "the the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."? That is an absolute statement. This was used by the Founding Fathers because it is not conditional language and there is no hook upon which a tyrannical ruler like President Clinton or President Obama may leverage argument to support any restriction on self defense. The first part of the Second Amendment gives individual states the right to regulate their militia. The second part of the Second Amendment empowers Sovereign Citizens to keep and bear arms for their own self defense and use of such weapons and Sovereign Citizens during time of war or natio
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Just as a comment: Should there be any wording against convicted felons owning certain classes of weapons?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	a watering down. Keep the part you want to get rid of
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't see how the new sentence even applies to the deleted sentence. Perhaps the deleted sentence should be included, with some modifiers.

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would consider keeping the sentence that is to be removed.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I like "oppose all laws at any level of government..." much better. But you could add that last sentence to then end and I would be OK - but I oppose taking out the opposition statement.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The omission should be retained, but replace 'firearms and ammunition' with 'personal defense weapons' for consistency.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the opening and stricken sentences. Why remove the stricken sentence? The closing sentence seems clumsy and over reaching.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	1) I just don't like the wording of the first addition -- just seems clumsy. Something like "Societies are safer when the RIGHTS OF PEACEABLE INDIVIDUALS TO DEFEND THEMSELVES, THEIR FAMILY AND THEIR POSSESSIONS are not abridged ..." 2) I don't like the specification of "private property owners" and "their own property." This seem to imply that people who RENT aren't included. In fact, it implies that we believe that apartment owners could set their own "rules" for their renters as to weapons ownership, and businesses could impose their own bans on customers. Don't we believe that we have the right to defend ourselves, regardless of where we are?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Modify "...This right inheres in the individual..." to "This right remains with the individual, ...".
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The stricken sentence should be left in.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	existing verbiage is better
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is a really good change; well done.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would add the BLUE sentences, but do NOT delete the RED sentence, keep it there..
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	it doesn't seem to consider that one would use it in a criminal manner if it doesn't state in the sentence that it would be in accordance with defense on ones property.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Well done.

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Add the last sentence but don't delete the other one. Keep them both.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	To me the phrase "private property owners" brings forth more questions than answers.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	OK now you look like you're catering to the anti-gunners here? I guess the free market will decide?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Keep addition, and delete nothing. Reword as: The only legitimate use of force is in defense of individual rights — life, liberty, and justly acquired property — against aggression. This right inheres in the individual, who may agree to be aided by any other individual or group. We affirm the individual right recognized by the Second Amendment to keep and bear arms, and oppose the prosecution of individuals for exercising their rights of self-defense. Societies are safer when the self-defense rights of peaceable individuals are not abridged by laws prohibiting or regulating the ownership, possession and transfer of personal defense weapons. We oppose all laws at any level of government requiring registration of, or restricting, the ownership, manufacture, or transfer or sale of firearms or ammunition. Private property owners should be free to establish their own conditions regarding the possession or use of personal defense weapons on their own property.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I support the additional sentences but I strongly oppose the deletion.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The preamble is great, but I don't see a reason for the last sentence. I'd rather see the stricken sentence rewritten instead of removed. Some reference to that concept is important to me. Government must not be used to restrict the individual right to self defense.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We need to assert that all levels of government have no right to require registration or permits for firearms.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There should be language specific to firearms since they are the most likely to be restricted.

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	If we understand the premises of life, liberty, property and, voluntary association...most of this is self-evident. I personally have trouble in overdoing it.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	...rights--threats to life, etc. I believe that new last sentence could become a thorny issue.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Suggest we keep the existing last sentence, but append to it, "...by citizens, except in cases where violent criminal history or diminished mental capability necessitate such restrictions.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	opposition to laws requiring registration of or restricting should not be removed from this plank
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Very wrong. Government needs to stay out of the ownership of weapons area. And private property owners who do business with the public have (whether they know it or not) granted the public an easement to come onto their property to do business. The public should not be required to give up any rights to conduct business. Business owners in non-public contact businesses don't have responsibility to protect employees against criminal attack, so they can't have leave to deny them realistic self-defense.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Except to the extent that an AK-47 is not a good weapon fore home defense.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	must stress the need for opposing registration, the first step towards confiscation
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The first addition weakens this plank. Second ammendments rights were added to the Bill of Rights guarantee a defense from obtrusive government, not so we can protect ourselves from our neighbors. I like the sentence that is to be removed. It is clear, unambiguous, and does not necessarily mean everyone can have a nuke in their basment. I do like the second addiion to this plank. It adds the idea that private property rights override the right to "bear arms". That's very good.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Please find another term to replace "inheres".

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Memberwith reservations. The last line starting with "Private property owners....." confuses me because it should not just be private property owners who have second amendment rights. Renters, and yes even full time RVers should have those same rights. That last line really confused me. I would prefer this: People should be free to establish their own conditions regarding the possession or use of personal defense weapons in defense of themselves, family and their property." As it reads now in that last sentence a person could establish a shooting range in his backyard endangering his neighbors and traffic.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Leave the red crossed out line in 1.6 Self-Defence
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	In the stricken sentence, why not simply replace "firearms and ammunition" with "personal defense weapons"? your comment about juries makes no sense. Juries can't invent new laws, that's not part of their function. Otherwise they could abridge First Amendment freedoms, for example.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I only support the first sentence and the last sentence, but not the deletion.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	This is too long and cumbersome. The original isn't much better. "We support the Second Amendment and believe it is personal right to bear arms in the defense of one's freedom and liberty. It is wrong to take up arms as a means of forcing others to do you bidding, and this applies to both people and governments."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would end it at individuals for exercising their rights of self defense. I would abandon everything that comes after both the current and proposed.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Glad the one clause was deleted. Wouldn't want to see LP support something so broad as "Oppose All Laws, etc.." . Felons or mentally unstable shouldn't have guns. There are laws against gun ownership by certain individuals/groups which have merit.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	retain objection to registration, otherwise support.

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The previous language was too restrictive, and the proposed language, especially the second addition, is more explicitly supportive of individual rights.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Leave the stricken line in, add the proposed changes.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"inheres"?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	These statements don't enhance the plank.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Does this last sentence permit a property owner to shoot with impunity a mere trespasser? Seems terribly broad.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The last sentence is too cryptic. If it is meant to be a replacement for the previous last sentence, it isn't clear. The new first sentence is good.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	WHAT ABOUT THE PERSONAL USE "OFF" YOUR PROPERTY? I'D LEAVE IN THE STRICKEN SENTENCE AND USE THE NEW SENTENCES AS WELL.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I've never been a fan of the Libertarian stance on gun ownership. It goes over the top and makes the party sound like a bunch of backwoods, apocalyptic loons.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	too broad use of firearms
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	People can be long-term renters. And still need the right to establish their own conditions.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This proposal contains a loophole, though - if a person has a right to weapons on their own property, do they not have a right to transport the weapon through public property, i.e., driving in a car or shipping in the mail, to get it to their property? If it is illegal to drive a gun from the store to the private home, it is essentially illegal to own - the language should provide for this. I think there should be language in here that no Federal or International law may restrict firearm ownership - i.e., it is up to each State.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the first sentence, just not the last. "on their own property" is the part I reject.

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Why would you water this down? Completely oppose, just add or "other traditional personal defense weapons" to the existing. What if the courts define "personal defense weapons" to only include bats? Just thinking...
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I disagree that private property owners....who hold out their property to the public, should restrict ones personal use of a firearm. Your private property line ends at my clothing. YOU dont have right to what is under my clothing, even if I am in your store. If you wish to have a PRIVATE store, in which the public at large is NOT allowed in, then fine. But to hold out to the public your business....then your property lines ends at my clothing. I am not your possession in your store. The same is true for "public" property. Whether it be a post office, city hall, or street or sidewalk. Imagine....if a city decided that sidewalk easements and roads were not to allow weapons? Then the "bearing of arms" is sidelined by a legal loophole.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I feel the current line should be kept as is
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The original wording is clearer and more likely to gain widespread support
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	what about mentally ill/dangerous people
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would support more with the new text AND w/o striking the original text.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I like the first addition, but I don't understand why the (current) last sentence needs to be struck.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Well said, except the word "inheres" is not everyday English.

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The original text is much stronger, the secondary text does not say anything other than rehash what was previously said. The fact that Libertarians oppose any laws requiring the registration of, or restriction of ownership, manufacture, or transfer of sale of firearms or ammunition is a key point of being a Libertarian in many of our members. However, I would suggest that a provision be added that would say something about the right to bear arms being stripped of those who were convicted of certain violent crimes. I don't think any Libertarian has any problem with taking guns from convicted felons of violent crimes. However, taking the 2nd Amendment from a felon who was say convicted of fraud or other white collar crimes should be looked at on a case by case basis instead of blanket assumption.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support this proposal, but I prefer the original last sentence ('we oppose all laws...').
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Original wording is more clear concise and unambiguous.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	delete the phrase "and justly acquired property" . That is a matter for courts, not guns.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"Shall not be infringed" mean what it says. Registration inevitably means confiscation.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Still seems to leave questions or be open ended. I like the first sentence in red better
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	do we support the right of individuals to own nuclear arms
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	added on to the last sentences should be a condition "so long as such possession or manner of possession doesn't inherently violate or threaten to violate the rights of others" . or something similar.

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I oppose deleting the language proposed. The 4th amendment is not a right of self-defense against burglars etc.: it is a right to remain prepared and able to make an armed revolution against the government, if citizens believe it warranted. Seems a bit anachronistic today, yet that's what it was for, 200 years ago.
Support Oppose	Unlikely Unlikely	No No	Non-Member Non-Member	But I prefer the original final sentence. I don't get this sentence: "This right inheres in the individual, who may agree to be aided by any other individual or group." Does the last sentence suggest that you feel private property owners should be free to say Yes OR No to guns on their property? Just curious....
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This allows each property owner to become a "lawless" area governed by their own rules, even if they are ridiculous. This could allow property owners to bring others to harm on their property due to negligence or extremism. We all live under the government and society. There have to be some "universal" rules for us to live by, so allowing the property owner shouldn't be allowed to do whatever they want and "invisible" to the rest of society or even visitors.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Although a landlord may be more flexible than various levels of government, this would open a door to remove weapons from those who truly need them for self defense.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Self defense is a natural right, but in addition to self defense there is the need to defend against a tyrannical government. Knowing the weapons and firepower available to our military, all the weapons I currently own seem rather inadequate for this pupose.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	citizens should be allowed to possess any weapon that the government has, leveling the playing field in the event of a revolution
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It's not as plain, but it does allow a broader scope while reiterating the idea of "private" in private property.
Support Support	Unlikely Unlikely	No No	Non-Member Non-Member	Keep the old and add the new. this is pretty brave.

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Not definitive and specific enough.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer the marked out sentence over the following one. The first is fine.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think protection from restriction of use of any TECHNOLOGY is the more important issue here. The isolation of "weapons" is very UNNEEDED.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The sentence regarding registration should be left in. Registration is the first step to confiscation. Further they're should be language opposing any sort of lisencing of weapons.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	why am I restricted to self defense on only my own property?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Strongly.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The American Revolution was not conducted by entirely peaceable individuals. While self defense should not be denied, neither should the right to overthrow an illegitimate government.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	#NAME?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would like to see the opposition of registration line left in the proposal.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This seems to limit where you can defend yourself to only on your property. I may be misunderstanding the term property.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree with this, but there should be reasonable terms of use requirements, i.e. distance from other homes/businesses or public roads, etc. We are not all ballistics experts and may not know how far a bullet will travel...I am a shooter and do not necessarily know how far my bullet will travel or in some cases what buildings are within 3 miles.

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe this should be kept, "We oppose all laws at any level of government requiring registration of, or restricting, the ownership, manufacture, or transfer or sale of firearms or ammunition." I don't understand why you would want to leave room for juries to restrict weapons rights of those with a history of using them to harm others. Restricting the rights of an individual is not an option, if a person is deemed to dangerous for society why should they be allowed to exist in that society? If a person is allowed to exist in society they should have the right to self-defense. Leaving room for limiting legislation actually further limits the rights of the average citizen, for example: right now I have to register my firearms, one reason for that is to prevent the sale of firearms to "dangerous individuals". I do support the proposed additional language.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I have no issue with registraton of weapons, so I like that that wording is removed
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The changes are good; however, I would not strike the statement of opposition to firearm-restriction laws. The new opening statement alludes to this position, but it's weak.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Both of the examples should be included, leaving no doubt about the intrusion of govt, into an individual's liberties. Any govt. interference / intrusion in Constitutional freedom is wrong.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The original writing was better especially in light of the fact the government now owns an inordinate amount of "private property" though call it "public lands"
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	As written, the amended plank supports bans on public carrying of weapons. There has already been a case in which a local government banned weapons except in the person's own home, a severe restriction of the freedom to practice the right to self-defense. Persons have the right to self-defense in any and all places, not just their homes.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The proposed edit weakens the plank

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Last line, after "own property" add "and person".
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Societies are safer when the self-defense rights of peaceable individuals are not abridged by laws prohibiting or regulating the ownership, possession and transfer of personal defense weapons. The only legitimate use of force is in defense of individual rights — life, liberty, and justly acquired property — against aggression. We affirm the individual right recognized by the Second Amendment to keep and bear arms. Would this be simpler and more concise?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The term "personal defense weapons" is interesting and probably well put...I'd have to think about this. I'd think it'd read better if it were "personal-defense weapons."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Put the redline back in and it is all good.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While the overall changes to this plank are headed in the right direction, I do think it is VERY important to keep the language about opposing government requirements to register, restrictions on ownership to peaceable citizens, manufacture or sale of firearms and ammunition etc. My opposition to this change isn't because of what is proposed to be added, but what is proposed to be removed. I can see where what is proposed to be removed can benefit from some rewording, however the essence of the message that sentence delivers should be expressly stated in this plank.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I like the new wording, but I would also keep the old wording as well.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would agree, but this is so badly written and ambiguous in places that I cannot accept it in its present form.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't like the striking of the firearms statement
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The last sentence appears to allow property owners to make their own rules concerning the use of weapons. This could be problematic if a third party uses a weapon to defend his or her life and the property owner disagrees with such use and takes legal action.

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the first sentence but I believe the sentence being removed is critical
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Why restrict to those of private property. What about those that live in rented properties. Are they not allowed to exercise their rights? I do believe that all firearms should be registered.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	However, the stricken line should not be removed in it's entirety. The government should still not require registration or tracking of defensive weapons designed to protect an individual or his/her property. (to exclude for example WMD's)
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	However, I believe the plank would be strengthened and clarified by leaving in the sentence proposed to be deleted, regardless of its possible slight redundancy.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	the deleted sentence should remain and my right to personal liberty and self defense should not end at your front door nor should yours at mine.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Keeping and bearing arms shall not be questioned.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The "We oppose all laws..." sentence should be re-instated.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I grew up in the northern neck of Virginia, where even as a minor I was able to carry rifles, shotguns, and revolvers to the hard ware store to get the right size ammunition, as long as the weapon was in clear sight and obviously unarmed. The heinous crime was to conceal the weapon and I do not agree with the concealed carry laws.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Private property and/or business owners should be free to establish....etc. A (homeowner or) restaurateur might not own their land, but they are still in command of it.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	"Private property owners should be free to establish their own conditions regarding the possession OR USE of personal defense weapons on their own property." "OR USE" is broad enough to include killing fellow residents or guests.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	add "limb" to life, liberty.....

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The difference is that a tavern's policy may permit a bartender to eject someone with a weapon, but doesn't make it a criminal offense. I'm fine with that.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Neither version is well written, and both can be easily misinterpreted.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Prefer original.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Leave the stike-out part in.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I have concerns over people who have committed crimes or those who have mental problems possessing guns
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It would be better if the crossed out language stayed in.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Yes, this is more pragmatic and inclusive.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I like the new sentence about "Private property owners...". However, I don't like the elimination of "We oppose all laws at any level of government ...". Governments shouldn't restrict rights of self defense, and I don't want the getting lost.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I would like to see some restriction on the ownership of firearms by individuals who have previously been convicted of certain violent crimes.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The text that is proposed to be removed does not need to be removed. I do, however, support the additions.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It is the individual, not society, that is the reason. Defensive arms need not be personal. Tyranny comes in many forms and sizes.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The deleted text needs to be reinstated to impassive the 2nd amendment
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Is "inheres" a verb? Even if it is, for non-attorneys, we might be clearer with "This right applies to all individuals, who..."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Leave the deleted sentence in. Common sense would prove that Libertarians are not in support of "personal WMD's".
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	LEAVE THIS ON AND ADD PRIVATE We oppose all laws at any level of government requiring registration of, or restricting, the ownership, manufacture, or transfer or sale of firearms or ammunition

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The Constitution guarantees us the right to bear arms. It also authorizes Congress to enact a law such as: Any individual who is convicted of committing a crime in which another individual suffers harm, shall serve not less than 25 years in a state or federal prison.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Every time you mention private property, Ludwig von Mises smiles down upon you!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The final sentence affirms the rights of property owners to ban the possession of personal defense weapons on their private property.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would use "personal armaments" or "personal defense armaments" rather than "weapons." Perhaps just "arms" is better. "Weapons" has a connotation that the bearer is perpetrating the violence rather than responding to it.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, the original says it all clearly and simply. There is no need to add or subtract anything. It is beautiful the way it is. Leave it alone.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This isn't *all* bad, but I think we should still oppose firearms registries!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The stricken sentence is the better of the two.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Your additions are good, but I would keep the proposed deletions as well. I'm not concerned about the WMD issue.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	So a person who may have committed a crime in the past has no right to self-defense? What idiot came up with that idea?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I oppose the addition of the first statement. The other changes are fine.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Gun registration and lisening is fine so long as not burdensome on the individual.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The removed "We oppose..." sentence is too important to remove without some replacement language. I understand the desire to allow regulation gun ownership by people with a history of being a threat to others--but the current proposal throws out the baby with the bath water. I gather the firs sentence is intended as the replacement, but as written it's more an observation than a statement of policy. It also leaves out manufacture.

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Very good!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the additional 1 st sentence but not the last sentence replacement
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	STRONGLY support this...I believe my 2nd amendment right should exist everywhere...but to use the power of government to force it on a private business or homeowner is very wrong.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Would prefer this language on second change: Private property owners should be free to establish their own conditions regarding the possession or use of personal defense weapons and should accept all consequences relating to their use of them.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	drop "by laws prohibiting or regulating the ownership, possession and transfer of personal defense weapons" and move "Societies are safer when the self-defense rights of peaceable individuals are not abridged" to be the 2nd last sentence.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Don't remove the sentence describing what we oppose. Revise it if necessary, but don't remove it.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Prefer the first version. I support the right of individuals to own WMDs.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	support, i think
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Why dele that sentence? It is a vital statement of libertarian ideals.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The new first sentence should be the second sentence. Don't remove the next to last sentence.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Keep the original language that has been crossed out.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Why weaken the language?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You had a good thought going there until the last sentence. The last sentence would make it legal to take someone into a place of business and shoot him as long as the business owner said it was OK. Thanks to the fact that there are alot fewer lions and tigers and bears out there and the fact that our modern medical abilities enable us to keep people alive that would have died at a young age, we need to acknowlege the fact that there are alot of stupid people out there and it would be a stupid idea to allow them to have a gun. It needs to be mentioned.

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Generally Support. However, I'd rather see the addition of the new first sentence removed; While the former last sentence remained.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	enough said mgm
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Remove the negatives. State what we support as this change does, rather than what we oppose.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would keep the entire plank, including the part that's crossed out. Any law on firearms and ammunition is an infringement on the right to keep and bear arms.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the first sentence. The initial wording of the last sentence was clear. The proposed amendment (to the last sentence) introduces too many unanswered questions. For instance: Why should the possession of personal defense weapons be restricted to one's own property? Do non-property owners have rights to use personal defense weapons? Hunting rifles are not "personal defense weapons." Is it ok to have those?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Last sentence potentially denies the right to bear arms, at work, while shopping, etc. anytime when on private property owner(s) may restrict right to bear arms.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	not sure
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	keep the 'striked out' portion with the 'new'
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer the original wording alone.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Prefer, AND BELIEVE IN, the original language that was struck out.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	"all laws at any level" too broad a statement
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do not support striking the original sentence. The new sentence's use of the phrase "their own property" will rapidly be latched onto by those wishing to curtail 2nd amendment laws. Honestly, restricting the rights of those with a history of criminal weapon usage is no different than restricting sale and use of alcohol or drugs to those with a history of abuse or DWI. If a weapon is used in a genuinely criminal act, punishment should be swift and severe, the end. My rights do not end at my front door. I don't know about yours.

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Nicely done.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I oppose only because of the phrase "on their own property" as I believe that potentially limits the right to bear arms on public property.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	The struck line should not have been struck but rather narrowed.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Does this mean my next door neighbor who lives across the pond can shoot at ducks on the lake even though my children are in my yard which is directly across from where he is shooting? This actually happened in my neighborhood.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Bearing arms implies the right to travel from state to state. Why is the Second Amendment an exception to the generally accepted reciprocity of things like marriage and medical licences.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	No, the reason is that results to equating human life to property - and more government control. Strongly recommend this proposal be struck down.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"for exercising their rights of self-defense." should flat out be the end! Stating that only "property owners" are the only ones free to make a decision - would make owning a gun become a financial decision. However, registration is important as well, along w/ making sure violent criminals cannot go buy guns. I believe committing a violent crime is = to waiving your right to remain silent. Just b/c a "right" is in the constitution - does not mean the citizen cannot waive that "right." I believe individuals who chose to commit violent crimes - are also waiving their right to keep a personal defense weapon.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I dislike to the extreme the limit of personal defense weapons "on their own property". These changes to the paragraph move toward a limit to open or concealed carry outside the home. This might not be the intention, but it is inherent in the wording and would be an unintended consequence. I assume it is unintended.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But I would prefer to retain or modify the deleted sentence.

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Concern: could germ, or other biologic weapons be restricted?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	self-defense rights of peaceable individuals to bear and carry armes
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I actually like this amendment, but I feel that we should keep the wording about being opposed to restricting laws rather than just saying that societies are safer without such laws.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The claim in the proposed first sentence is debatable and may alienate some people. The right to bear arms exists regardless of whether the exercise of such right makes societies safer (or more dangerous).
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Can we make "justly acquired property" simply "property"? Otherwise it seems to condone violence over disagreements on what is "justly acquired". What is "This right inheres in the individual, who may agree to be aided by any other individual or group" here for? Seems unnecessarily weird and gangish.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The original plank is clearer.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Keep the original language on registration etc.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	self-ownership is a compelling enough reason for self-protection. The right to protect one's person is the strongest arguement for self-defense. Going into "societies are safer..." is creeping socialism. I think there should be something about protecting children, who do not have gun rights, from the danger of guns on the property.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	pretty good, still some room for language on opposition to "laws ... registration ... restricting ... etc."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Original wording of the final sentence seems clearer. The addition of the new first sentence is better though.

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree with the overall idea of this change. The wording of the last sentence is fantastic, and paints a picture of self-regulation rather than a wild-west of automatic weapons. I don't, however, care for the word "Safer" in the beginning. I'm in complete support of the second ammendment, but there are many statistics which can be used to tear apart the idea that any country is "safer" with more guns, (Michael Moore was all to happy to point this out to America in "Bowling for Columbine"...), and I feel this would draw too much fire from people opposing the party. Maybe replace: "Societies are safer when the self-defense rights of peaceable individuals are not abridged by laws..." With This: "The self-defense rights of peaceable individuals cannot Constitutionally be abridged by laws..." Like I said, I'm all for second ammendment rights, but the word "safer" makes the statement too easily dismissed by those in support of gun control.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The replacement of the last sentence implies that we only recognize the right of self defense on a person's own property. This is definitely NOT the case.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would prefer to retain the sentence proposed for deletion. What does that last sentence actually mean?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't know. The change isn't necessarily the best wording that might be found. I'm not sure about this one.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You have to be more specific like "I WILL GIVE TO EACH AMERICAN A \$75,000 LIVING CARD IF YOU ELECT ME FOR U.S. PRESIDENT"; "I WILL ISSUE \$50 TRILLION NEW FIAT MONEY ELIMINATING THE FEDERAL RESERVE"; "WE WILL MANUFACTURE ONE HUNDRED PERCENT IN AMERICA USING THE FEDERAL LANDS CREATING 100 JOBS". If you need help call me to 571-288-7383. My family could donate also \$100 million to your PAC. Thanks Alberto Lopez WWW.EBLM.US

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Libertarian Party seeks to enlarge essential rights of the US Constitution
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support this change but feel it may need to be made more clear that we oppose government restriction at federal, state and local levels. Not sure how to do that, but I would like that to be more clear.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"personal defense weapons" is a nice phrasing -- I like it.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't really like getting rid of the last sentence, I think it is important and should have some changes instead of being scratched.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, you leave things such as the "right to life" undefined. Why? I think you should, again, greatly simplify this. Individual citizens/residents should have access to exactly the same weapons (and don't mince words here!) that the police and individual infantry soldiers use. You also confuse two things here. First, we have the right to bear arms for political purposes. As you well know: to prevent tyranny, etc., by a government. Second, we have the right to self-defense. You should really make a distinction. For the first, individuals in a state should have the right to own and use (responsibly) the same weapons that individual police and infantry soldiers use. I doubt I need to elaborate. For the second, individuals have an inherent right to self-defense, and therefore should have access to tools (such as firearms, etc.) that facilitate that.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Personally, I oppose the use of guns and all types of violence, but this Plank is in line with the Libertarian philosophy of non-intervention by government.

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I completely support the last deleting and adding but oppose the new first sentence except for "societies are safer". The Constitution does not say "peaceable" individuals, it says "people", with no adjectives meaning regardless of background. But I do believe the states should deal with any restriction on people that can obtain weapons or weapons beyond personal defense even though I would personally never support any of those restrictions.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	last 2 sentences (1 deleted and 1 added) => While private property owners should be free....., we oppose the registration or restriction of the ownership, manufacture, transfer, sale, or benign use of firearms or ammunition at any level of government.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	This revision is slightly better than the original plank but I still have serious problems with it.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	This amendment removes a strong opposition to gun control laws and substitutes watered down and imprecise language.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Agree with the stated purpose for this change.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We also retain the right to overthrow a tyrannical government by force if necessary.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Can we find a more common word than "inheres?"
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We still need to state our opposition to the registration of and restriction on the ownership of personal weapons.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Obviously the guns will end up being used for non-defensive purposes.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer the original.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think it is important that it is explicitly clear that we oppose all gun laws, and not just ones on our personal property.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	However, the new language does not address our rights to have our weapons on public property, such as streets and sidewalks.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	not sure
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The new sections should be used in addition to the existing wordage, not to replace any part of it.

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	At this point I'm coming to the conclusion that you platform people are more trouble than you're worth. Jeeez. What's wrong with the 2nd Amendment?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You have a point about individuals with a history of violence, but removing the specificity of the existing language to ensure it covers knives is quite unnecessary and in my mind no longer makes it clear what is meant.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Do not strike the sentence, keep it.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think I can defend this plank a little bit better now.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Absolutely correct.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do not believe that individual liberty includes the right to bear arms. The regulation of arms is a legitimate part of a libertarian government.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Add the new wording (perhaps following a conjunction such as "but" or "however") but definitely keep the original sentence regarding government registration, etc.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The proposed new sentence is good. Eliminating the penultimate sentence ("We oppose . . .") is not.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	No comment
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I disagree with the LP interpretation of the 2nd Amendment. In the actual wording of the amendment regulation of the militias (and the individuals making up those militias) is clearly stated.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	However, rather than eliminating the sentence you have marked out, I feel it should be left in, but the words "firearms or ammunition" should be replaced with the words "personal defense weapons."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer the original language. It should be stressed in the strongest possible terms that government hinderance to an individuals right to the proper tools for defense of themselves and their homes cannot be tolerated.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't like that the opposition to specific infringements has been removed. Couldn't those specifics be restored by adding them into the list in the first sentence?
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	All things being equal, I might keep both the additions and the deletion.

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	The additional sentence is good. But do not delete the previous sentence. Don't worry if makes it seem somewhat redundant, it can act as reinforcement of the main concept.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	When the 2nd Amendment was adopted, "arms" included muskets. There were no AK47s and other similar killing weapons. Besides, the 2nd Amendment clearly applies to militias and not to individuals. It's plain English, but don't mention that to Scalia and Thomas.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I still oppose requiring registration of ownership.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	And their person
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What happens when I walk off my property with a firearm, with no intent to do harm - this seems to prohibit that.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	make it plain as the marked-out sentence does.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	??? a vehicle is private property! Mobile homes, RV's.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Dislike first addition due to use of peaceable Like second addition.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Defending ones person, and defending ones property may include different categories of weapons, and the language may be used to oppose weapons used to defend, for example a building or land, against force used against that property.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Well done.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Because children shouldn't be able to own guns, the Second Amendment was obviously meant for adults, so good call on the red for that reason anyway.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Keep the proposed deletion as well as the proposed additions.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There are too many people that do not own "private Property" that leaves to many people out of the fourmula
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	but I would leave in the sentence saying "We oppose all laws..."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the red text.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Removing the deleted sentence considerably weakens this plank.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Too much info.

8.0 - Self-Defense

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%
Commenters	40.5%	59.5%	10.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The new statement does not say anything, it is fluff. Keep the stance that has a clear meaning and can be actioned upon. It is the <u>right</u> of the establishments to ban whatever and whomever they see fit. So if they say no guns, knives, teddy bears, or cowboy hats, then so be it.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	add - 'so long as it does not infringe on the rights of others'
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You should still appose government requiring registration
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the addition of the first sentence, but not the edit of the last sentence.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We need to leave in a tad bit of the deleted section. We need to be more explicit in opposing gun laws.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i like added 1st sentence but would not add the last sentence leaving original

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It just sounds kind of whiny and bitchy. The current version is better.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	the existing version is fine
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Very clear
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Please keep the American Nationalism out of our Platform.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	keep the RED
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	In general the changes are good but should not remove the lines about the abolishment of the IRS or the passing of a Balanced Budget Amendment.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"the American dream" PLEASE!!!! Flowery vague nonsense. may as well be called Romney-speak
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	That was one angry person who wrote that piece. Too many examples of Gov. Waste not all inclusive.and what is the American Dream?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I stilol think the Libertarian Party should support a balanced budget amendment to the constitution, but yes I agree with this revision.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Start at "We call for the federal government..." and eliminate the preceding. Too open to interpretation.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Don't think the first sentence is necessary.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The original wording is more succinct, and also mentions the balanced budget amendment.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Sounds way too whiny. Libertarians are not unique in opposing pork projects and special favors to lobbyists.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I generally prefer the original plank, however I would remove the call for a Balanced Budget Amendment. This policy is well-intentioned, but has many of its own pitfalls. It's unnecessary to call for it specifically here.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Much better.

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do support the part of this proposal that reads "without having their success taxed for pork projects, social engineering, special favors to lobbyists, bailouts of failed private investments of others, subsidies for private industries, charities chosen by the government rather than by the donor" and "Future generations should not be born into a debt burden from previous generations, as it is taxation without representation, so government has a responsibility to eliminate its long-term debt and operate under balanced budgets." These are supportable. But I don't think the attitude of 'every man for himself' makes for a healthy society. For instance who is to judge the irresponsibility of someone else's personal choices? I find this statement to be mean and even offensive as it disregards the bad situation that many people have found themselves to be under due to low wages and a corrupted government who has not done their job of seeing that business is run in a fair and equal manner. "but when the laws undertake to add to these natural and just adv
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer the original wording.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Suggestion: Libertarians "...call for the federal government to be scaled... The rest of the sentences be arranged, (a) (b) etc.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Waaaayyyy too wordy. Almost like what congress is generating right now.

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe that government should be allowed to perform functions that are considered beneficial to society that fulfill needs that are not competitive with private organizations but that the government should not go into debt to do so nor rely on a stream of tax money to fund it. NASA for example spends lots of money but it is nationally associated with our country and doesn't really at this point as far as I can see injure private space endeavors. On the other hand, it is reasonable for people who do not care a bit about space exploration to not wish for their tax money to go for things of which they can not appreciate the value. So I propose that government organizations such as NASA be allowed to continue as long as they can be privately funded. This way what is truly valued by the American people gets done and is supported by those who wish to adopt the projects financially perhaps going into an interest bearing trust fund for the purpose of allowing the government to do such projects from only the interest on the funds. That way the projects get funded from non-taxed money
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If you start naming everthing, you'll use too much paper. Actually, the first (old) sentence is adequate, in my view. We can't re-engineer gov't spending via Constitutional amendments, IMHO. I prefer legislating penalties for public officials that don't balance budgets.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'd like to see "wars of choice" in the list of "without having their success taxed for" sentence. I would prefer a statement in support of balanced budgets and taxation up to a vote by 60% of the populace.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Period after representation, delete "so," begin new sentence at "Government."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Recognizing that the use of force obviates any claim of government to be engaging in philanthropy, LP recognizes that laws designed specifically for redistribution of wealth are not a proper function of government.

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The plank should read:"We call for the repeal of ALL Federal programs and services NOT required by the US Constitution. We oppose any requirements for employers to serve as tax collectors. Government should not incur UNnecessary debt, and ALL such proposals should be submitted to the consideration of the people by referendum."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Define "American dream," "success," "pork projects," "social engineering," "special favors to lobbyists," and "the consequences of other individuals' irresponsible personal choices." This is just hyperbolic rhetoric. And, let's be completely honest here, the Libertarian "party" is more akin to a lobby than a political party. So who are we kidding?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Maybe so, but it also pushes the plank up too high on the abstraction ladder. Abolish the IRS! On so many levels we need to be explicit about that.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There needs to be room for joint consumption of common goods, e.g. air traffic control. There needs to be a way of funding these common goods projects.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Well done on this plank!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Who wrote this abortion? You expect people to rally around this babble? Please call me, you need help.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While I might agree in principle, the fact is that many of the taxes are so ingrained into our society that there is zero chance of their elimination. Over-broad, overreaching statements like this are precisely the kinds of things that turns off potential libertarians, and makes the party look like the "lunatic fringe." Keep the first additional sentence; lose the rest.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	This is excessively wordy, limits itself by going into too much detail, and doesn't cover everything the previous version does while using weaker language.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Taxation of Citizens should Be a Simple and Open transaction. Our present Tax system is designed to be as Confusing and Opaque as possible.

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Might consider a comment that the government is required to have some kind of emergency fund (cash in the bank) for unexpected contingencies such as natural disaster, defense against onset of attack etc.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This one is really good!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I really like this change, however, I would prefer a shorter plank that eliminated "for pork projects, social engineering, special favors to lobbyists, bailouts of failed private investments of others, subsidies for private industries, charities chosen by the government rather than by the donor, and funding the consequences of other individuals' irresponsible personal choices." This language panders to one particular voter, and does not do so very efficiently. If any of it is kept then it should read "for subsidies to private industry or funding the consequences of other individuals' irresponsible personal choices." All the other issues listed can be categorized inside of these two. If we are going to list issues so extensively there are likely to be more added every year and that degree of emendation creates the perception of instability with our position where there is none. The fewer changes that are made in the platform over time the more it becomes obvious that our position is the most correct and does not need to vacillate in the face of a simple change
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	These two need to be merged. I think we all support of a "repeal of the income tax and abolishment of the IRS". I think the change is meant to propose an intermediate step of "scaled back to its Constitutional limits". But this seems like too much of a compromise
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I find the original text to be more straight to the point, and the new text to be too "emotionally based."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would support it but would include language in Sentence Two to indicate these are only a few examples.

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A litany of past transgressions for sure, ones in dire need of repair still, yet need they be listed here? This lacks eloquence with or without the itemization.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	previous staement was more direct, concise, and powerful. Perhaps the platform is not the place to say this, but perhaps it is: income tax + slavery. Income tax is not a tax, it is tribute, a form of slavery. Any government that assumes power to skim a portion of its citizen's productivity does so by assuming ownership of its citizens and ALL of their productivity.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	stupid. why talk about pork. anyone who talks about pork is a moron. pork is like 5% of the budget. gimme a break
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	No way. This means that taxes don't *have* to be repealed, and they may continue to exist. I want Libertarians to cal for abolishing the income and other taxes.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Only problem, though, is how will our "new" government find funds to operate at the basic, constitutional level? Donations? Again, that can lead to power mongers wielding unscrupulous acts through government. How about doing only a corporate tax? Taxing those corps whose income is at or above a certain (high) level.

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I fully support the concepts of the new version, however it reads more as a current events piece and/or rant than a true plank. A rant I'm frequently guilty of, but that's on Internet message boards, not a party plank. Though I really like the rant I propose the trimmed down professional sounding version below: People should be free to keep the fruits of their labor and live the American dream without having their success taxed and punished. We call for the federal government to be scaled back to its Constitutional limits, allowing for the elimination of income, payroll, and many other taxes. Future generations should not be born into a debt burden from previous generations, as it is taxation without representation. Government has a responsibility to eliminate its long-term debt and operate under balanced budgets.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Very good!
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	change "pork" to "pork-barrel"
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The amendment is to much blah, blah, blah. The original is straightforward and clear.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Define the purpose of the government rather than the opposite. This should be self-referential rather than going back to some other document(s). E.g.: Individuals have the obligation to pay their share to support the purposes of the government while having the right to participate in defining those goals within a range of specific duties to be set aside as legitimate duties of the government. (E.g.; stated in a negative way as one example: it is not the duty of the government to assure "fairness".)
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	nicey worded,succinct. this ought to be a winner.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Suggestion is muddy and seems to ramble. I like the original better.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Proper grammar indicates that the word in the first sentence should be "fruit" not "fruits".

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Perhaps mention something about capping USG spending at 5% (higher than I want but if we could not go above it for the Great War I think we can manage it now too)
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like it for the most part but a repeal of the 16th amendment is still necessary, instead of the part which reads "which would allow the elimination of income, payroll, and many other taxes" it should continue with We Call for the repeal of the income tax, the abolishment of the IRS
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the first one better. Watering this down too much just to appeal to a broader audience is annoying.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Government has limited powers and duties to its citizens which must be funded with tax dollars. This provision is too sweeping in that it calls for the elimination of taxes. I would prefer that they be scaled back to fund only those duties of the government delineated in the constitution.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I don't want to allow for the elimination of...I want to call for repeal
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"I pledge by my life and my love of it, that I will never live for the sake of another man, nor ask another man to live for mine." John Galt, Atlas Shrugged
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Neither version says what actually to do about the debt! The proposal insults people. The American Dream used to be freedom, not real estate. The apparent end of Social Security requires returning the taxes collected.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	No mention of inflation and the fed?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"People must be free to keep the fruits of their labor and live the 'American dream' without having their success taxed for any reason not in the Constitution. (The rest as written.)"
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Terrible. Significantly weakens the plank.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	With respect to Romans Chapter 13 as reference to continuing to cater to Gods Kingdom of Churchs schools and defense system.

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This was a hard choice; I decided to agree, because the specific items mentioned decrease the level of abstraction in the statement.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The original needs no explaining nor revision.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The proposal is better than the original, but there is an inconsistency between scaling the govt. back to its Constitutional limits and allowing the elimination of income taxes. As currently amended, the Constitution empowers the govt to tax income. The original text explicitly favors repeal of the income tax. Could the proposal be modified to retain that statement?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The government should not use its' power to redistribute and redefine wealth.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Though I would welcome insights on a more efficient tax plan to deal with the already massive national debt. As such bottom 80% of US citizens should pay 0% Federal Income tax. And the top 20% continue to pay their current rates and that money is used directly to pay off the debt. Given unconstitutional income tax is still unconstitutional on any level... we can say it can go to 0% Federal Income tax for everyone once the debt burden is eliminated.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Wording is all wrong. The platform needs to be concise. This rambles, and is not direct.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree for the most part; however, no one should die of a curable disease because they are poor. I know, right? Socialist Libertarian? The only way I part from the party.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Strongly support this one. This is much better. The first sentence is a long list, but it is better as a long list than a medium length list. I especially prefer the "which would allow the elimination of <various> taxes" over the "call for the repeal of the income tax, abolishment of the IRS and all federal programs/services not required under the US Constitution."

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	With the caveat that I do believe in the provision of a limited safety net for the unfortunate regardless of responsibility for their situation.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	This wording is excellent. It supports libertarian values while acknowledging the role of government. I believe these changes create wording that is much more palatable to the mainstream.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	But it needs to eliminate the word "should". "Should" indicates a desirable or expected state. Our plank should (pun intended) state what our rights ARE not what we want our rights to be. Change "People should be free to keep the fruits of their labor", to "People have a constitutional and natural right to keep the fruits of their labor"
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The first one is more to the point less inflammatory.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	new proposal sounds too "current" by mentioning pork projects, etc. Platform should sound more like eternal truths, not a current day tv ad.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Add "No taxes legitimately collected to support specific programs, such as gas taxes targetted for use expanding or maintaining roadways, shall be borrowed to support any other program."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The simplicity of the original wording is powerful and clear. The proposal would take away from that. It sounds too much like a campaign speech.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Government shall not abridge the rights and freedoms of citizens through oppressive taxes (>3% including ALL taxes). People must pay for rights ie free speech, (mass media), lawyers, private property, writs or other grievances against our governments and individuals.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Not a bad re-write. Much more positive.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	All the rhetoric should be eliminated, leaving just "We call for the federal government to be scaled back to its constitutional limits". Maybe add "The federal government should only do those things that only a federal government can reasonably and efficiently do".

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Traditionally, a civilisation has been able to thrive on a 'tithe' or 'tenth' taxation level, above which government becomes a tyrant. A tithe for government, a tithe for charities and faith, and the rest is due the citizen who earned it. Minimising the government by Constitutional guidelines is a good way to implement these advantages.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	To wordy.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Excellent!!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	not good language in this ammendment. Pork? That isn't the problem, it's the government interfering in the market place and world defense.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree with the desire to have a more positive language, but cannot agree that the proposed revision represents improved logical flow or readability.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Clearly, congress can spend enough to surpass any possible revenue. Why, then, not just set tax rates to yield the greatest possible revenue and then amend the constitution to disallow spending beyond that level. Imagine the titanic struggle among the Demopublicrons over what those tax rates would be. Seriously, we need to be accepting of a much larger role for government than we would find ideal, and allow for it in the platform.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't know, I kind of prefer the original text. The new text is mostly a resuscitation of a laundry list of all the wasteful things government spends money on, there are probably a million more you did not include, does that imply those not mentioned we consider to be "ok". The original simplifies but just saying basically no funding for things not authorized by the Constitution. Period. I don't know, the new text just doesn't read well, I like the original better, it seems clearer and more to the point.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	sounds too pompous and speechifying. Yes, the earlier language could flow better, but this doesn't cut it.

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This plank is entirely unsustainable and needs to be re-thought from scratch. Taxes are collected for legitimate purposes - for example, creating roads (infrastructure), or for national defense. I presume the core complaint is to much taxes, which might be a legitimate way to re-phrase this plank. Regarding (offensive) bail-outs, sometimes they are necessary to keep the economy from crashing. Would you support bailouts if they resulted in economic stability? Most people would, especially if no bailout meant large scale economic crash, unemployment, and loss of retirement funds and house. Instead, bailouts should be structured such that the government ends up owning the asset, which (at best) might be sold to recoup costs, and at worst, disassembled to the point where they no longer pose a threat to the economy (ie are no longer to big to fail). I would add a clause such that no business should be allowed to get 'to big to fail'. It could be ordered to shrink itself under anti-trust laws, as Microsoft was, and other large monopolies have been. This principal ge
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I support this, but would like to see the word "irresponsible" stricken from the first sentence. I think that word is unnecessary and will sound overly judgmental and harsh to liberals.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Super proposal !!!

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Emphasis on a number of specific examples of government abuse that are currently popular does little to define our position. The new wording is not a plank in our platform, it is an argument. I would maintain the current wording with the possible exception of the last statement. I want to eliminate all taxes; but once the tax system is in place; we should position ourselves as being in favor of equitable treatment. While there is no fair way to steal people's money; the proliferation of special deductions and targeted credits is away to excuse some from paying tax at the expense of others. It was once argued on the floor of the convention, that libertarian should support all tax credits; I pointed out that a credit that said registered Republicans and registered Democrats would get a \$1000 credit would be one that we would oppose. As long as we have an income tax; we need to realize that the use of the Internal Revenue Code to direct our behavior and economic choices should be opposed.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Original wording preferred.

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Drop the reference to "The American Dream." It means different things to different people. For some, it refers to the tycoons of the Gilded Age and what amounted to, for some, to child wage slavery and horrible working conditions. For others, the "American Dream" refers to middle class wages and strong, manipulative unions in the 1950. For others yet, it refers to deregulation and neoliberalism of the past 30 years. Also, the first sentence is too top-heavy. Simplify it: "People should be free to keep the fruits of their labor without the burden of overtaxation for specious and unjustifiable public spending. Myriad are the examples of taxpayer financed pork projects, social engineering programs... and funding the consequences of other individuals irresponsible personal choices." My proposed variant recognizes the limited role of taxation for justifiable government services (military, police, courts, basic roads etc) and separates the list provided to a separate sentence).
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This subject is my only real criticism of the Libertarian Party. We should define precisely WHAT functions the government should be engaged, and precisely HOW it should be funded. This subject is our weakest and least appealing aspect in the minds of non-libertarians.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Last time I checked, the gov't has the Constitutional right to tax. Aka the 16th amendment. So we might want to look at the wording on that. Other than that, we're good. :)

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree with the repeal of the personal income tax and the abolition of the Internal Revenue Service, but a platform that calls for the abolition of a major revenue source begs the question "Where will the funds come from?" The answer is either "We won't need funds because we're going to eliminate all government programs, including police, Social Security, etc." or "Instead of funding government programs though the personal income tax, we will fund them by _____."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is too broad. While I support the basic concepts, I also recognize that there can exist situations in which the government must bail out private industry in order to prevent a total collapse of the economy.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The examples after "having their success taxed..." seems too emotional and targeted for a platform statement. End it at "taxed."
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	In the last line, I would substitute a colon for the comma, viz., "...from previous generations, as it is taxation without representation; so government has a responsibility..."

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We disagree entirely with the income tax, because an individual's income, per the 4th ammendment is a private matter, and per the 5th ammendment - property that government cannot take without just compensation. (Also, as part of Article 1 section 9 - the original Constitution prevented a direct capitation tax) Government cannot justify anything that it takes from the individual without giving something of equal value back in return (5th ammendment). Per the equal protection clause of the 14th ammendment - all laws which compell an individual to support some Constitutionally limited function of government must be EQUALLY ENFORCEABLE (i.e. no favorites) - i.e. no difference between individuals. This would suggest some sort of flat tax (not saying I agree with flat tax persay) not based on a person's income. I believe that in this section, rather than delineating what government should and should not tax, we merely say that individuals should be able to opt-out of having to fund any part of government which has is not directly tied to a Constitutionally limited function of governmen
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Unnecessary. The existing wording addresses everything that needs to be stated. The new proposal is watered down, compromising and not as well stated as current.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Much better!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree that the Plank needs a fix. The LP is not the Constitutional Party. But this is not the fix needed. A better one would deny the right of government (and so, to be financed) to exist.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The new language is not as strong. I love the first sentence of the deleted text. The proposed language sounds like something from a campaign speech, not a party platform
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	But i do miss the part about coercing employers to serve as tax collectors.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I would support it if there were a period after "taxation without representation" and the word "so" eliminated.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	please preserve the balanced budget component

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Should name specific programs, not general concepts.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Replace 'the American dream' with 'as they will'. Replace 'which would allow the elimination' with 'which would allow the eventual elimination'. I think the LP has to recognize that the public debt has to be dealt with, and that it either has to be paid down via taxes, or defaulted on. It's not going to vaporize without some fairly significant consequences, and it's not going to happen quickly, either.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Neither plank states how the government would be funded when all taxes are repealed.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Big improvement!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	...which would allow (for) the elimination of income, ...
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would like to see more forceful words used, like 'must' instead of 'should' or 'would'
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer a balanced budget
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It might be a bit watered down compared to the old, but the new proposal would probably be much more generally accepted.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We should call for the elimination of the IRS and all Fed programs not required by the US Constitution... Otherwise, spot on.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think you should still include the Balanced Budget Amendment in the proposal, and that you should also add a section to the beginning where you discuss how people own themselves and they own their work and how the income tax has the presumption that the government owns your work and therefore owns you.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	difficult plank to create; further massaging, especially for PR reasons, should acknowledge that to keep our world-beating form of government, we currently only know how to do it through taxes

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I disagree. I don't see the proposal as "improving the logical flow and general readability of the plank". I find it verbose and in accurate. What is the "American" dream? Was that the same dream as the Hopi, Apache, and Inuit tribes? We are not going to deny that they too are "American"? The original verbiage is to the point, less verbose and more accurate.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe the original was much more to the point and covered the major topics without trying to list too many things.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	First draft is better
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support this change, however, this wording seems very anti-tax. To have a federal government that can protect our rights as individuals, that government must somehow be funded. How do we address that funding? Would this be the place to allow for some statement to show that this isn't just an irrational "No Taxes" argument?
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Waters down the previous language. Too timid.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	are elected people should all have to study the constitution????
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	better than the second abortion change also
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do not like the listing of what should be removed that is in this change. I can understand the idea for a more positive language, but think we could end the first sentence after success taxed. I think the list just looks petty and creates an "us against them" framework - as what you view as "pork" may be my "necessary" project.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While I'm opposed to excess taxation and support most means of eliminating and reducing taxes, I feel that the old language is a better read than the new language.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Good luck with this one!

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Some of the proposal is better ("federal government to be scaled back to its Constitutional limits"), but it's too wordy, and omits some good previous points (abolishing the IRS, employers as tax collectors, Balanced Budget Amendment). This plank should have more clear statements of policy and less explanatory justification.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Much more positive-toned than the original, which I generally approve of as it may be more palatable to the average joe/centrist/curious folk. I might emphasize that taxation is okay within Constitutional limits. Libertarians (it seems) are often accused of wanting to strip away funding for basic needs like roads, schools, etc. We need to make clear that SOME taxation (profits and gains, not income) is appropriate for certain government functions at all levels. We should also try to make clear that we believe many problems can be solved privately without the need for federal programs which run on tax dollars - education and energy being major ones.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Fantastic! But I'd also like to read a hint somewhere in this about how there would be a "gentle" transition back to the Constitutional limits--I'm seeing a lot of panicked withdraw symptoms in the minds of many.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like some of the new wording, but action item, "abolish the IRS" should remain.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The existing plank is not as politicized and states our position more clearly.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would eliminate everything in the first sentence after the word "taxed". In the next sentence, I would change the word "allow" to "require". Last sentence is good.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Anytime you make a list, you have the chance of leaving something out. We all know that omission is seen as consent.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"Pork" should not be used this way as it is not clear. Perhaps "Pet" would be better.

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	1. The term "Americian dream" is both too emotional and mythological. 2. The first version is easier to understand.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	All persons are entitled to keep the fruits of their labor. Keep that, mix the rest together and you've got it.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While some of our planks may be overly formal, I think that this proposed change is entirely too informal. This sounds like how you would try to sell libertarianism on the streets or in a high school, not how you would want to present the party.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would re-word all the "taxed for" list into "bureaucratic or political interests" because the list leaves off many other items like foreign aid, empire building, et al... Re=word saying, "...success taxed for bureaucratic or political interests."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	WOW.... this is a GREAT ONE !!!
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	This is NOT the GOP lite party -
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I simply love this.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	YES!!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Strongly support.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Supported but a bit winded.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Reverse the order of things that we are being taxed for. Start with funding for the consequences of other individuals and organizations irresponsible personnel choices.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Original is much cleaner and easier to follow.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I prefer replacing the income tax with a federal real estate tax.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The previous language is much more clear. It seems that the author wanted to add a bunch of hype words to the statements in order to attract people based on those words. Simplicity is key in understanding a party platform.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I really like this proposed change.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'm a classical liberal and support fair taxation adequate to support government.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Suggest: "People should be free to keep the fruits of their labor. Too often, these fruits are taken as taxes and used for ..." Em-dashes, instead of commas, should be used around "as it is ... representation" in the last sentence.

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	This needs modifications in order to be realistic.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Reduce government
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I really like the concept here of changing "are entitled to" to "should", but don't favor the overhaul otherwise.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Support, although the following language is subjective and too casual: "fruits of their labor", "American dream", "pork projects", "lobbyists".
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The specifics mentioned here would be more appropriate in a Libertarian program, as opposed to a platform. Our platform should be philosophical, our program should be about concrete actions to implement our platform values.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Not quite there. You should EXPLICITLY list PROPERTY taxes in your list. Property taxes are contrary to federal law, and they are unconstitutional, inasmuch as they undermine the right to property lawfully acquired. Failure to pay property tax results in confiscation of property without compensation of any kind.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The Last line of this panel should be Stressed, it is at the core of a good fiscal policy that I think all should be able to understand and get behind.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	By not calling for the repeal of the income tax, we leave it open to continue.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Where has the LP been all my life?! I LOVE IT!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Support over all, but "American dream" is too vague and shouldn't be included.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Abolish the IRS and all federal programs not required under the Constitution.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"should be free" is this a suggestion now and not a right? The "American Dream" is an undefined quantity. Taxes should be voluntary. Taxation without the direct consent of the individual taxed is theft. Anything taken by force or otherwise from anyone without their express consent is theft. I've never voted in favor of taxes, thus all the taxes I pay are theft.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Colloquialisms such as "American Dream" and "Pork Projects" are vague.

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i think the language proposed is short sighted, claiming too many current issues rather than focusing on the principles inherent. the original is flawed in that it limits the citizenry right to assemble funds for whatever it deems though should do so without an IRS. perhaps a funding based on voluntary charity with a line item method (like used in many churches) specifying use of funds to certain departments or causes.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'm not thrilled enough by the changes to fully support obliterating the old plank.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	and "live the American dream without"...is too nationalistic. Libertarianism should not sound like nation building. What is the American dream? How is it different from the Canadian or Latin American dream? Not a good choice of words. I suggest "...and live their lives without..."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Perhaps it could be further revised, but not a bad start.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Right idea, but there you go listing again. Re-read the Bill of Rights for style pointers.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree but it may be more prudent to define what taxes may be lawfully used for rather than attempting to list myriad of misuses. And perhaps include a few defining examples of the types of things taxes should not be legal to be used for.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I thought the original plank was just about perfect.

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While I do like a good deal of the suggested language, including the mention of "pork projects, social engineering, special favors to lobbyists, bailouts of failed private investments of others, subsidies for private industries, charities chosen by the government rather than by the donor, and funding the consequences of other individuals' irresponsible personal choices," I prefer the original, which explicitly calls for the repeal of the income tax and the abolition of the IRS. The proposed change would merely "allow for" the repeal of the income tax, but fails to call FOR the repeal, and doesn't even mention the IRS.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	How about "Every individual has been given the right to pursue their happiness with the fruits of their labor. We call for the federal government to restrict our programs, services, and requirements within the limits of the U.S. Constitution. Future generations should not be born into a debt burden from previous generations, as it is taxation without representation. Our government has a primary responsibility to eliminate any long-term debt. Our government should only be permitted operate under annual balanced budgets achieved through due process."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Try again. Shorter, more direct language. No need to list every grievance we have about government spending. The first sentence needs to be revised, but the new language is worse.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Much better!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the present version better. It specifically calls out elimination of the IRS, a balanced budget amendment, elimination of withholding, and cutting programs and taxes. This version is more wordy without adding many specific stances, and it removes a few. The phrase "live the American dream" is meaningless.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	but don't like "American dream" as it and similar rhetorical phrases are undefined propaganda bites

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Well said!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	but too detailed
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Nice changes to help or further the understanding that we are being tax to much.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	include language from the amended portion to address constitutional limits, debt free government, and gradual abolition of taxes/beurocracy.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The original work is very clear as to what the LP would do. The proposal is just philosophy.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	This is a GOOD One! Full support
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I am strongly oppose to: 'People should be free to keep the fruits of their labor and live the American dream without having their success taxed for pork projects, social engineering, special favors to lobbyists, bailouts of failed private investments of others, subsidies for private industries, charities chosen by the government rather than by the donor, and funding the consequences of other individuals' irresponsible personal choices.' Agian this sounds like political rederic(sp?) and not an intelligent statement. It's a real turn off. I like the wording of the rest of the proposed change. Different author eh?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the tone of the original with the ending of the revised suggestion
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	This proposed rewrite again seriously waters down our message. It would delete three important statements from our current platform: (1) our call to eliminate unconstitutional departments and programs (2) our call for employers not to be compelled to serve as tax collectors; and (3) our call for government to operate without going into debt. All of these things are important and worth saying clearly and strongly. All that has to happen for short-term debt to become long-term, inter-generational debt is for government to fail to pay it off (because there's other more popular stuff they'd rather spend money on than balancing the books).

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	98% correct. I've not seen any budget analysis that would support the elimination of virtually all taxation and income taxes are authorized by the 16th Amendment. I agree that the government is over-spending but this statement goes a bit too far in it's assumptions.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	it's better than the old plank, but I still think the first sentence could be worded better.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I don't mind the more positive phrasing, but dislike the mealy-mouthed language ("would allow the elimination of..." vs. "call for the repeal of...").
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We need to get to where we limit the federal government to protection of our freedoms and all other powers reserved for the states!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't think there are many people who view the elimination of income tax is a remotely achievable outcome. IMO that sort of statement invites the "extremist" or even quasi-anarchist brand to Libertarianism.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Prefer original wording.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Strongly support
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	and live the American dream --> and pursue the American dream
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Love it!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I strongly oppose "the American Dream" talk. It's vapid, and lends itself to exceptionalist thinking. If just those three words would be deleted I would be in favor.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	This plank needs to be toned down. The idea of no income tax suggests no government and most people are still convinced that we need government.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	we will always have some form of taxation- the point is that those funds should be used exactly as mandated with no funding to special interests.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	seems to dumb down the intent of the plank
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think the old paragraph is clear enough. Second one looks a bit 'trendy'.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the original better

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	easy to operate under balanced budgets just raise taxes. balanced budget act must have GDP caps in place or its going to get ugly.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	change "pork projects" to "projects for purposes outside those enumerated in the constitution"
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I certainly support this as the ultimate position of the party, though I think it comes off strong and off-putting to many Americans. To soften it, we could say "...allow for the eventual elimination..." I'm an example of someone who might have a problem with this language, as I believe the current level of debt will not allow us to eliminate taxes completely. In the short term, taxes are needed to pay down the debt, reduction of spending alone cannot accomplish our goals. In the long run though, I completely agree with this position.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	TOTAL BULLSHIT. This is the libertarian not the constitution party. You are motivating me to come to the convention and organize a strip in against right wing fascists taking over the party.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I would change the term pork projects. It lacks the professionalism necessary in such a document. Perhaps specialized projects or something else
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	this rewrite is more clear and concise
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The positivity achieved is not worth the loss of clarity. "the American dream" means different things to different people--to many, socialism.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the new wording, except for the term "pork projects." It sounds like jargon.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	but...it does sound stilted or legalistic somehow. I don't see the readability coming through.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Excellent, much better!!!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I totally support this language.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't like either of these statements. They need more coherent writing.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Does not say how the Government is funded
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	AMEN!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer simply removing the last sentence of the current wording. "All persons are entitled to keep the fruits of their labor. We call for the repeal of the income tax, the abolishment of the Internal Revenue Service and all federal programs and services not required under the U.S. Constitution. We oppose any legal requirements forcing employers to serve as tax collectors. Government should not incur debt, which burdens future generations without their consent."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I begrudgingly support. I believe the new wording is better than the previous wording. I'm not sure it's the "best" wording....I don't really disagree with any of the new plank, it just seems a little bit wordy.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Both versions sound good to me.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	<3 <3 <3 <3 <3 <3
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Just tool long of list of where not spend tax dollars. I also liked in original how it points out government forces employers to be tax collector. I do feel need more explanation of how government will get money.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Too wordy.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Sounds angrier and less positive than what it proposes to replace. The original sounds more neutral to my ears.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Barely; it is very long and tedious and tries to be all inclusive. Try this: People have a responsibility to fund the means required to permit government to carry out it's responsibility to protect the people from internal attacks and those that come from beyond our borders.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Try again
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would support the proposal if you added the words "a balanced budget that doesn't allow the federal government to raise taxes or increase borrowing to balance the budget."
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	good but written poorly

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the general concept of rewriting this plank to serve the goals stated above. I believe the current attempt fails to serve the goals: the first sentence is too long of a laundry list (though it is concrete and specific, which is good) and uses slang ("pork") which, while widely understood, may not be universally so. I approve of the proposed second and third sentences.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the original one better.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Yes, though only on a federal level.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The first three lines is one long run on sentence. I prefer a period after American dream. Then rewrite that awful list and please do not use "pork projects". If you must use that term, call them pork appropriations.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I'm not thrilled with the existing plank or the proposed replacement, but the replacement seems like an improvement. I recommend striking "funding the consequences of other individuals' irresponsible personal choices." and moving the "charities chosen" section after the "and", as it seems redundant.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I recommend changing the last sentence. Split it into two sentences to state:...as it is taxation without representation. Government has a responsibility to eliminate its long-term debt and operate under balanced budgets.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I neither support nor oppose. I feel that this change is neither better nor worse. However, since I am not given "doesn't matter" or "don't really care" option, I have chosen Support. In fairness, I will likely abstain from voting on this one. BTW, why is there not a "NOTA" on these questions?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Both seem way too wordy and try to cover way too much. It's really rather simple: "Libertarians believe that people spend their money better than government. We believe the tax code should be significantly reduced with the goal of elimination of individual taxes. We believe in a debt-free society."

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support only the last sentence of the proposal to replace the original last sentence.
Oppose Support	Likely Likely	No No	Non-Member Non-Member	IRS should be abolished This is too wordy. Focus on the central issue, not the myriad of applications. "... fruits of their labor. We call for ..." I agree we should drop the BB Amendment language.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Although I agree with and support the new text and the statements and ideas made therein, I tend to somewhat disagree with the Purpose statement that the language is "more positive" (specifically, I'm referring to the first sentence). I would suggest modest revisions to that sentence. The latter sentences are excellent.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the sentiment, but this is more of a diatribe than a policy position. As an old economist who began life very much on the left, I have concluded that the "enemy" is not government or corporations, but simply size and complexity. The genius of the 10th Amendment is its recognition that size and distance between the governors and the governed engenders inefficiency and corruption. To make government more efficient and less corrupt, we must transfer as many economic functions as possible from the federal government to the states where people are in a better position to monitor it. We also need to address the issue of national defense in discussing public finance. We will never get our expenses under control as long as we keep sending people to DC who promise that we who make up less than 5% of the world's population will spend more than the other 95% on military goods and services.

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The country should go back to the original Constitution and deny the federal government the right to impose direct taxes. Only direct grants of power to the national government should be legal. The Federal Government should be treated like any utility. They should do their proscribed duties as efficiently as possible and go home.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i am against a balanced budget amendment to the constitution
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the "scaled back to its constitutional limits" language. Maybe that could replace the last 7 words of the deleted language, making it perfect in my opinion.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would avoid vernacular in a platform (e.g.: "pork projects")
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	MUCH nicer! We can't expect to instantly roll back decades of policy in one fell swoop. This allows more people to consider our position.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	My whole reason for becoming Libertarian. Yes!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Make this a MAJOR ISSUE
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i like the original.... Sentences are too long in the second.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Original version sounds more professional. The second sounds like a political newcomer wrote it using MSNBC and Fox News as sources.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like this one
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Whole-heartedly!!!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Keep the red part in.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	eliminate "live the American dream".
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i like some of the original statement. e.g. 'we oppose any legal requirements forcing employers to serve as tax collectors'. i think including the notion that the fed gov't is 'forcing' it's will should be included. should emphasize that we'd replace the fed gov't's handouts with private charities. maybe something that links to the history of private charities and their success over gov't.

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Any such list can be subverted. A more general principle needs to be stated - such as limiting government to its strictly limited Constitutional role. A tax to support government enumerate roles performed in an economical manner could be supported. (National Security comes to mind - not one that creates wars, but one that defends our Nation against enemies - external and internal). Local government fire/police protection would fit into that also. But not all the other stuff they do. And taxes should be equitable to all (i.e. flat tax on any earned income source).
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	All persons are entitled to keep the fruits of their labor. We call for the repeal of the income tax, the abolishment of the Internal Revenue Service and all federal programs and services not required under the U.S. Constitution. We oppose any legal requirements forcing employers to serve as tax collectors. Government should not incur debt, which burdens future generations without their consent. We call for the federal government to be scaled back to its Constitutional limits, which would allow the elimination of income, payroll, and many other taxes. Future generations should not be born into a debt burden from previous generations, as it is taxation without representation, so government has a responsibility to eliminate its long-term debt and operate under balanced budgets.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There is too much emotion and unnecessary rhetoric in the new proposal. The original is concise and to the point.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The language is too "colorful", and taxes are taken for much more than the items listed.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The phrase "pork projects", while accurate, sounds like a headline, not a platform item. Something along the lines of "frivolous" or "unnecessary" sounds better to my ears.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	need to leave the " Balanced budget exclusively by CUTTING" etc in
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer the current plank.

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, I see where you're going...but we're losing the clarity of it. Of course people shouldn't be taxed for "pork projects"! Everyone agrees to that. And scaling back to Constitutional limits should then "require" not just "allow" the elimination of those taxes. Be clear on that.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	. . .having their ongoing success or estates taxed for earmarks, bailouts and special treatments of persons or businesses, or wealth redistribution.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	much better tone
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The second one is a bit rambling, but the whole notion of a Balanced Budget Amendment is something that the gov't will easily corrupt.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This revision gets into too many details and attempts to defend our position. I would support a revision that deals primarily with deficit spending and a balanced budget amendment. "We must first limit spending and then have a good faith debate about priorities. Without a limit there can be no priorities."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the revision but I'm not crazy about the inclusion of the phrase "live the American dream," it sounds trite and rhetorical, in my opinion.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	We oppose taxing success for any reason; this laundry list is totally unnecessary. The original language is much stronger.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The first sentence comes across as whining.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	But, the statement "all federal programs and services not required under the U.S. Constitution", sounds like stronger language and summarizes some of the other listed items.

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The laundry list of specific objections is not very strong, largely a string of cliches. Better to rephrase "should not be born into" as "should not bear". In the existing plank, abolishment should be abolition. Factually scaling the federal government back to its Constitutional limits does not allow all those taxes to be eliminated unless we default on the debt. The implicit call for an immediate end to Social Security and Medicare will cause problems for our Presidential candidate, in either version. We need a completely different rewrite.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do not like the term "pork project". Viewed historically or by others not within the range of its' colloquial scope it has the good chance of being mistaken as projects meant to fund agriculture or even specifically those industries involved in swine products.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	yes, I feel this proposal is more up-to-date
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like it except "pork projects" just doesn't sound very classy, for lack of a better word.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I object to the use of jargon, "pork" in this case. I also have a problem with the last phrase. Government does not really have debt. The individuals governed are burdened by that debt, not the government. While I accept the intent of the usage, it must be emphasized that ONLY individuals bear the cost of governance.

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I have been a Libertarian for a long time and think I understand the libertarian philosophy. While I support the notion that individuals are entitled to keep the fruits of their labor, I have come to see that the government has legitimate functions and providing services requires resources. Ultimately it is individuals who must contribute to support the government. I am not comfortable with either wording of this plank. Balanced budgets: yes. Low government spending: yes. Ending all subsidies: yes. I would like to see something like a combination of a flat income tax with no deductions or loopholes plus a VAT tax. As un-libertarian as it sounds, I think we must have taxes and those taxes should fall upon everyone at the same rate.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	See Youtube "Vote Pump" by bill Whittle. Our country is redistributing wealth. There are soon to be more takers than makers.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The change is an obfuscation.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i like the direct way in which the original clause was written.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Sounds good. but of course a repeal will never happen.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The initial verbiage is timeless. The new verbiage can easily be dated over time and becomes limiting in its efforts to be broad.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the stronger language of the original version, but the second says basically the same thing in a way that should appeal to the mainstream more.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Perhaps you should insert the first sentence of Article I, Section 8 as it show that it is the legislative body's responsibility to pay down the debt.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	completely non-specific politically correct BS. Leave as is
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The revised proposal sounds awfully scathing.

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While I agree that the elimination of income, payroll, and many other taxes is both necessary and constitutional, it should be stated where the money the government needs to operate is coming from. (What taxes are we keeping/deem constitutional?? Tariffs?)
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	New version is better, but claiming to "eliminate taxes" is just pandering.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I despair of the validity of this political party! No external government. If truly SELF-government, then there is no such thing as taxes. No one has the right to take from you anything that is yours: life, liberty, property, labor, earnings, investments, etc. NO ONE. It is theft and fraud, pure and simple. Why quibble and mince words about this?! There is no necessity of "supporting" any external government. EVERY external government WILL, MUST, impose some sort of tax scheme in order to perpetuate itself. And as any living organism, that perpetuity necessarily entails GROWTH. That's WHY we're in the pickle we're in today, isn't it? DUH. ". . . which would allow . . ." "ALLOW"?! Make it "which would eliminate almost all taxes except, as long as we are voluntarily under the original Constitutional government, possibly a flat poll tax to support the Treasury, State Department, and whatever defense might be necessary in case of physical invasion of states by opposed foreigners or domestic threats. . . ." How come no mention of working to repeal th
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Very strongly support! Great rewrite!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree in bringing Government spending under control and to gradually scale back some programs to give individuals time to adjust. Lower taxes some but do not completely eliminate-our founding fathers ran into that problem!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	very well said!

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"favors to lobbyists, bailouts of failed private investments of others, subsidies for private industries"-----The words 'of others' are not needed and reduce readability. Otherwise well done. Perhaps a line about who makes more rational decisions; individuals or government but that may be beyond the scope ...
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Good proposal.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Flows better and uses more strong key words to catch attention.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	First is way better. Don't pander. There is no reason to try and be current.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Some combination of these two would be better. Both include unnecessary details and some preaching. A more simple straightforward message will be more convincing.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the lines marked through better. Both are good.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The original is direct and to-the-point. Your revision is actually LESS readable and unnecessarily vague. Terms like "American Dream, pork and social engineering" can be interpreted different ways.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	My "dollar-for-dollar tax credit" idea helps here too, BUT the hidden/concealed reality is likely repudiation of the ridiculous debts created by governments everywhere.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Support the original wording
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The original is more specific and concise. If we lack consensus on abolishing the IRS, then remove only that part.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think the previously existing statement is more specific and clear, and much less wordier, which allows for a better understanding of the text. I think the LP should be concise and to the point. It is meant to inform and not meant to make the reader feel happier. I like that it specifically talks about repealing income tax and passing a Balanced Budget Amendment. I also like that it clarifies that the budget is balanced through cutting expenditures and not by raising taxes.

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It is good to remove the politically loaded phrase "Balanced Budget Amendment."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The proposed is better, but is still lacking. The first sentence is too wordy to be effective. I am not sure how to change it.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think the "so government has a responsibility" clause at the end should be its own plank. The government should be forbidden from spending money it does not have.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Great!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"irresponsible personal and business choices."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the first one better.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Tax what you burn and not what you earn! necessities vs. luxuries
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	some kind of taxes for social programs, roads, city workers are good. can we provide for these things with simply consumption taxes?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Additionally, I'm for abolishing the Post Office, even though the Constitution calls for it.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	strongly agree
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think a balanced budget amendment is a good idea

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The Internal Revenue Service exists only because the Federal Reserve banking cartel exists. The IRS is the enforcement arm of the FED and the collateral used by the FED to manage the deficiency of funds received paying down the interest on Treasury debt. Because the FED exists, Sovereign Citizens do not exist. Their property, GOLD, has been stolen and replaced by BANK NOTES. This has made chattel of former Sovereign Citizens who now may rightly be labeled Tribute Slaves. Abolish the FED and the IRS must be abolished. This is as far as this plank should go. Again you are using conditional language and living with the CANCER in the assumption that we need elimination of "income, payroll, and many other taxes." ELIMINATE ALL taxes on Sovereign Citizens, restoring their sovereignty by eliminating the FED cartel which has stolen it. Our government is funded through "tariff, post, apportioned property tax, any other apportioned tax." U.S. Constitution, Article 1, Section 8 : "The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect TAXES, DUTIES, IMPOSTS and EXCI
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	First sentence: Put a period after the word 'taxed' and delete remainder of sentence OR remove all text after the word 'taxed' and insert: 'by government bureaucrats and busybodies.' This initial sentence is just a grievance, which will be found in the next Declaration of Independence.....
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would add foreign aid and nation building, especially when these are used to prop up a failed policy such as the "war on drugs" in the pursuit of a facist regime.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Very "tin hat" change to the plank. Will scare off possible supporters. While both say the same thing, the changes sound like we all are paranoid.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	much better...
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Attach as the last sentence: "We support the passage of a "Balanced Budget Amendment" to the U.S. Constitution, provided that the budget is balanced exclusively by cutting expenditures, and not by raising taxes."

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	if this plank focuses on government finance and spending, does the right to keep the fruits of labor belong here? The specificity makes this verbose and may look dated or aged very soon since it uses current jargon "pork projects" "social engineering" etc. Perhaps keep this plank focused on scale back to Constitutional limits and why and how that will cut government finance and spending?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While I favor this version over the previous since it has a positive approach, rather than a negative ("We oppose"), this version is preachy. The flowery language takes away from the underlying message.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Hell NO !!! REPEALING the Federal Income TAX & dismantling the IRS are the foundation of my BELIEF system --- with Personal Property TAXES supporting Schools & Local Government playing a close 2nd ...
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Okay...the first line is a bit florid (we could do away with "live the American dream" and cultural vernacular like "pork projects"), but the ideas are good.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	How are you going to support reasonable and useful government actions. What do we do about healthcare? What do we do about people who can't take care of themselves?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Love it! I also would like to see the next to last sentence kept, the one about government not incurring debt.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, well done.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	That first sentence is way too cumbersome. Break it into two sentences and format it like this instead. "People are entitled to keep the fruits of their labor and live the American dream without having their success taxed to support government activities that far exceed Constitutional limits. Such activities include: - "pork" projects - social engineering - special favors to lobbyists - bailouts of failed private investments - subsidies for private industries - charities chosen by the government rather than by the tax payer

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would replace the word "pork" in the first line with either "parochial" or "provincial".
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	works for me
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This supports the concept of interperiod equity, a cornerstone of Governmental Accounting.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Amen. I would strike the American dream line, as there is no uniform and standard way of defining the term.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Without an explicitly stated reduction in defense spending, I don't think this plank would be deemed logical by many readers. The first sentence should include something about "waging voluntary and/or preemptive foreign wars."
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	This is a watering down of our opposition to the Federal Income Tax. I recommend that we specifically endorse the Liberty Amendment www.libertyamendment.org which requires the fedgov to sell all unconstitutionally held property and repeal the federal income, gift and death taxes in three years. I have adopted the proposal of one of my campaign advisers and now refer to the Liberty Amendment as my 0-0-0 Tax Plan. I recommend all federal and state executive and legislative candidates to do likewise.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The first sentence of the proposed rewrite should be eliminated - too defensive and preachy for a platform.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Wow, that's a great rewrite! Strongly support.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Governments must and will exist. While I'd prefer to keep them as limited and as local as possible, I see no point in distinguishing between one form of taxation and another. They are all basically compulsive, and compulsion should be kept to a minimum. But when compulsion is truly necessary, it should be employed as efficiently and as fairly as possible

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think this re-write is becoming a little too colloquial. I would aim for a platform that is enduring; not one that is rooted in contemporary jargon. For example the phrase "American Dream" is becoming divisive and potentially cliché. I would prefer the wording: "to keep the fruits of their labor and live their lives to the fullest..." In addition, words like "pork projects," "social engineering," etc. are catch phrases that link the platform to certain talking points. I'd prefer to keep this as clean and cerebral as possible.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Our income belongs to us exclusively and should NOT be taxed for any reason.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	see previous comments.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Suggest we replace "pork" with, "politically-motivated". "Pork" sounds a little casual for a formal Party Platform.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The first is more action-oriented.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	honestly, either of these work for me. I think the last line of the 1st one should be include. "Balanced Budget Amendment"...
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Love it. This modification keeps us on principle while adapting to modern language.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer the original language.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	tax exemptions for religious organizations must be eliminated, as those exemptions increase the individual tax burden, thereby de facto forcing me to support religion, which I would not do if given the choice
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the second version but the "balance budget amendmant" is still a good idea and this would be better if it included it as well.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer the original language, which is stricken out above.

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Neither language covers good governance along with social responsibilities to pay taxes for government services shared by all. We have the responsibility to pay for government services, but we also have the right to limit those services, governments should not be allowed to spend or promise more than it can pay for than from current revenues. All future obligations must be funded with current tax revenue and set aside untouchable unless future obligations are eliminated.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is an subject where Libertarians loose lots of support by being viewed as extreme. Please consider inserting in the first sentence, "excessively" taxed for pork.... Also insert in the second sentence, "reduction or" elimination of income,...
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You can't be serious? We don't need totalitarianism "scaled-back" we need it eliminated. If you can't own the output of your own labor you are a slave. Period. If you have to help the government collect taxes at your expense you are a slave. Have we forgotten all that?
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I like the intent, but dislike the implementation. The first sentence is way to long; too many bug-a-boos. In the third sentence, (for example) the phrase "taxation without representation" is rather trite. A phrase more along the lines of "we should be paying our our own way" or "assume financial responsibility for the decisions that we make" would be more to the point.

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It may be necessary to add some language to clarify that it is OK to incur limited-term debt for capital investments. E.g., roads should not have to be paid for in a single year, but amortized over at least a portion of their useful "lives," so, it is all right to issue bonds for capital investment. Really, the federal government should separate its capital and operating budgets as state, county and municipal governments do -- an idea floated in the 1960s by the late Terry Sanford, governor of North Carolina for one term, then president of Duke University and then a U.S. senator from North Carolina.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	again with reservations. One man's pork is another man's constitutional right. That needs to be defined. We need to scale back the government to it's Article I Section 8. and it's enumerated rights. Some of the rank abuses being committed by the Federal Government can be argued as ligit under the constitution. I'm leery of Constitutional amendments because the government writes the rules for the process. It's like the fox determining how many chickens the farmer can own. For this reason since you've eliminated that section I'll support this proposal.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While the Amendment is not bad, it does not go far enough to repeal the income tax and IRS because these things allow the government to treat individuals not as equals but rather as being in different class where one can be punished more than another.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Re: governmental borrowing. At times (e.g. unexpected natural disasters) borrowing is needed. Better to carry the requirement that any appropriations requiring debt MUST include SPECIFIC plans and deadlines to pay off said debt, with no further borrowing allowed until such time as the debt is successfully discharged.

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"which would allow" language should be replaced by "and" for reasons that should be obvious. This is not the time for us to walk back on this issue. Also, "many" should read "all."
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Keep it short and simple. "...American dream without the burden of funding unconstitutional government programs. We call for the federal..." Last sentence should read, "Future generations should not be saddled with our debts, and cutting government spending is the only way to eliminate that debt."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is a much stronger statement. I however, do support a flat tax being imposed which would force everyone to pay much more similar taxes percentage-wise. Given the size of our national debt, I don't see how it can ever be eliminated without some creative but fair taxation.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	HALLELUJAH !!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	best plank change yet
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Very good, explains our position well
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Rephrase last sentence without the 'as' or 'so'.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Wording needs to be more general in content. The wording being so specific will cause a misunderstanding of the definition of the description.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is non-sense. Who decides what a pork project is? What determines a special favor. Our original plank covers this just fine.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Good but a bit wordy.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Could support if sentence #2 of the proposed were to replace sentence #s 2 & 3 in the existing wording.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	suggest "... taxation without representation. Government has a ..." period, new sentence
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	End the first sentence after "fruits of their labor" Then pick up again with "We call for the federal gov't..." The listing of grievances is unnecessary.

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	There are a lot of problems with the proposal, such as saying that returning to Constitutional limits would allow for the repeal of the income tax. The income tax is authorized by the 16th amendment. Frankly, I'm not fond of either.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	IF YOU ARE GOING TO LIST EVERYTHING THE GOVERNMENT SHOULDN'T DO, THERE IS NOT GOING TO BE ENOUGH ROOM. PUT A PERIOD AFTER THE WORDS "...SUCCESS TAXED." IN THE FIRST SENTENCE.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	That was more positive? It irritated me about the bailout all over again. Put a period after dream. 2.4 should be, "People should be free to keep the fruits of their labor and live the American dream." The rest is rabble raising justifying fluff. I supposed you could add the line, "The government has the responsibility to eliminate its long-term debt and operate under balanced budgets."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While more wordy, I would prefer keeping most of the red and adding to it examples of the blue.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the language of the original better. I do, however, like the part of the final sentence in the proposal that states "Future generations should not be born into a debt burden from previous generations, as it is taxation without representation," and would support a proposal to add that.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Oh boy, are we DREAMING !
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Some change from original may be good. The proposal sounds too much like a campaign speech.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Agreed, in the current climate this specifies the problems to the less informed.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would like to see a note on usage fees versus taxation as a means of eliminating "other taxes" which are as burdensom as income and payroll taxes.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The first sentence is too long. Find one phrase for all of that.

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	huge salaries area paid to elected officials by our tax dollars...scale back their salaries that we pay
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	While it is true that the new language seems more positive, it's also far less detailed. The current version has specific recommendations, like the abolishment of the IRS and the passage of a Balanced Budget Amendment.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Good
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Missing the importance of ABOLISH the income tax and the IRS.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But too wordy.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the concept, but too many words for a simple idea.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer this plank, but feel that it may need to be updated often; in future years some of the issues listed could be gotten rid of or more could arise and need to be added in.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Delete last sentence
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	repeal the 16th amendment
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Strongly support. Time to get real. This is the 21st century
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	A little wordy.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Don't like the term "pork project".
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Too much of a laundry list which only raises the question of what was left out.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It may be best to propose sentence-by-sentence changes in this Plank, as the Plank is somewhat complex and multi-faceted. 1. "Pork projects," "social engineering" and "pet projects" are colloquialisms. They may be headline-grabbing in a news release. An official Plank will want more precise and objective verbiage. 2. Unfortunately, our current bloated government is arguably within "its Constitutional limits." Rather than keeping government within its Constitutional limits, I think we intend for "the federal government to be scaled back to its *MINIMUM* Constitutional limits"

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The federal government should be free to operate interstate infrastructures that enhance the ability of interstate commerce and transportation and provide for the nation's security (defensive only) These projects would be limited to the scope of that they would provide a beneficial, positive impact upon the majority of the citizen's health or well being
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This kind of explanation of benefits is best suited for a companion document. I do not like the listing of examples is a plank statement.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	With the reduction/elimination of all these taxes there must be a corresponding reduction to the size and cost of government. Eliminating minimum wage, unemployment compensation, social security, medicare, medicaid would be a good start. Unfortunately, so many now depend on these programs it will be a hard sell.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	yes giving 50%+ of our income to federal, state, and local government is just outrageous. The 9.175% state sales tax in Arkansas must be repealed
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Although I'd put the period after "success taxed" in the first sentence. I don't think the list of evil expenditures needs to be enumerated. Part of what has given the LP platform its beautiful poetic cast is the sense of striving for that which is lofty and positive.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Conditional support. You should also call for the repeal of the 16th Amendment, which was probably not properly ratified to start with and the decertification of the Federal Reserve and a return to sound, backed monetary policy.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	really quite good.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Well written.

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Use of slang terms, such as "American dream", "pork projects" is inadvisable, as they are not well-defined and subject to interpretation. The term "bailout" does not express the same meaning as "using tax money for private purposes". "Social engineering" has no permanently established meaning and means different things to different generations. In short, these terms should be spelled out in proper American English. The federal government should not be "scaled back", it MUST BE CONFINED TO CONSTITUTIONAL LIMITS.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Maybe this will come up later, but I would like to see opposition to corporations being given the same legal protections as human people, but not the same responsibility, especially when corporations are not punishable for violating either employee's rights or citizens rights, or threaten the safety of health.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Tax payer funds should never be FORCED to be used for ANYTHING private.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Although the original is a bit choppy, it is also much more specific.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I could support a better combination of the old statement and new proposal. The old statement appears more professional and unbiased. The second relates to today's news.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Beautiful!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	On the right track, but this plank should not be limited to federal spending. State governments also need to be scaled back to those activities required by a free society, regardless of the state constitutions.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A great reduction, not total elimination. How would the country pay for defense and highway maintenance without some level of taxation?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I certainly do approve this one!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"allow" the elimination of income, etc. ... ? How about "lead to" or "dictate" or "eventuate in" or, well you wordsmiths get my drift.

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	How is the proposal more positive? I see it as more negative. I find the first half of the last sentence especially nonsensical; if a parent is a representative for their child how are they not a representative for an unborn child? The original language seems pretty clear.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It sounds preachy and whiney
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	last sentence - change "representation, so government..." to "representation. Government..."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Both the federal reserve and federal income tax are unConstitutional. Neither were ever ratified by Congress.State that, and then compose your " plank ".
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"should be" is not a firm stand. We are entitled to keep the fruits of our labor. Private property tax is ridiculous as we never "own" the land because it is a "subject of the state" as we are individually slaved out for taxes. This one needs to be firmed up.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What / who is driving these edits? The proposed edits are LONGER than the original.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would keep something referring to the abolishment of the IRS.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I favor the original. It listed exactly what we wanted and where we stood. I do not see the rewrite as meeting the stated goals of the rewrite.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'd say this is an improvement. The term "charities chosen by the government rather than by the donor," seems awkwardly put, as is "funding the consequences of other individuals' irresponsible personal choices". Is that the correct possessive? Individuals'? Even if it is, there has to be a more elegant way of putting that idea.

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	w/ caveats. People shouldn't "be free to keep" they are entitled. In fact, it's really one of the few "entitlements" there are. While I support itemizing the federal governments' largesse, the language in the existing plank: "abolishment of...all federal programs and services not required...." is perfect. but don't forget the States' obligation to spend on only what is required and not what is wanted. Medicaid is a state-run program only partially funded by the Federal government.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This cannot happen without reapportionment. We cannot have Representation and Liberty with only 435 Representatives. Please add something about this. Congress has limited it's own membership to concentrate power and can add members but will not as it would dilute the individual Reps power and give a greater voice to the individual constituent as opposed to the special interests.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The new version comes off as more of a rant than a platform plank.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I don't care for the existing language or the proposed language. The Constitution gives TOO MUCH power to the federal government, so we shouldn't be endorsing that.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would like to see us take a stand against any retirement benefits of any kind for congress. I would also like to see us stand for members of congress having to follow all laws they create. Also, they are supposed to serve the public. As George Washington and others warned, there should be no salaries for members of congress because what has come about was destined to come about the first time one member of congress took an entitlement benefit, i.e., pay check, allowances, etc.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is a garbled mess. Don't you have an editor? I can't support it in its present form, even though in spirit I'm with you.

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Suggested: ...to be scaled back to its >strict< Constitutional limits... Last sentence is difficult, suggested change: From: ' "...generations, as it is taxation without representation, so government has..." To: "...generations, therefore government has..."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Just because a service is not required under the Constitution does not mean that individuals do not require the service. Not all services can adequately be provided to individuals by for-profit or independent non-profit organizations.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Enumerating the things that we should not be taxed to support leaves the door open for others that some clever politician can come up with.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	People should? NO NO NO! CHANGE "SHOULD" to MUST! Seems redundant to previous sections. Can simply be amended, changed, to reflect the immorality and unconstitutionality of involuntary servitude.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The proposed first sentence isn't anymore positive than the old language, and to boot it's basically saying that its ok to tax for other than the reasons listed. In that sense I prefer the old negative wording to the new negative wording. I do like the last two sentences of the proposal however, and feel these are truly positive.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	again - nice improvement in emphasis with ideas explained in a way that better connects to more people
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Can we make a proposal that government must follow the same health care guidelines and are not allowed to have compensation past their term (pension and retirement). How about term limits so there are no professional life long politicians?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Seems a touch too verbose, but that is probably intended.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The language should stay as is not softened as it is in the rewrite.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Taxation and levy of all sorts shall be prohibited.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The new language is outstanding.

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Government revenues should not come taxes on production, rather it should be from a user fee based on the annual "rental" value of resources from the commons such as land; natural resources such as water, minerals, fossil fuels, et cetera; and radio bandwidth et cetera
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The list of programs misses the point that taxes are bad regardless of which program the money is spent on. It leaves out the worse use: The killing of thousands of people in order to expands a global empire.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would support a LIMITED, short and easy to understand income tax. There should be no reason to need a tax professional for the average person to file taxes. IRS should make no regulation regarding the right of free speech on tax returns.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is a great improvement.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think that the correct term is "Pork Barrel". I also think that some long term debt is acceptable as long as it is used to fund the purchase or construction of long lived assets. Therefore future generations get the asset along with some of its corresponding debt.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Keep the original, with the exception of rewriting sentence 1 to read "All persons should be free to keep the fruits of their labor."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Prefer: "The Constitution limits the government to very specific powers and we believe the Constitution is the supreme law of the land. No spending should be allowed outside strict Constitutional limits and no funds appropriated for than the general welfare. The federal budget should be balanced every year and the debt of the United States should be eliminated in 30 years".

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	All persons are entitled to keep the fruits of their labor. We call for the repeal of the income tax, the abolishment of the Internal Revenue Service and all federal programs and services not required under the U.S. Constitution. We oppose any legal requirements forcing employers to serve as tax collectors. Government should not incur debt, which burdens future generations without their consent.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It is an improvement. The last sentence should be broken in two at the comma after "representation" and then cutting out the word "so".
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I guess I slightly like the newer version, but I am not entirely satisfied with either. Not that I disagree with eliminating all taxes, but considering our staggering national debt, it is also not going to be pragmatic to expect this anytime soon. Also, you propose no realistic replacement system. I would start off with the general statement of principle, that people should keep what they earn. I would call for some specific actions, such as the balanced budget amendment, a commitment to reduce taxes wherever practical, or a switch to fee based by utulization services. This is the overriding concern of many, so it would be best to show that this is carefully considered, not that we're just a bunch of revenuer hating tax abolitionists.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I like the proposed statement.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	. . . fruits of their labor. We call for the federal government. . . . The proposal is too wordy and meaningless.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I am opposed to 2.4

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The wording, both before and after, does not address the root problems of the current model of government finance and spending. We must insist on sovereign currency, zero personal taxation, and a proper distribution of new cash to the states rather than the banks. We should not allow banks to issue or control currency in any form and no interest should be charged on new money without the interest money itself being created and inserted into the circulation. The rest I agree with.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But, it should start: People HAVE THE RIGHT to keep the fruits of their labor
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The original statement is much more straightforward and acceptable. The proposal is pandering, almost to the point of absurdity. It gives more the impression of being a sales pitch rather than the stance of a major political party on a particular issue.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	C'mon -- this is a platform, not a blog. Let's remove the "pork," "social engineering" and other au courant slang and write a formal document, please. Future generations and non-native English speakers would have a hard time understanding why we were emphasizing pigs and how you engineer society...also, try "entail" rather than "allow"
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Meh. Slightly better. I don't like that you left out the IRS.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Like the original better. "live the American dream"? Gag
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	In my opinion, it is unrealistic to call for the elimination of all taxes. The platform should call for minimizing taxes to collect only those funds which are required for those legitimate, Constitutional functions of government which are enumerated elsewhere in the platform.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The original is succinct and gets the point across. This version is too pansy and wishy washy. It is also VERY long winded. (and it leaves out important parts of the original) Some medicines are not to be cherry flavored. Harsh and to the point language is sometimes needed.

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Terms like "American dream" are too nationalistic. We support the rights of individuals no matter what their nation of origin. This proposed text is a little wordy. There is probably a more succinct phrasing.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Change "We call for the repeal of the income tax, the abolishment of the Internal Revenue Service and all federal programs and services not required under the U.S. Constitution." to "We call for the federal government to be scaled back to its Constitutional limits, which would allow the elimination of income, payroll, and many other taxes." The rest, while accurate, will not win any friends among non-Libertarians.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	DEFINITELY SUPPORT 110% and I believe that most Americans would love to see this policy in place
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Interesting, but I think this should be split into sub-proposals. The old text reads MUCH more smoothly, and contains important things (e.g., mandatory tax collection by employers). I don't think informal language like "pork projects" belongs in the platform.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It's not written very well, and I prefer the original, but I could support this.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It should state: People should be free to keep the fruits of their labor without being excessively taxed. We call for the government to be scaled back to its constitutional limits. Future generations should not be born into debt burden from previous generations, with the exception of those that provide reasonable security to sovereign security and personal liberty, as this represents taxation without representation.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer the plainer language in the original plank. In particular "All persons are entitled..." vs "People should be free..." have very different meanings. If you want to emphasize the benefits, do it in separate explanatory language.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Very good!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"All persons" is still better grammatically than "people".

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think the new first sentence is more negative, not less; I don't like it. I do like the new last sentence better than the current one. I'm 50/50.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I support this in spirit. I am not a fan of the wording.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Something should be said about allowing debt in case of war.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Too much whining. It's almost enough to say 'We call for the Federal Government to be scaled back to it's constitutional limits of operating a strong military defense.'
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Original wording is far better that the proposed.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	With one provisory. The calling for the abolition of the IRS should be maintained. I know such action is implicit in the rewrite, but what American legal thought can do with an "implicit" concept is unbelievable. Keep the explicit language
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The first version is much clearer.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Keep the original. Eliminate the first sentence of the proposed change. The rest of the proposed is OK.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, the language appears to have nuanced and weakened.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	"pork-barrel projects," not "pork projects"
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	(1) Why do you switch from "Individuals" to "People" here? (2) There should be language that more explicitly demonstrates our recognition that social welfare programs, on which many millions have unfortunately become dependent, cannot and will not be eliminated overnight. This is a criticism I often hear against Libertarianism. Rep. Ron Paul has lately been doing a good job of explaining the need to "transition" away from social welfare spending.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	WE created the debt, WE need to pay it off. Taxes need to be raised.

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Enumerating certain specific uses of tax money that we oppose could suggest we are not opposed to other uses. The original statement was more concise and more general. However, the statement about employers as tax collectors in the original is unwise. Somebody must collect some taxes; exactly who is a detail below the level of this plank.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	vote for ron paul!!!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We don't want to be taxed for crony capitalism, special interests, or financial support of political parties.. Pls consider adding that to this spending plank.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would still call for the abolishment of the IRS. But this is better than the previous.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Initial wording is concise and accurate. Proposed amendment is too rhetorical. It also consists of three lengthy sentences, which is much less readable. Most importantly, it sounds more like a blog entry than a party platform.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Prefer the original wording, except delete "without their consent". "Their" refers to children, and their consent cannot be obtained.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"We oppose the dynamics of slavery (i. e. taxation of labor, taxation of property, numbering people as cattle, monetary inflation), as these operate as a violence against peace and the large hope for world peace. Any move to take the value of labor from individuals through force must be opposed."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Good rewrite, but I would cut the first sentence completely.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The general idea is good but the wording is poor. A few weak points here. 1) Income tax is allowed by the Constitution 2) Taxation without representation? How about no taxation? 3) Leave out the American Dream. It sounds too wishy-washy though as an immigrant I appreciate the sentiment completely.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Make shorter sentences with fewer clauses. The phrase "other individual's irresponsible personal choices" is redundant. Strike out personal.

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Prefer this to the original, but would like to see it written more formally. Sounds like a rant. Also, use of "the American dream" is silly without explaining what the American dream is.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	"pork projects---to---irresponsible personal choices" is probably an incomplete list of taxation faults.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'd dump the "... for pork ... choices." No need to specify (or forget to) each specific bad expenditure.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	When you start positively listing things you don't want to be taxed for, you open yourself to being taxed for the things you didn't list.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Lists. Not every enjoys lists, what are we Cracked.com now? "pork projects, social engineering, special favors to lobbyists, bailouts of failed private investments of others, subsidies for private industries, charities chosen by the government rather than by the donor," the more specific you are, the more ways others will find around you. I propose, drop "We support the passage of a "Balanced Budget Amendment" to the U.S. Constitution, provided that the budget is balanced exclusively by cutting expenditures, and not by raising taxes.", and replace with "We call for the federal government to be scaled back to its Constitutional limits, which would allow the elimination of income, payroll, and many other taxes. Future generations should not be born into a debt burden from previous generations, as it is taxation without representation, so government has a responsibility to eliminate its long-term debt and operate under balanced budgets.". Also, have you ever heard of a Flat Tax? Something to think about.

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Delete the portion on "for pork projects, social engineering, special favors to lobbyists, bailouts of failed private investments of others, subsidies for private industries, charities chosen by the government rather than by the donor, and funding the consequences of other individuals' irresponsible personal choices." The above statement is not needed and may send a wrong message to the reader of venom spewing instead of liberty. If you really want something after the '...their success taxed...' then simply put 'for unconstitutional government spending.'
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Not sure about "American dream," but otherwise well written.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	very good improvements!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Taxes have lost their function as the means to pay for government and have become vehicles for the purchase of votes.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	who says it is more positive?!?!?!? "balanced budget amendment" IS the most important clause in either version.... I would have supported the new "rewrite"... but the balanced budget amendment is more important than the "wording" or any opinion of which phrase is more "positive".....
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Wording is cumbersome.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, we are exchanging succinct language for flowers.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Too much "dog whistle" verbiage. Drop all language from the word "labor" in the first sentence to the beginning of the second sentence.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	strongly support
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The concept is good, I am not fully comfortable with all th wording in the first sentence.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Try again. Politically and emotionally loaded words like "American dream" and "pork projects" mean different things to different people. Clarity demands their elimination.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The original is clearer than the proposed changes. Yes it's radical, but we're not expecting to win an election, are we?

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I weakly support the language. Drop the pork projects and other specific projects. The intent of changing the language is to make the party less extreme. I support Jeffersonian Democracy and that is a lightly regulated and lightly taxed citizenry.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Still needs more development but it's a step in the right direction.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Woot! Go, Libertarians!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Self-ownership is the strongest principle. This might be stronger if self-ownership were extended to ownership of all that is peacefully attained, or attained without infringing the rights of others. Is the government free to coin its own money, or do you support the FED? The FED isn't mentioned. Specifics are good, but shouldn't it start with self-ownership and expand from there? Taxes are essentially taken by force (levenworth) so it might be good to mention we do not support using force to redistribute property.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This plank could be edited down to something along the lines of: Americans enjoy the freedom to pursue their own happiness including keeping the fruits of their labor. Government's role is to protect America's sovereignty from foreign invasion, enforce contracts, and protect individual liberty. Therefore, taxes can only be justified to the extent proscribed by the Constitution and in the amount necessary to fulfill strictly defined roles of government. Government has a responsibility to eliminate long-term debt and operate under balanced budgets. Long-term debt to finance deficit spending requires taxing future generations to pay for current spending, and is tantamount to taxation without representation.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A little wordy listing the examples, but I like it. The better description will likely allow more people to see the logic in the idea of living without income tax, as it is something most people have come to accept as "necessary". I know I did before I truly understood the economic ideas of the Libertarian Party.

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I'm 50/50 on that statement. While it is a good start, I think if a Gov't program is working & not going over budget, it should kept. I support cutting or making Gov't programs that aren't working, work effectively. The whole tax system needs to be overhauled, but so that it works for the American people. Also, if we don't look to compromise, people will reject a libertarian platform.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Better, but not perfect. Long-term debt is legitimate for financing a long-lived assets, but certainly not at the levels we see today.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Yes!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Too verbose. I would substitute "and their honestly acquired property." for this phrase "...and live the American dream without having their success taxed for pork projects, social engineering, special favors to lobbyists, bailouts of failed private investments of others, subsidies for private industries, charities chosen by the government rather than by the donor, and funding the consequences of other individuals' irresponsible personal choices."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You have to be more specific like "I WILL GIVE TO EACH AMERICAN A \$75,000 LIVING CARD IF YOU ELECT ME FOR U.S. PRESIDENT"; "I WILL ISSUE \$50 TRILLION NEW FIAT MONEY ELIMINATING THE FEDERAL RESERVE"; "WE WILL MANUFACTURE ONE HUNDRED PERCENT IN AMERICA USING THE FEDERAL LANDS CREATING 100 JOBS". If you need help call me to 571-288-7383. My family could donate also \$100 million to your PAC. Thanks Alberto Lopez WWW.EBLM.US
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	repeal the income tax
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Add balanced budget amendment to this and I will support it even more.

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The language is too undignified -- "pork", "bailouts". The change in registers is jarring. I support the meaning in spirit, but I really don't like the wording. I also don't like invoking the Constitution in that spot, because I think it probably fits better elsewhere. I also think the last sentence is bad English, bordering on a run-on sentence..
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support it, but I am not really satisfied with it. I don't care for the "American Dream" as it makes it seem that this should only apply to Americans and all people. "Government should not incur debt" needs to stay in it.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support this in principle, but you don't define your terms and therefore cause problems. For example, what does "social engineering" mean (in my field -- cybersecurity -- it means something quite different than what you mean -- I think). You need to cut this down, and emphasize that the federal income tax works as a bad idea from a policy standpoint. You cannot, reasonably, try to make the case that it works as a bad idea on principle (I think; I know we all agree that the income tax works as a bad idea). You also need to explicitly separate the idea of an income tax, per se, from the idea of a balanced budget. These work as separate ideas, and by combining them you merely muddle the issue.

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I don't like the original or the new proposal actually. I think it is totally unnecessary to spell out the types of things our tax money is misspent on. I like the idea of the "Fair Tax" to tax spending not income. Perhaps this should be in the platform. I would word this plank something like this, with 2 distinct paragraphs: "People should be free to keep the fruits of their labor and live the American Dream. We support the elimination of income, payroll and other non-constitutional taxes and fees. We would replace these taxes with a "Fair Tax" which taxes spending rather than income and puts the tax burden on those who can afford it. "We call for the federal government to be scaled back to its Constitutional limits. We believe that the federal government is constitutionally obligated to have a balanced budget and to have no deficit spending."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	How about: Individuals should be free to keep the fruits of their labor and to enjoy such, without having their success taxed for "pork" projects, social engineering, special favors to lobbyists and campaign donors, bailouts of failed private investments, subsidies for private industries, government selected charities, funding the consequences of irresponsible personal choices, and the like. We call for the federal government to adhere to its Constitutional limits, and to eliminate income, payroll, and other taxes. Future generations are not to be burdened by debts from previous generations, which otherwise amounts to taxation without representation, and therefore government has a responsibility to operation under a balanced budget and eliminate long term debt.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"...donor, and THE funding OF the consequences..."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Too wordy, prefer original wording of the plank.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	If we oppose "social engineering," that should include opposition to "genetic engineering," right?

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	This not only waters down a strong statement, it establishes the LP as a minarchist organization that supports some form of federal government, thus excluding anarcho-capitalists.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I like the new wording better than the old, but I've never completely agreed with this particular plank or our party. Especially given the grossly bloated state of both the debt and deficit, I don't see the math working out as to how we can both balance the budget and completely eliminate income and payroll taxes. I think reduced taxes (but not eliminated), with greatly reduced government size & spending, will be required at least for the next decade. The Libertarian Party agrees with the need for federal and state governments of appropriate (i.e. greatly reduced size). Even a much smaller government will require some revenues to function.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Under the Fair Tax proposal, *someone* would have to collect taxes (i.e. retailers). Also, saying that future generations deserve representation in taxation is an awful lot like invoking the rights of the unborn, which would feed right into the abortion debate that we welcome both sides of.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	suggest last sentence be broken into two sentences, i.e., ", as it is taxation without representation. Thus, government has a responsibility..."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the rewrite, although I really would miss the final sentence of the original plank regarding the "Balanced Budget Amendment"
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But income tax is allowed under a Constitutional amendment (16th?)
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Don't care for the use of "pork projects"
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Congress does have the power to lay taxes according to XVI amendment.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	pork is slang
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Language such as "prok projects" is too informal and imprecise.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Fantastic.

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A big improvement. Calling for elimination of a specific government agency means nothing, as its functions could be reassigned.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	absolutely
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	JEEEEEEEEZ. One fucking short sentence. "You make it, you earn it, it's yours."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Suggest removing items that are subject to personal opinion, such as PORK PROJECTS, SPECIAL FAVORS. Emphasize following the constitution as written, ending programs not specifically required by the Constitution.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	AMEN!!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Absolutely correct!!!!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Income taxes are a legitimate, and constitutional, form of taxation, both by the original document, and by the 16th amendment. We should avoid getting into specifics that quickly become outdated, and should instead restrict ourselves to getting the government back to its constitutional limits.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	No, no, no, no. Something simple would be appropriate: "People should be free to keep the fruits of their labor." Forget the examples, which leave open the possibility that taxation for other purposes might be OK.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There should be an option to SUPER support this.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This certainly makes it more clear that Libertarians oppose forcing others to spend against their will whilst retaining the general small government ideal of the original language.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I don't like either of them. Need to pare them down to essentials.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	First sentence of proposed new language could be shortened without listing all the ways governments spend what they shouldn't.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	First sentence should go. Last sentence is good. In middle sentence, how is government funded without income taxes?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Original, while awkward, was better. This is much too wordy. It reads more like a bad infomercial than a platform plank!

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	These are both poorly written. I don't like either of them, but the proposal is too wordy.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Absolutely always include the call for the repeal of the income tax. Do not wimp out!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But, without adequate government services, life can be very miserable. We are no longer an agrarian society where we can grow a garden, milk the cow and slop the pigs.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Oversimplified and extreme
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Somewhat verbose.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Too much frou-frou
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Sounds too preachy.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But how much immediate unemployment occurs and how can you ever get those now employed in those depts to agree with this - but yes I fully agree.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Makes the statement too soft.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Too specific, keep it general like in the original
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't see how the proposal is more "positive", and see them as essentially the same. Nevertheless, the plank is sound.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	put the term pork projects in double quotes: "pork projects". Replace "scaled back" with "limited". Replace "would allow" with "allows". You rule!!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Though I would add something about natural disasters, the size and scope of disasters around the world, governments are the only one capable of funding to help with those. I do not mean free money, but low or no interest loans are probable.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Very nice job here!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Remove the words "of others" after the phrase "bailouts of failed private investments."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It is important to tell the government and the populace where the government CAN get its money from.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	so gorvenment should be required to eliminate its long term debt and operate under balanced budgets

9.0 - Government Finance and Spending

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Commenters	50.5%	49.5%	14.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	people should be free to keep the fruites of their labor and live *their version* of the American Dream. i feel that adding that language is very important
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Too broad.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The Government not private banks should print our nations money debt free. We should no longer borrow our money from National banks. Further banks should no longer be allowed to practice fractional reserve lending. And the Us Government should not be allowed to borrow money. It should be we the people that are in charge of our money supply and not the bankers.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Eliminate government theft!!!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	One person's pork project is another person's essential public works project. The original language is much less loaded and more neutral.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Start again; the replacement is no better than the original.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Clunky, but better than the current language
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	convoluted
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	scratch, "the American dream".
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	'American dream' there is no such thing except in story books.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Bravo.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I propose a compromise, something halfway between the old wording and the new proposal.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I hate to say it but income tax is a necessity because Gov't does need to provide some services such as a military. I say scale back income tax but I cannot see forever being rid of it. Darn it.

10.0 - Money and Financial Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	85.1%	14.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.3%	44.7%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The first two words of the new plank make it sound like we "would if we could"...as if it is a pipe dream and since we are (thought to be) "unelectable" it will never happen. A better idea might be to say, "Libertarians call for a halt to government's..."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The second sentence of the new version is a good addition
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Change 'Americans' to 'people,' and change 'combating' to 'prosecuting,' and this would be a good amendment. Otherwise the American Nationalism and the hint that regulation instead of prosecution of actual crime is a proper role of government are deal-breakers.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	add abolish the FED reserve
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	How about Libertarians WILL halt...
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This needed elaboration, and I think this revision accomplishes that.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I know that's not what it means, but I read "hard-working American" and I think "class warfare."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Support change but would like "Money" aspect of plank included. Gold standard and/or competing currency should be mentioned.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The old and the new are saying different things, and making different points, in my opinion. The old is about fiat money, and the new is a polemic against bailouts.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Final proposed sentence would be okay. First one too complex for a plank. There may be reasons why some policies will naturally favor larger groups or special groups.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Banks should not be allowed to gamble with their clients investments. I do want regulations in certain areas
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, I prefer the original wording. I am not in favor of making any of the platform more "politically correct."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	However I don't think the second sentence should be eliminated. Even if it isn't on the mind of the average voter, it is still a very important issue and removing it makes it seem like it is not important to Libertarians.

10.0 - Money and Financial Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	85.1%	14.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.3%	44.7%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree with the comments (only 4 lines). However, a suggestion again is pple: Libertarians favor free financial markets and the other ideas set out in (a) (b) etc. below it.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'd like to see an "end the Fed" plank and stronger "no bail outs" language.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Can we come out squarely against Keynesian economic model for government during times other than war or national emergency?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Needs more End The Fed.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We oppose the DESTABILIZING affects on the national economy by capitalist bankers in the "monetary business" of using money as commodity or "product" for profit. Government has a legitimate role in regulating the money supply which it provides by instituting ONLY government banks and outlawing/abolishing all others. Government should further return to the CONSTITUTIONALLY LEGAL tender of gold and silver coinage and abolish ALL "symbolic" or "token" money.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	How about this: Libertarians endorse a free and energetic economic marketplace in which sellers and buyers are each at liberty to pursue the rewards and risks of all legal transactions. Libertarians seek to remove all governmental encumbrances that limit commerce between willing trade partners and entities.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Keep the proposed deletion and add the last sentence of the proposed change.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Need to include the concept of transparency.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The new statement mentions nothing about unconstitutional legal tender, i. e. the Federal Reserve and fractional reserve banking. The current plank implies support for sound money based on real backing like precious metals, which is the constitutional way. The replacement statement is weaker on this topic.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Should keep the second sentence - haven't private minters of gold coins been shut down by the Federal Government?

10.0 - Money and Financial Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	85.1%	14.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.3%	44.7%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	See my previous comment. As soon as you say "Libertarians would halt governments manipulative monetary policies..", you've lost 95% of the American people. You don't have to slap them in the face to get their attention.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Presently the Regulators of Financial Institutions such as the NYSE is regulated by the SEC and The NY Federal Reserve Bank. whose President is Voted In By the Heads of those same Regulated Financial Institutions. We have a situations of The "Fox running the Hen House"
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There seems to be a contradiction between government's role in combating fraud and the idea that people should invest entirely at their own risk.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would make it clear that large banks and the Fed have been the biggest culprits.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Absolutely not, because it wimpifies the long-standing LP call for private money, and abolishing the Fed. The success of the Ron Paul movement calling for commodity-backed and private currencies gives the lie to your claim that no one cares for the idea.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	'nuff said on that one.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We can address the unconstitutional legal tender laws when we get there.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	We ought to make a distinct difference between the parties by Libertarians desire to have silver and gold based money and to eliminate fiat currency laws.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	make the big financial institutions repay their bailouts
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The amendment tries to persuade people how good we are. The original states exactly what we think about the matter.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Scratch the first and last sentences (which are editorial statements) and restate the second as a proposed purpose and legitimate duty of a government.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Maybe mention the free-market another time or two, this would drive home the distinction

10.0 - Money and Financial Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	85.1%	14.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.3%	44.7%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You would need to define "manipulative monetary policies" for this to work. If you take out those words, the policy is fine.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I didn't think the Libertarian Party platform applied only to Americans.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Change "hard-working" to "working".
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	While in general I like the new more inclusive nature, I don't want to eliminate our recommendation of private barter currency, nor do I want to admit the government has any legitimate power in and of itself. At least add the old "when they exist" line.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	How about "combating fraud in financial markets but not regulating or guaranteeing them."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Unsure
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I generally support this concept, but would like to see the following sentence struck from the language. "Government has a legitimate role combating fraud in financial markets."
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Weakens the Plank.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	They are both bad. The old versions of these planks are stiff and the new ones are conversational and sometimes sound like slogans - unprofessional.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Original text mentions "inflation[ary]," which term is not well understood by the average person, IMO. The proposal states things in terms of reduced purchasing power-- better.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I like this but think using the term "hard-working" is not necessary. It sounds a bit like a Republican campaign speech. The purchasing power of all Americans is reduced - even the lazy ones.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Inflation is typically promoted by government. It must be curtailed. At the same time, each adult should have unlimited right to contract. The government shall not be able to abridge individual adult contracts.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support this proposal in principle, but I still don't like the language.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Absolutely.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	+++

10.0 - Money and Financial Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	85.1%	14.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.3%	44.7%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Again, nice changes that seem to bring the party's platform more in line with the concerns of mainstream America. I'd be careful about using the term "Americans." Everyone who earns a paycheck here is affected by the monetary policies, regardless of whether they are American. I understand the meaning and intent of the policy, but I can easily see a journalist or political opponent using this wording to label the party isolationist or "anti-foreign."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Preferred the first one.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again "eternal truths" not ads. What average voter is going to read our platform? Put this type of language in a flyer.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I really like the add of the Government has a role in combating fraud in financial markets, because it should what we do believe that the government should do
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't think you emphasize the issue of market-chosen money enough. Even Ron Paul doesn't demand gold but rather would allow open competition and contracts. I like everything else, but I am afraid not enough folks realize that "free financial markets" requires competitive money as well. Please add this, it is especially important now.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Recent bailouts and porkulus programs should be retroactively rescinded.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But... don't ever make the condecending mistake of talking down to "the mind of the average voter" again. Leave the voters are stupid attitude to the Republicans and Democrats.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I neither support or oppose the new proposal, I think that it should be merged in with the old one.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I still would like to see some language opposing the criminalization of competing currencies.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree with either statement
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	better in the original

10.0 - Money and Financial Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	85.1%	14.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.3%	44.7%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	needs a stronger statement that FED needs to be abolished, as well as fractional reserve banking at the FED / government level. Congress not a multinational banking cartel should issue and control monetary policy.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the original better; it is clearer and more to the point. The new version just sounds too "preachy" but I can see you have dumbed it down a bit to appeal to the average uninformed voter "hard working American" bit. I guess that is fine since we are trying to broaden appeal, however I think it wise to explicitly state somewhere exactly what we would do to "halt ... manipulative monetary policy" for us "meat and potato's" libertarians like myself who understand enough about free market economics to want to know exactly what are you going to do to be sure we are on the same page here.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The suggested change uses too many words open to interpretation. The original leaves nothing to the imagination and is more straight forward and clear.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	OK but exceedingly clumsy. Better to oppose corporate lobbies and restrict by law any lobbying to protect corporate profits. Our congress was designed to represent the citizen, not corporate campaign contributions. Address the real problem, and the other issues evaporate. Corporations are NOT people, NOT citizens.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	good, thank you

10.0 - Money and Financial Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	85.1%	14.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.3%	44.7%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This reads like it was written by someone who has not taken basic economics. A little inflation IS DESIRABLE for the average American; no inflation favors those who already have money. Remove the first sentence entirely. Keep the next: "Government has a legitimate role combating fraud in financial markets. We favor free financial markets, where private investors assume financial risks, and are entitled to the rewards of honestly acquired gains". Remove the last fragment "without expecting taxpayers to subsidize them or bail out their losses." Replace it with "Taxpayers should not subsidize or bail out financial institutions". Is the intent to limit this only to financial markets? What about automotive or airlines or aircraft manufacturers or weapons systems?
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	The proposed plank should appeal to both left and right. I hope this one gets pushed through at the convention!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The original is clearer in its philosophical claims.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The proposal contains no direct reference to the fact that our Federal Government is supporting the Federal Reserve's policy of inflating the dollar's value into oblivion.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Before regulation, fraud was defined by the general knowledge that we know it when we see it. Now fraud is something that doesn't violate the regulatory language and if the regulatory language doesn't specifically address a misdeed; no personal or institutional liability is assessed. I don't think my comment fits within the platform plank; but I believe I make a point that is not often expressed, and that the benefactors of bipartisan cooperation of Democrats and Republicans are well aware of.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Original wording preferred.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A great inclusion here. This may be the only platform which directly addresses moral hazard in financial markets. Very well done.

10.0 - Money and Financial Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	85.1%	14.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.3%	44.7%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The original (red) wording is better than the suggestions, but the whole issue of money and financial markets should be far more explicit, i.e. eliminating the Federal Reserve, eliminating a fiat money system and returning to a gold standard. This plank needs a lot more work.
Oppose Support	Unlikely Unlikely	No No	Non-Member Non-Member	The previous statement is more on point. Let's not make it sound like our political promises. "Libs WOULD..." sounds more like, "we'll do this... if elected." So change the wording there.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, too broad. We are still suffering the consequences of the Bush deregulation of the financial industry.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Very bad modification. It's very important to defend the free banking and private currency. And inflation destroys directly the saving, not the purchasing power of worker. " Government has a legitimate role combating fraud in financial markets " what ???
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	The new language is OK, but it should include the following from the original: Individuals engaged in voluntary exchange should be free to use as money any mutually agreeable commodity or item. We support a halt to inflationary monetary policies.
Support Support	Unlikely Unlikely	No No	Non-Member Non-Member	Favor? over 'advocate or stand for' I think you should combine, especially noting "individuals engaged in voluntary exchange should be free to use as money any mutually agreeable commodity or item.
Support Oppose	Likely Unlikely	No No	Non-Member Non-Member	Very good! Government has no legitimate role, anywhere, ever.

10.0 - Money and Financial Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	85.1%	14.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.3%	44.7%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The LP needs to propose a solution, an alternative to "government's manipulative monetary policies". That's where the freedom to choose currencies and repealing legal tender laws come in, despite the apparent belief that these are 'hardly a problem' to the average voter. The LP needs to make it clear to the voter just WHY these things are problems, because they are fundamental. Monetary policy is even more fundamental than fiscal policy, because our current monetary policy ENABLES fiscal profligacy. This is the key issue of our time.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Somehow you should define "fraud"..after all what brought everything down was "legal" but untrustworthy financial practices by the banks
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe that the sentence, "Individuals engaged in voluntary exchange should be free to use as money any mutually agreeable commodity or item. We support a halt to inflationary monetary policies (i.e. the Federal Reserve) and unconstitutional legal tender laws." A gold or silver standard must be returned to end inflation and unrestricted and illegal habits of monetary manipulation and fluctuations.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Maybe explain what government's legitimate role in combating fraud is. The second and the third sentence may seem contradicting to some readers.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Please could we drop the "hard-working"-we get it enough in pol speeches!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would otherwise agree with the re-write but I'm not sure what we mean by "honestly acquired gains". Does this mean legally or something else? Please clarify.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We should also explicitly demand audit and abolition of the Federal Reserve System.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Too wordy. Too focused on current events.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think "Government has a legitimate role combating fraud in financial markets" is too open and needs clarified.

10.0 - Money and Financial Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	85.1%	14.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.3%	44.7%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Agreed.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	must retain "free market banking" language. This new language seems to accept government's monopoly over money creation.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'd suggest adding something about the gold standard in this, but I'm nitpicking.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Bad English. Remove comma after risks. Add "to" before "bail" since this a compound infinitive.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would eliminate the first part and only use the final sentence "We favor free financial markets, where private investors assume financial risks, and are entitled to the rewards of honestly acquired gains, without expecting taxpayers to subsidize them or bail out their losses."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Wonderful!
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Definitely add back in the verbiage struck out. New explanation is fine, but former needs to be retained.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, new wording is better in places, but proposed change waters down the libertarian position.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would add that we should return to the Gold Standard.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would add the second statement to the first instead of using it as a replacement.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Reinstate the lined out version.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I feel like this explains in a better way what the original was trying to say.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The issue is about freedom of choice in Units of Accounting, which is one central function of "money" but not the most familiar, which is payments media. Of course fraud and manipulation is important, but that is not the message of the platform plank.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The wording is coherent and understandable to the every day American.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The constitution gives no authority to regulate business.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Possible edit: While government has a legitimate role markets, we favor
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Change "hard-working" to "all". Otherwise strongly support this change, though I wish we included the reference to legal tender laws in the revision.

10.0 - Money and Financial Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	85.1%	14.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.3%	44.7%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I would, however, support a revision in which the last sentence of the proposal replaced the first sentence of the current plank.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The Libertarian Party, not Libertarians sounds better....
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A little bit more that defines .gov's role in combating fraud may be useful, as it seems too open-ended currently.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The working is sufficient as is.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Change second sentence: "Government has a legitimate role in adjudicating acts of fraud in financial markets." In third sentence, change "where private" to "in which private".
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The original version seems more philosophically correct calling for "unrestricted competition...of all types" and to "halt...legal tender laws". This strikes directly (and appropriately) at the federal reserve system. TARP is a leaf, the federal reserve act is the root. If you haven't consulted Bill Still on this topic I recommend it; this is his baby as they say and he makes sense to me.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think the plank should call for an audit of the Federal Reserve.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Keep it simple.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The original statement is more appropriate to a platform. Issues such as our disdain for subsidies and bailouts are more appropriate in a program (the program is our plan of action).
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Personally I feel the need exists for some form of regulation but I don't know who should be charged with the task.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The existing version should be expanded, but the new version is too vague. Also, a desire for the end of the Federal Reserve and fiat currency should be explicit.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	YES!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Retain " Individuals engaged in voluntary exchange should be free to use as money any mutually agreeable commodity or item" This may not be on the mind of the average voter but as Libertarians it's always on our minds

10.0 - Money and Financial Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	85.1%	14.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.3%	44.7%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I dislike the new language as much as I dislike the old. Too much weasel-language. Strike "hard-working Americans". WHAT is the legitimate role of combating fraud? Many in gov't would say that current regulations don't go far enough to combat fraud...
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would use the word preventing, rather than combatting, since your spelling just looks wrong, though my Webster's says either is okay.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	not sure, seems confusing
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Yes, but some distinction should be made between Civil Fraud and Criminal Fraud. The former can be resolved without government involvement.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	it is unclear whether the softening and dilution of language reflects the want of new voters to the party or the relaxed viewpoints of the party now after an influx of new individuals
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Whoa, the lack of a mention of commodity money is too important to let go by. We need to support the gold standard.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Libertarians would "halt government's manipulative monetary policies" is a complicated phrase that lacks specificity. Suggest Libertarians "reject the government's reckless expansionary monetary policies"....
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree that there could be improvement on the original statement, but the proposed language is no good, in my opinion.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Another good idea lost in translation. Just recast the good bits about self-ownership and the personal responsibility that comes with it. Think in terms of common ideas, phrases and even rhetorical cadences marching across your platform. This isn't going to grab anybody.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We need to add a little more about banking practices, particularly fractional reserve lending. That one item gives the bankers power over the government and forces the government to be to the bankers.

10.0 - Money and Financial Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	85.1%	14.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.3%	44.7%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The new wording is too weak; the original is at least clear. The new wording relates to intentions, not means. We should know well that good intentions are not enough.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would not be opposed to the addition of new language if not for the fact that I do not like to see the elimination of old language. Wouldn't this be best: "We favor free-market banking and free financial markets, with unrestricted competition among banks and depository institutions of all types, and where private investors assume financial risks, and are entitled to the rewards of honestly acquired gains, without expecting taxpayers to subsidize them or bail out their losses. We support prohibiting and combating fraud in financial markets and elsewhere. Individuals engaged in voluntary exchange should be free to use as money any mutually agreeable commodity or item. We support a halt to inflationary monetary policies and unconstitutional legal tender laws, and would halt government's manipulative monetary policies, which favor large financial institutions and special interests while reducing the purchasing power of hard-working Americans." This would also eliminate the claim that government has a legitimate role, while affirming the view that law is legitimate.

10.0 - Money and Financial Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	85.1%	14.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.3%	44.7%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would prefer: Plank 2.5 - Markets, Money and Financial Institutions Individuals engaged in voluntary exchange should be free in their transaction to use any mutually agreeable commodity or item. We support a halt to unconstitutional monetary policies and legal tender laws that reduce the purchasing power of individual Americans. We favor free-market banking, with unrestricted competition among banks and depository institutions of all types. We favor free financial markets, where private investors assume financial risks, have the private right to pursue their own happiness with their acquired gains, and are privately responsible to suffer their losses. Government has a legitimate role combating fraud and monopolization in all markets.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The new language is no improvement in my opinion.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	"Money" is part of the plank title, and yet the issue of what is money is eliminated by the rewrite. I think it is important to mention that government should not have a monopoly on money (i.e., the second sentence of the original version).
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the idea of this change, but the concept of currency competition has been completely removed, which was the main idea of this section. Perhaps a combination of the two ideas is in order, adding the new ideas of government seeking out and penalizing fraud and opposing bailouts, while still preserving the currency competition ideas. There is no reason to substitute ideas simply because certain ones are more modern/topical. History repeats itself.
Oppose Support	Unlikely Unlikely	No No	Non-Member Non-Member	Ok as was, Another good change to help with the understanding of the platform.

10.0 - Money and Financial Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	85.1%	14.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.3%	44.7%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Do not like last section:...."without expecting taxpayer to subsidize them or bail out their losses" Too event specific and would rather have it read...and suffer consequences of bad business decisions and losses without government subsidies or bailouts.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer the original
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	One more attempt to water down our platform! Just because something is not a "problem on the mind of the average voter" does not mean we should expunge it from the document that states what we believe! This proposal would eliminate our call for people to have choice in money and an end to legal tender laws. By stating that there is a "legitimate role" for government it also explicitly violates the party's informal Dallas Accord agreement to remain neutral on the question of anarchy versus limited government. Finally, it adds language that begins with an emphasis on what we oppose and deletes language that begins with an emphasis on what we favor, notwithstanding the fact that the committee justifies one of its revisions to the Rights and Discrimination plank (proposal #13) on the grounds that "The proposed re-write begins with an emphasis on what we favor, rather than what we oppose."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Note: The Libertarian Party could stop manipulative monetary policies by challenging the Federal Reserve's refusal to redeem Federal Reserve notes in "lawful money" as required under Title 12. In spite of erroneous beliefs the US is still on the "gold standard" but statutory law and contract laws related to promissory notes are not being enforced.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I like the new language as an addition, but don't support a plank that eliminates all concrete proposals.

10.0 - Money and Financial Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	85.1%	14.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.3%	44.7%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Money is too important to be controlled by government. Any government which controls money has defacto control of the population. Just state simply that money and banking should be completely free and subject only to legal recourse in cases of force or fraud.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Perhaps mention something about a sound currency?
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Here again, the typical American has no idea how well a free market can regulate itself. This needs to be toned down so as not to scare off potential members.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Where is the audit the fed plank?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Free-market banking and no legal tender laws is clear enough. Introduction of the `fraud' theme here is risky.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	may need to be reworked but dont like the current rework
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The proposed language should be added to, rather than replace the existing statement.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Libertarians are in favor of free market money. Is this some attempt to have the libertarian party support a GOVERNMENT IMPOSED gold standard??
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	We should discuss auditing or eliminating the Federal Reserve which is a successful theme for Ron Paul
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Original was clearer. Which non-manipulative government monetary policies do we support? Implies we would support government policies that favor small financial institutions.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We should also change the law regarding interstate commerce and the illegitimate powers it enforces.

10.0 - Money and Financial Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	85.1%	14.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.3%	44.7%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If only we could get this plank factuated in full!!! Were the average voter to seriously read www.zerohedge.com they could quickly come to understand, among many and various points, they could very helpfully serve aid to such government's role were they to massfully clamor for elimination of the so-called Federal Reserve; however, i question if there is enough existing ordinary people's prison space for all of the financial sector criminals currently in need of removal from their predatory perches and lairs and "liary" platforms.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is much better.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	How to "halt government's manipulative monetary policies"?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	not sure about gov't legitimate role in combating fraud. I might support it. Maybe.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	support current wording
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	yes, a good improvement.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Much clearer.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Well done.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, too tedious and specific driven by very recent events
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	C'mon. You can do better.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	While the average voter may not care about monetary policy and legal tender laws, the disaffected Ron Paul supporter may be attracted to the direct language in the plank. If we held language to the standard of the "average voter", the platform would be much shorter! ;)
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Lukewarm support. I agree with the ideas behind the rewording. The current proposal points out the negative current situation and that we'd "halt" it, but does nothing to explain (positively) what Libertarians would *do* in its place. Or, if it does so explain, it is wholly unclear to me.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Original one is clearer - but the addition of a statement against bailouts would be OK.

10.0 - Money and Financial Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	85.1%	14.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.3%	44.7%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would support the addition of language that provides heavy penalties for organizations and individuals who fraudulently profit off of disadvantaged individual or organizational investors.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The proposal is too statist, and removes championship of competitive money. As a compromise, I'd support adding the proposed language to the existing language.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Are you serious? You don't think that average Americans are thinking about the money supply? Have you seen the price of gold? Have you seen the Tea-Party movement's call for an audit of the Federal Reserve? Have you not seen the "Down-size DC.org's and Dr. Ron Paul's push for competition in currency? Honestly? "End the Fed" has more attention than it ever has since the inception of that institution, and you don't think that Americans care about the issue? Really?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Original language seems clearer and less needing revision again.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the first two sentences of the proposal, but against the last sentenc.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Add: Libertarians support the return to a stable, non-inflationary, metals backed currency as required by the Constitution.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is a good start, but unless we address Too Big To Fail head on this will never happen. There are only two ways to eliminate the risk of more public bailouts of financial institutions: either break up the big banks, or go back to Glass-Steagall.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think more folks are worried about inflation, the federal reserve, and fiscal policy than you may think, but the new language is better overall.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Use last sentence only.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Can we speak to or address speculation in the market? This is not the intended purpose for when the market was created, that is to provide capital funds for business growth.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Now we are cooking. Money, debt, economics and rights.

10.0 - Money and Financial Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	85.1%	14.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.3%	44.7%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Opposition to legal tender laws is too important to be dropped.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The Federal Reserve language is valuable and needs to be addressed. If you want the individual language, then keep the monetary policy part.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i think you combine the two....since this is about 'money' - include that 2nd sentence of the original plank. what is constitutional, too? emphasize that...
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Apparently we need to add the Consumer Protection Agency - which is now trying to regulate bank fees - an invasion of private free enterprise. Another government agency gone bad - and in only two months, no less.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, the former is plainer and easier to understand. The proposed rewrite sounds like it was written by a lawyer. You need to consider your target audience.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The wording of the existing plank is clearer and less emotive. Believe it or not, government's manipulative monetary policies also reduce the purchasing power of lazy Americans.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Yes!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer the current plank.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is MUCH better than before, considering the dishonesty and fraud of recent years in banks. Emphasizing that government should prosecute fraud-for-gain is good.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Consult Ron Paul for a strong, clear statement in support of sound money.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	last sentence could use copyedit work
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would support a revision that contains only the final sentence. I do not like the implicit attack on "large financial institutions" and the warm embrace of the "hard-working Americans, " as if those who are in large institutions are not in the class of "hard-working Americans." Let us not get into the "class warfare" a la Obama!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Suggest adding one word (the) in line 3. "...investors assume the financial risks,... I think it emphasizes the responsibility of investors.

10.0 - Money and Financial Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	85.1%	14.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.3%	44.7%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The new language has merit. However, it should include opposition to legal tender laws (whether Constitutional or not).
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I would add that the free market is a better regulator than the government in that it requires investors to either file bankruptcy or re-manage their debt, consequently causing them to manage their investment while weighing risk. Or words to that effect!
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Consider adding another sentence: So long as the Federal Reserve exists, its primary purpose should be to maintain a stable dollar, without government creation of inflation or deflation.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would like to see a statement regarding our stand on monetary policy in regards to how money is valued and how we plan to stay consistent with that valuation, i.e. We plan on binding our currency to the price of gold and shall print no more than \$xx dollars a year. Or, some other equally suitable and verifiable statement of purpose with regards to the valuation of printed money.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	weak, but acceptable
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Obfuscation.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Libertarians would halt government's manipulative monetary policies which devalue our currency, favor large financial institutions and give government the power to create and grow bureaucracies. It is the marriage of bureaucracy and special interests that infect our free market with cronyism. Government has a legitimate role to combat fraud and enforce laws in the financial markets. We favor free financial markets, where sound money is based on a real commodities. Private investors assume financial risks, and are entitled to the rewards of honestly acquired gains, without expecting taxpayers to subsidize them or bail out their losses.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	We need the explicit statement of competition in currency. I would be ok with both paragraphs.

10.0 - Money and Financial Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	85.1%	14.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.3%	44.7%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	remove "bail out" from the end. "...subsidize them or their losses." is what we are actually after. Bail out is simply a waste of words and plays to current hype.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The unconstitutionality of the legal tender laws hasn't changed; let's not change the plank either, although incorporating some of the new language wouldn't be a bad idea.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Add the original struck words back to the new parts.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again politically correct and current BS - leave as is
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I like the first sentence of the part being omitted personally.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It is disgusting to play politics with this anti-bank rhetoric. People in banks work hard as well. Simply state the correct principle: The government has no authority to meddle in any way whatsoever in commerce, except to protect individuals' rights (such as upholding a contract in court). All commerce is private.

10.0 - Money and Financial Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	85.1%	14.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.3%	44.7%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What?! How about: "Libertarians would repeal the Federal Reserve Act of 1913, the 16th Amendment, and thereby free financial markets from any type of government or special interest oversight and regulations. We will work to accomplish a true free market, where individuals must freely, rightly and necessarily assume the risks and responsibilities of free trade. There will be no government interjection into the free market. The only legitimate roll of any government is to ensure a free market, only prosecuting clear cases of theft and fraud. The ultimate goal is to shift that role to independent insurance companies and arbitration, completely out of the realm of external governance. Every individual has the right and responsibility for his own finances and investments, and should have recourse to means to address fraud and theft without the interference of external governments or government regulators. This state of affairs would of necessity rule out 'public' or 'national' debt, deficits, or any other 'sharing of the load' with the inevitable dumping of that
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	There should be no populist, anti-corporation or anti "large institutions" language worked into our Platform. The principles are enough on their own. Don't fall into this current fad. The original statement is enough.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I would delete the word "financial" after fraud in" as I believe Libertarians are opposed to fraud in general and not just in financial markets. Present wording could justify excessively detailed regulation.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Personal responsibility!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Tell what we are for, not what we are against. Be positive, not negative. Act, do not react.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Amen

10.0 - Money and Financial Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	85.1%	14.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.3%	44.7%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, you've taken an elegantly simple, positive and easily digestible statement and turned it into wordy mess. The revision starts with a negative ("would halt"), and loses the timeless quality of the original. You can't assume the government will be engaged in manipulative monetary policies forever, so you might have to change this again someday.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This section should address the constitutionality of fiat currency, the re-establishment of the gold standard, and the abolishing of the fed.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	gov't has no right to oversite, if someone is frauded, then seek prosecution from the state Dump the Federal Reserve, audit it combine the ideas of these two
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I will support it if the statements about free market banking and freedom of choice in money are restored.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Would "the economic power" be more effective than "the purchasing power" in the first sentence?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Needs to be a clause added in regarding the transition to the legalization of competing private currencies.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There needs to be something regarding sound money.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Would put in "The [g]overnment has a legitimate role"
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We support the freedom to fail for both individuals and public and private businesses.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	strongly agree
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I also support the abolition of the FTC and other regulatory agencies of and by the Federal Government. The government has no place regulating trade except under the much misunderstood "Commerce Clause" of the Constitution which ONLY regulates trade with foreign nations and among the several states. The commerce clause has no power to regulate stock / commodity traders and trading. The Constitution is silent on money and financial market regulation. Otherwise, laissez-faire trade will regulate itself via boom bust cycles and restructured assets.

10.0 - Money and Financial Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	85.1%	14.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.3%	44.7%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would not favor the elimination of the current deduction for capital losses (i.e. pay tax on only gains less losses). If a new tax system with only one huge personal deduction occurs, no problem.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would add the second part, instead of replacing the first part.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	nice worded.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	the entire system is corrupt --- i really do not favor either version
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Why not mention and piggy-back on "End-The-Fed" movement? Again, I would not use use Libertarian in the phrase. Until a person has realized they are a libertarian, they might be put off by it. I would leave the term "inflation" in the plank. Everyone knows what that is. Especially paired with "reducing the purchasing power".
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support this proposal but I think "government's manipulative monetary policies" sound a bit negative and you all are trying to sound more positive. Maybe "halt government's monetary policies that favor large financial institutions...."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Very nice.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	How do you fund the regulators, if the government has no income?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like sentences 2 & 3. I'm not sure how to express sentence 1, but I don't like it as is, and all my attempts to 'fix it' just sounded dumb when I re-read them.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would simply add after the first comma on the first line the following phrase, "including by the Federal Reserve,"
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	agreed
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What you have in the proposal is fine, but keep the ideas from the original. Just because it's not on the mind of the average voter doesn't mean it isn't important. Banking issues are very important for our financial health, and people need to be made aware of their importance.

10.0 - Money and Financial Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	85.1%	14.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.3%	44.7%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I would also support returning the coining of money and the regulation thereof back to the government and away from the banks. banks should also be denied lending money they do not have because to create debt without creating the money to pay back the debt can only cause default on the part of the borrower
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would add a clear statement to the effect of by name asserting support for abolishing the Federal Reserve System.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Again, this is a further watering down of the platform.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The kick-off line "Libertarians would ..." assumes that " ... if we EVER get strong enough to make policy decisions ..." - this language should be changed to a stronger position. "Manipulative monetary policies, which ... Americans, will not be supported, and halted." sounds better.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I am not convinced that " Government has a legitimate role combating fraud in financial markets."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It's fine to broaden the concepts to go beyond just banks, but the second and third sentences are important to me. I'd be happy with more specific wording around ending inflationary policies, too.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The phrase while reducing the purchasing power of hard-working Americans...seems, once again, to be too contemporaneous with current talking points; not statesman-like.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'm concerned that "combating fraud" can be a pretext for much mischief.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	"...manipulative monetary policies." not , Too much government...combating fraud?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The first is simpler
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is a message that should be combined not replaced. True liberty should be the message of all the planks and the first sentence does that. If you wish to add to it to make it more relevant do so, however the message of liberty must be there or we risk starting to sound like "Republican Light"
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer the original language.

10.0 - Money and Financial Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	85.1%	14.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.3%	44.7%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	please add The Government, Corporations and Individuals must assume "fiduciary responsibility" over the money and finances entrusted to them on behalf of others
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Stick to the original.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	May I suggest that the second sentence be enhanced to imply that the government has not just a role, but a responsibility to prosecute fraud, and must do so in a fair manner.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This plank needs a complete rewrite and the suggested language does not do this well. It's both prolix and unspecific. At minimum there should be references to the gold standard and government caused inflation through counterfeiting of the currency. Start over on this one please.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	love it
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Woot!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Where is real money addressed?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The proposed language is better than the original. However, the commentary on monetary policy from the original should be retained, and we should refrain from speaking about "bailing out" anyone, as this is a temporary, hot-button "fad" term and issue.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again there is nothing wrong with the plank. Are we trying to make changes just to make changes. This wording you are trying to add is undefinable. Keep to the simple truth that we are founded on.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Need to have the prohibition against legal tender laws.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Need to add proper role of government toward maintaining balances of organic market forces where imbalances have been intentionally implanted for personal advantage and thereby circumventing free market benevolent controls.

10.0 - Money and Financial Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	85.1%	14.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.3%	44.7%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	suggest "... manipulative monetary policies that favor ..." - "that" instead of "which" and no comma also, suggest remove comma from "financial reisk, and are entitled" leaving original sentence, without subordinate clause, reading "We favor free financial markets, ..., without expecting ..." which makes better sense It also leaves the subordinate clause more complete, saying "investors assume ... and are entitled"
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't think the platform should explicitly recognize any "role of government" as legitimate.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would take out 'hard-working'...it is a cliché used too much by Republicans and Democrats...it also suggests that this right does not apply to Americans who don't work hard...just a personal thing
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Strike the second sentence. "Honestly acquired" in the final sentence implies the money is legally made. Leaving the gov't an unspecified role in "combating fraud" is dangerous.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	"combatting" "fraud and other criminal behavior"
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would like to see this as an addendum, not a replacement.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I can't say one way or another. This goes back to rule number one: If you aren't hurting anyone else, then it's okay. This includes financial pain.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The impossible dream continues.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This proposal needs to flesh out the government's role combatting fraud. You are talking about regulation here or certification ('blessing' an institution) - does it include a police power? Is there a distinction between International, Federal and local?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Keep the initial and add the second sentence.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Barely. Dont like either proposal actually. Go to a free money system, eliminate the federal reserve. Money backed by gold or silver.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the original better.

10.0 - Money and Financial Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	85.1%	14.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.3%	44.7%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I hope we support free COMPETITIVE markets. That is an important differentiation. Without adequate competition, Adam Smith's free market concept does not work. I don't know what the right answer is, but I don't think this statement is it.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	whether they favor large or small institutions should be irrelevant ... a better statement (using the word "such as") could get the idea across without implying any discrimination against large institutions.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Free markets are self correcting!!!!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I oppose this on the sole grounds of implying governmental legitimacy.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The purpose of this new language is to make it pertain to present events but is sacrifices describing the underlying concepts. I prefer conceptual language over the specifics as the list of specifics could be infinite. If example are wanted then fine but do not sacrifice the conceptual language.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	It's not as clear as the original text.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You've lost the idea that government shouldn't print money and force us to use it and only it. Better: We favor free market financial services, including banking and financial markets, among others. The government's manipulative monetary policies and legal tender laws are inflationary and unconstitutional. We favor free financial markets where private investors assume financial risk and reap financial reward and use as money any mutually agreeable commodity or item.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	a free market is favorable to the people
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Except for the sentence, "Government has a legitimate role combating fraud in financial markets," the original wording is better.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Change the first sentence to "Libertarians would halt government's manipulative monetary policies, which reduce the purchasing power of Americans."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Although I like the deleted portion also.

10.0 - Money and Financial Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	85.1%	14.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.3%	44.7%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would substitute the word criminalize for halt. How does one halt anything without teeth?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like it, but there is a point where all this positive sounding rhetoric fails, and that is when you need to sound ominous. Does this sound ominous enough?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't like 'would halt'. Maybe we 'require'.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Tax payer funds should never be FORCED to be used for ANYTHING private.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, the original is more specific and better worded, although I do like the language in the proposal about bailouts.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	change the beginning of the first sentence to: "Libertarians believe that government does not have the right to manipulate monetary policies,"
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A better combination of the old statement along with the new proposal aimed at today's problems would work better for me.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would like to see the word free-market in the blue part
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Start with S2, then S1, then S3 etc.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The rewording leaves open the possibility that Government has many roles in the financial markets, one of which is combating fraud. How about, "Government's only legitimate in financial markets is to combat fraud."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Excellent.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	OK, but drops the opposition to unConstitutional legal tender laws, which I think should be retained.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	per the U.S. Constitution-" money " is to be created by the U.S. Treasury ! Not the " federal reserve " it creates and presents " notes ". Create a " plank " to start there, and then insure 100 % free markets.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We should keeo the parts regarding freedom to make exchanges in whatever media that individuals wish. Government has tried to restrict barter; we need to oppose that.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Sound byte editing - stop it.

10.0 - Money and Financial Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	85.1%	14.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.3%	44.7%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The spirit of the proposal is good, but its not using strong words (i.e. would vs demand). Also, hard-working doesn't include retirees and those who's income does not come from an employee relationship.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Better. I get the rhetoric, but consider losing "hard-working" as it's probably largely inaccurate. Those on fixed incomes who don't work are probably hardest hit by price inflation.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	w/caveats: Start the plank with "While Libertarians believe government has a legitimate role...." And change: "which favor large...." to "which favor special interests while reducing the purchasing power of ordinary Americans."
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I would leave in "We support a halt to inflationary monetary policies and unconstitutional legal tender laws." It's a legitimate concern, and I do not agree that the average voter isn't concerned about this problem.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Should directly include wording to get U.S. monetary currency reflective of available wealth; that is, a money supply limited to actual wealth.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	This is a case where I would add the new language to the old, rather than deleting the old language.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Much better.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This, too, needs editing for better language.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Please define 'fraud'. Sentence "Government has a legitimate role combating fraud in financial markets." seems misleading.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think it would be good to still somehow say that the government should not have a monopoly on money and should eliminate legal tender laws, etc.

10.0 - Money and Financial Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	85.1%	14.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.3%	44.7%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	would? (strupid and weak adverb) Libertarians advocate laissez, faire free and honest markets with no government authoritative and unconstitutional intervention in the marketplace except to enforce contracts, adjudicate breach of contracts, and protect against force and fraud. WE favor? Should be" Libertarians insist!"... favor is sounds half-assed and semi-committal.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I suppose this may be an improvement, but it demonstrates a remarkable ignorance of economics. The first sentence should indicate that the Fed's contradictory objectives of "maximum employment, stable prices, and moderate long-term interest rates" should be resolved by making "stable prices" the Fed's only objective (as is the case for the European Central Bank). This is a real issue in the US now, with a chance of adoption. The LP should be supporting it explicitly. The second sentence needs to be expanded to include externalities. The third sentence needs to add the word "competitive" after "favor" and before "free".
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would support if unconstitutional legal tender laws were addressed
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	However, again leave in the second sentence. While it may be "hardly a problem on the mind of the average voter," that's as much of a reason to leave it in as to take it out. It is a valid statement of our ultimate ideals. If it is indeed not on the mind of the average voter, then it is unlikely to repel very many potential members--but is likely to ATTRACT those on whose minds it IS a problem.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	better left as written, clearer as to the libertarian position as well.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Government shall not regulate money and markets.

10.0 - Money and Financial Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	85.1%	14.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.3%	44.7%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	See previous user fee comment, I think this system would change the economic incentive such that highest and best use incentives would help balance the economy with the incentive of lowering the relative user fee rate by going up to the highest and best use against the loss of profit by going to a higher than best use.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	This totally guts the main thrust of the plank. The new wording neither mentions the repeal of legal tender laws, nor does it recognize a market for competing currency.
Oppose Oppose	Unlikely Unlikely	No No	Non-Member Non-Member	The proposed replacement is too specific. Either you favor "free financial markets" or government "has a legitimate role combating fraud." This needs revision. In any case, the original is better.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Prefer: "The Federal Reserve Banking system encourages manipulative money policies and had debased the currency of our country. The role of the FED should be changed to protect the integrity and stability of the dollar within a global free market system".
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Getting to wordy "We favor free financial markets, where private investors assume financial risks, and are entitled to the rewards of honestly acquired gains, without expecting taxpayers to subsidize them or bail out their losses."
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	The market must be truly free. That means that the hands of non-profits and alternative model businesses must be untied. The government should not favor one business type or another through any type of legislation. The market is currently only "free" to those who chase profits and succeed at it. Non-profits are not allowed to compete with them.
Support Oppose	Unlikely Unlikely	No No	Non-Member Non-Member	Strongly support The original statement is greatly preferred to the proposal. We need not water down the explicit language of the stance as to render it palatable to the uninformed, lest we risk giving off the appearance of rattling common talking points for the sake of votes.

10.0 - Money and Financial Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	85.1%	14.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.3%	44.7%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Does not specify what policies should be halted -- bag the Fed? or what? And this "legitimate role" in combating fraud should be specified -- "As in any industry, anyone who commits fraud should face a legal penalty" or whatever.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is wrong...you missed the point. "Money and Financial Markets" is about government, banks and constitutional law to coin money. Government isn't supposed to favor the "hard-working American" or the "financial institutions". It should favor only sound money circulation. Say something about coining money and the governments judicial-only role in a fair market.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is ok, but the first sentence is somewhat vague as to what the manipulative monetary policies are.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Capital gains taxes on dividends and interest must be eliminated so as to provide incentive to individuals to invest and save.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It may not interest the average voter, but it is at the heart of the average voter's complaint about government. Don't you dare go soft on monetary policy. Put the new text first and add the old text on the end of the new text, but don't you dare get rid of or weaken the old text.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Wordy
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But I would relocate the second sentence to be the last sentence and amend it to read, "Government's only legitimate role in financial markets is to combat and prosecute financial fraud."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is also (like the previous ones so far) a triplicate vote.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The original says it better.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Interesting material, but this proposal deletes important specifics (free-market banking) in favor of lofty ambitions ("halt government's manipulative monetary policies"). Again there is excessively informal language: "bail out".
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	add 'and corporations' after 'where private investors' in sentence two.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't really see the point, but ok, except I believe "combating" is spelled wrong.

10.0 - Money and Financial Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	85.1%	14.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.3%	44.7%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Remove the term "hard-working". The last sentence should read "We favor free financial markets, where private investors assume all financial risks, and are, in turn, entitled to all honest gains."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The change would imply that manipulative monetary policies can be okay if they don't favor large institutions. That's not a libertarian position.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Lukewarm. "them or bail out" is unnecessary.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	alot of this feels like libertarians trying to 'broaden their tent' good point about the focus on banking subset, but still really prefer the 'say it like it is' language to the trying to impress/lure broader range of voters
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would add 'support returning the U.S.A. to the gold standard and abolishing the failed Federal Reserve System.'
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Original is more clear and better written than proposal
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The government has no role in combating fraud in financial markets; that is the role of the market and competition. Add the original part back in, and add to it only the final sentence of the proposed amendment.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Need to include "end federal loan guarantee programs".
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I oppose the elimination of support for alternative forms of money from this plank.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would replace the word "would" with "will" in the first sentence.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Good in principle, but this language does not call for ending the Fed like the old language, and again violates the Dallas Accord in its second sentence.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	(1) add "and inflationary" after "manipulative" in the first sentence. (2) Libertarians also favor the return of the power to coin money to the government. This power should not be in the hands of private bankers (i.e the federal reserve system).
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The Government needs to be a consumer advocate in the financial industries. Loan sharks must be eliminated.

10.0 - Money and Financial Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	85.1%	14.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.3%	44.7%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The Party's principled opposition to fiat money has disappeared in the revised statemnt. What is a "manipulative money policy"? This suggests a non-manipulative policy is OK. And what is that? The revised statement also includes statements that have nothing to do with monetary policy, such as the prevention of fraud. The original was much better.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is much better.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"Monetary inflation represents a forced redistribution of the value of labor from the poor and work-a-day folks into the whims of politicians and their wealthy donors, which operates as a dynamic of slavery, a violation of the thirteenth amendment."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer the original.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Pretty good. Just remove "hard-working Americans." Sounds a bit too popular.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Also,what about anti-monopolistic laws?
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Would like to see this expanded. Get an economist to add some good stuff.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	banks an stockbrokers have proven their ability to create worthless paper and defraud their buyers
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'd dump "manipulative" and ", which favor ... Americans." Government has no business having a monetary policy.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Keep the choice for exchange medium.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would change the last sentence thusly "We favor free financial markets, where private investors assume financial risks, and are entitled to honestly acquired gains and losses, without expecting taxpayer subsidies or bailouts."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I find both statements a bit confusing, but the new proposal is less confusing and sounds more positive.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This sounds Republican not Libertarian. GET GOVERNMENT OUT OF MONEY!!!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This better addresses 2012 conditions.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the focus of our previous plank on real money, and freedom of contract. I think the change whitewashes that, and dilutes the statement in favor of truly free monetary markets.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Drop the first sentence. Move the second sentence to last.

10.0 - Money and Financial Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	85.1%	14.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.3%	44.7%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	strongly support
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would like to see a sentence such as the following added to this plank: "Our government has failed miserably at its duty to prevent and prosecute fraud in financial markets. The Libertarian Party calls on all federal and state governments to fulfill their responsibilities in this area, and further calls for the impeachment of officials who have refused to carry out their sworn duties."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Loaded terms again: "special interest" "hard-working Americans".
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	The revisions are more in tune with the times.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	When you say government has a legitimate role in combating fraud...they can't do it well, obviously. Is this something the Libertarians feel should be done by the Justice system. If so, should persons only, or should corporations also be allowed to function and be recognized as persons in the justice system.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Does this mean ending the central bank (Federal reserve)
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Add sound money to the change and it's perfect so that we specifically address how the monetary system would need to change to take away the advantage to special interests and financial institutions.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Amazing wording, and likely to gain support in light of recent events with bail-outs of major corporations.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Good.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Although I would leave the term inflationary, as in: "manipulative and inflationary monetary policies..."

10.0 - Money and Financial Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	85.1%	14.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.3%	44.7%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You have to be more specific like "I WILL GIVE TO EACH AMERICAN A \$75,000 LIVING CARD IF YOU ELECT ME FOR U.S. PRESIDENT"; "I WILL ISSUE \$50 TRILLION NEW FIAT MONEY ELIMINATING THE FEDERAL RESERVE"; "WE WILL MANUFACTURE ONE HUNDRED PERCENT IN AMERICA USING THE FEDERAL LANDS CREATING 100 JOBS". If you need help call me to 571-288-7383. My family could donate also \$100 million to your PAC. Thanks Alberto Lopez WWW.EBLM.US
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I only oppose this line because I think we still need to discuss restrictions on legal tender. I generally agree with what this new line says, but it is missing the part about legal tender. Also, the beginning seems out of sync as far as syntax with the rest of the lines in previous sections (libertarians would halt...) doesn't match other sections.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	With the reservation that I dislike the term "bail out" being used in a serious document.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	In the last sentence, I would change "expecting" to something stronger, such as "requiring." You also, again, confuse two issues: financial manipulation by government, and preventing fraud. You should take this opportunity to emphasize the philosophical reasons why we believe that government should punish, etc., fraud. Without expanding the verbiage.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I like this proposal very much. Much better than the original.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I doesn't flow very well. The middle sentence just kind of feels thrown in. It leaves me saying, yeah, so? Why does it matter that you think Gov't has a legit role in combating fraud - it's like it should be a followed by a "therefore..."

10.0 - Money and Financial Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	85.1%	14.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.3%	44.7%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	or: While we believe that government has a legitimate role in combating fraud in financial markets, we would halt government's manipulative monetary policies, which favor large financial institutions and special interests while reducing the purchasing power of hard-working Americans. Libertarians favor free financial markets, where private investors may assume financial risks and are thereby entitled to the rewards of honestly acquired gains, without expecting taxpayers to subsidize losses or provide a bail out facility of any kind.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	If an institution is "too big to fail," it should be broken up...
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Yet another fucking minarchist amendment talking about "a legitimate role" for government. STOP IT!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We also favor an end to unaccountable manipulations by the federal reserve bank which should be done away with.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	absolutely
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	YOU IDIOTS. YOU MUST STATE SIMPLE IDEAS IN CLEAR SIMPLE, SINGLE SENTENCES, IT YOU WANT ANYONE TO UNDERSTAND YOU.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I strongly dislike the phrase "hard-working Americans." I've never heard an honest man use those words before.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But keep "Individuals engaged in voluntary exchange should be free to use as money any mutually agreeable commodity or item."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	OK, but keep the gist of the deleted sentences, too: Individuals engaged in voluntary exchange should be free to use as money any mutually agreeable commodity or item. We support a halt to inflationary monetary policies and unconstitutional legal tender laws.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Absolutely not. (1) Specific references to free-market banking need to be retained. (2) No sentence affirming that "Government has a legitimate role" belong in the LP platform.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	No comment
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	There is no constitutional authority for Congress to legislate against fraud.

10.0 - Money and Financial Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	85.1%	14.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.3%	44.7%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	However, I feel that the second and third sentences that you would eliminate should be left in, but have them follow the new sentences.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Is this the appropriate place to address the Federal Reserve? Also, while gov't DOES have a legitimate role in regulating fraud, there's no mention here of gov't gone too far in regulations, intrusiveness, etc. (the money-related provisions of the USA PATRIOT Act alone, for example).
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Here again, the substitution is clearer and easier to understand.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	nd the FED!!!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"Manipulative" is an objective term and should be avoided.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	we should also state we support doing away with the federal reserve system.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	This says nothing of eliminating the central planning in money, nor, really, free banking.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think a majority does want some control on excess.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again softens the blow too much.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support, but I think you should take out "hard-working" - it's sort of cliché and doesn't seem to fit the language that's in here (plus, it reduces the purchasing power of ALL Americans, hard-working or not). I think the last two sentences can be streamlined to say something like this: ""We favor free financial markets without bailouts, where private investors assume risks and are entitled to rewards of honestly acquired gains, recognizing that the government's only role should be combating fraud."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Take out manipulative
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Just take out "banking" in sentence 1, and "among banks and depository institutions of all types" in sentence 2. It would broaden the statement to the entire economy, and include all financial institutions.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is great.

10.0 - Money and Financial Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	85.1%	14.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.3%	44.7%	11.0%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would rather see language that proposed the elimination of the FED and put the coining money back in the hands of Congress and done so as the constitution says. Demand a return to the Gold Standard.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would add that taxation twice on dividends or such should not be allowed.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You need to say how you would halt government monetary policies.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Perfect
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	honestly acquire gains *knowing* tax payers will not be there to bail them out
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do not like monetary manipulation but ... something has to be done to combat the moves of China and its monetary manipulation. I say "eye for an eye" in that realm.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We also support prosecution of all that use fraud and will prosecute to the fullest extent of the law any one that uses fraud for financial gain.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Freedom of choice of any kind of money should be kept in the resolution.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The constitution doesn't authorize an SEC or any other method of regulating the financial markets
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Free markets AND FAIR markets!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Combating Fraud is not a legitimate role of government
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I specifically do not support the elimination of the Federal Reserve, provided it is governed appropriately. It is a valuable tool for world competitiveness.

11.0 - Labor Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
Commenters	53.1%	46.9%	8.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	1. The first sentence seems to deny the power of government to enforce contracts. 2. Where I live the City government is corrupt and the police union acts to protect good officers (those who act as peace officers and let minor "infractions" go) against bureaucrats who want this town to become a "police state." I have a Libertarian friend in the Union who shares Richard Mack-style info with the new officers he trains, and he is part of the Union for his own protection. Not all gov't-employee unions are bad; in some cases we would be in worse shape without them.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	However, I believe that government employees who signed on with the promise of defined-benefit pensions need to be grandfathered - it would be wrong to mandate changing their contracts without their consent.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i especially like the specific reference to unions for gov't employess in the new version.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I am a federal employee, and contrary to fables our retirement sucks. The TSP or 401k is the only grace, the really nice retirement went out in the 80's as a trade off for living wages. (the union is a joke)
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	That last clause may well become very dated very quickly. The sentence should end at 'oppose government employee unions.'
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Just to remark on the example given in the "Purpose" paragraph to show how the original plank could be misunderstood, Libertarians SHOULD oppose laws forbidding convicted sex offenders from working in daycares, as that decision should be up to the employers and their customers, never mind that the list of offenses for which one can be convicted of a sex crime is broad well beyond the point of absurdity.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	To me it reads like we are backing off of "support the right of free persons to associate or not associate in labor unions" right to work
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Yes that is a good revision to make.

11.0 - Labor Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
Commenters	53.1%	46.9%	8.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Original wording is much clearer and less wordy.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I generally support these changes, although the new plank is a bit wordy and could be cleaned up.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	might want to add something about "adult employees." Libertarians are often accused of wanting children working in sweat shops and coal mines
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Original is better though I also like the final sentence of the proposal as an addition.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Libertarians believe that employment agreements between private employers and employees are the sole business of the parties to such agreements. Therefore: (a) government has no business involving itself in these agreements... (b) etc. (c) etc. (b)
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	In general, I support this. However, the phrase "we oppose government employee unions" may make it difficult or impossible for our candidates to earn endorsement or support from some unions, potentially stunting the urban growth of the LP without any significant benefit. I would request that it be removed to allow our candidates to favor or oppose that issue based on their local conditions.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think the non-discrimination laws do protect the right of individuals to seek work and obtain it on merit and talents, and not be denied on the bases of race, religion, gender, country of origin, sexual orientation, etc. Can we let that in somewhere? Otherwise it seems the LP supports labor discrimination of any kind.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The "social engineering" thing still needs to be addressed. Way too vague to have meaning. It should be dropped from the language.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Also it say what WE support instead of accepting the lesser alternative of picking sides in someone else's argument.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Create a separate plank regarding govt. employee unions.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But I support defined-contribution plans.

11.0 - Labor Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
Commenters	53.1%	46.9%	8.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The proposed change is too detailed. The existing plank is clear and does not get mired with a very specific scenario.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, why some many words to put forth a simple truth? The right to work.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Bravo!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	As a Former Government Employee and Union Steward. I completely agree with with this Policy. Most issues on the Job involve Nepotism, Cronyism, Unsafe working Conditions, OSHA is far more Helpful to the average Employee than a Union... Holding "All" Employees, Managers Politicians Accountable for Poor Performance, Incompetence. Vengeful Behavior will take The Country of the road that led to the Collapsed the USSR. Negativity, Class warfare, Indifference is ruining the Spirit and Competitiveness Of American Companies, Their Employees, and quality of Services and Goods on an Open World Market.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	A.) No union of any kind should be permitted to endorse, or support in any manner, any political party, initiative, or other organizational operation without a majority vote of approval (in detail) by the ENTIRE membership. B.) "Closed Shop" employment should be forbidden as forcible intrusion by unions into employment situations. C.) You might consider splitting the comment about existence of 'governmental unions' into a seperate plank from benefits- they are not directly related.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I generally support it, but feel it is too specific and can therefore be picked apart.

11.0 - Labor Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
Commenters	53.1%	46.9%	8.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	You're kidding, right? The second sentence is a "rare" problem? Who wrote these articles? The feds, through a variety of methods, force retirement upon just about everyone. How is that "rare"? And why should any further faith be placed in the government's sex offender files? How many 'sex offenders' are people who were falsely accused by former spouses, or kids who were sexting?
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	This specifically denies those who work for the government, the same rights we say we uphold for individuals who work privately. It also creates an unworkable goal of how to compensate government employees.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	should be re-stated but what the hey.....
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Much better!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'm actually neutral on this one. But there is no "neutral" radio button
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The form of the pension plan for government employees is irrelevant.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Absolutely !
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"private sector employers" should be "private-sector employers", and "plans which are typically found" should be "plans, as are typically found".
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"outside the province of government". Use those words in the abortion planks commented on earlier.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	As a government employee, I believe that unions have a conflict in interest with the people of the United States to keep Government limited.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	If gov't employees form a union do we put them in jail? Or do we just mean school teachers are not allowed in the LP?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I see nothing wrong with government unions, "protected monopoly" or not.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Unsure
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This one is too specific, and will alienate a lot of people.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Well said.

11.0 - Labor Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
Commenters	53.1%	46.9%	8.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Prohibition of government employee unions would seem to go against the right to assemble, petition government, and freely associate. Also, government workers are subject to market forces (although less so than in the private sector) since they can be rifted, furloughed, or have their agencies eliminated or privatized.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree with the strong stance against Public Sector labor unions. We should be sure that this remains clear in this plank.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Neither unions or government laws or actions shall not have power to undo or abridge adult private contracts. Adults will not be able to use government or law to undo something they may belatedly think they entered into errantly.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"government employee unions" . . . we oppose the right of workers to organize simply because they work in a government setting? I dont think so. Besides unions exist for lots of things, like workplace safety, and government workers certainly deserve the same right to organize themselves to guarrantee that, among other basic rights.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Excellent
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think the "such as compulsory arbitration" could go (to save real estate). The last clause of the paragraph may be better as its own sentence: " and advocate replacing ..." with ". We advocate replacing ..."
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Again, nice work in building the foundation to shed the extremist stereotype.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Government employee compensation should be consistent with that found in private jobs for the same or similar functions.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	it sounds a lot better
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Another good re-write while maintaining the positives from the original. And by the way, what of these statements says that we don't oppose laws preventing sex offenders from working in day-care centers (and again, isn't that the responsibility of the day-care owner)?

11.0 - Labor Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
Commenters	53.1%	46.9%	8.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I oppose the original and the rewrite, as the first sentence of the rewrite does away with anti-"sweat-shop" laws. There does need to be SOME protection, particularly in times of high unemployment, when the employer has too much power to impose draconian conditions on employees. If that is fixed, I would support the rewrite.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Ban yellow dog contracts and closed shop!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Excellent! The last sentence drives it home.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think the other one is more accurate.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The original is clearer
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Everyone should have the right to bargain collectively, public or private and every employer, government or otherwise should have the right to fire everyone. Agree with the defined contribution part. Defined benefits should be removed.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	excellent
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Once again, details should not be addressed in the platform. I would suggest a list of bullets listing labor "rights". BTW, labor unions are legitimate "free association" and have brought significant benefits to everyone, even those not in labor unions. What exactly is the "social engineering" argument/complaint? Should the plank be focused on government employees, who constitute 1/3 of the voting public? Details about public employee benefits should not be a platform detail, but rather addressed in a separate essay.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	So much better than the old wording!

11.0 - Labor Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
Commenters	53.1%	46.9%	8.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The argument that the original plank would argue against forbidding convicted sex offenders from working in daycare centers is a stretch. Convicted offenders often surrender their freedom for a period of time; and reasonably should have certain rights limited further. The original wording should not be construed to countervail that. Why advocate for defined contribution plans at all. The right approach to compensating public employees is to budget and pay them for the value of their services as they are earned and allow them to choose their own retirement strategy. Currently, the allowed deductions or non taxability of and for 401k type plans and defined benefit plans is a way to divert money to a favored sector of the economy. Why can't a person receive what they have earned, spend it or invest it as they see fit. Maybe they would buy gold, buy land, a taxi medallion at an exorbitant amount; or invest in night school or other educational endeavor. Support for any of the current government favored plans buys into, provides sanction for the systems that steals
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	MUCH better.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would like to see the best elements of BOTH statements here included. (i.e. Don't eliminate the line about the "right of free persons to associate or not associate in labor unions" and definitely include the new lines about public unions.)
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't think we should be supporting labour unions in the first place but....
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The existing government employees who have worked 20 or 30 years with the expectation that their retirement will be what they were told, should receive the benefits that were promised to them, however new government employees wages and benefits should be adjusted to a more typical private sector scale.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The original statement accomplishes what you want without getting too emotional.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Why would freedom-believers oppose "sex offenders" seeking work in day-care centers? Free information flow will swiftly determine which DCCs succeed.

11.0 - Labor Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
Commenters	53.1%	46.9%	8.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	would support if ending with "defined-contribution plans found in the private sector."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	great redo that also addresses right-to-work
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Support, but with this change: "Libertarians believe that--aside from laws protecting against force and fraud--employment and compensation agreements..."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Some will not understand the difference between the two pension plans. Many are just against pensions period for government employees. And do you include teachers in this plank about government unions
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Government employees can and will be abused by their employers. Their bargaining rights should be protected equally as much as private sector employees. I believe the original wording is better.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do not agree with the arbitration clause. Unions are often the target of aggressive corporations who have unlimited funds that they can use to "starve out" the workers into demurring. I do agree with the government employee union part, workers should not be given raises or not given raises at the whim of whomever is in office.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Include repealing all pensions to politicians, except Pres and vice pres
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Spot on!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I am glad this was addressed.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The statement should end at "we oppose government employee unions".
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is a vast improvement over the previous wording.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	These defined-contribution plans do not work. Many companies cancel pensions after employees have paid into them for close to their whole career. Leaving the employee with a small lump sum of money not enough to cover retirement. There has to be a better way.

11.0 - Labor Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
Commenters	53.1%	46.9%	8.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Somewhere we need to define the proper role of government- in addition to its role in national defence its job is to referee the game of life not to play the game. le to enforce legal contracts, to make rules of how people interact etc.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Disagree on government workers unions.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	too complicated for the average idiot, keep it simple
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think the last sentence should be struck.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Governments under a libertarian-esque minarchy should be able to prevent people from being employed in this country if they are not in this country legally.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Stop watering down the action we want.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This makes it sound like private employers should be allowed to discriminate on say, religion or sexual orientation or race. Last sentence however is great.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, this is complicating a clear issue.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This draws a harder line and is more accurate to how most American libertarians would identify themselves.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I'm not sure we should be forbidding Govt employees from having Unions- freedom of association you know.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Public sector management can be just as corrupt and abusive of power, if not more so, than their counterparts in the private sector, and therefore public employees have as much need of union protection as any other employees.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The Libertarian Party....
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, simplicity in the statement will make it far more understandable. I think this rewrite just throws a wall of text at newcomers and targets even more issues that are current rather than long term targets of the party.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Why should adults working for the government be prohibited from organizing into a union? And, Reagan's treatment of the Air Traffic Control union demonstrates that over-reaching by unions has consequences. Moreover, advocating in the platform for a specific pension plan seems to restrict choices unnecessarily.

11.0 - Labor Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
Commenters	53.1%	46.9%	8.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'm a left libertarian and support union rights for all.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do not think the position in the final sentence is settled enough within libertarian philosophy to include in the platform. If the government is to employ any people, perhaps they should have the right to organize and negotiate with it however they wish (or not to organize, if that is what they wish). There is a lot to say on each side of this issue, and all libertarians certainly agree that the current government funding trough does not mix any better with public-employee labor unions than it does with politicians. However, I have not seen deep enough discussion about how libertarians who would accept some limited role for government (which I think most do) would handle its labor relations to take a stand in the platform on this matter at this time. Also, suggest changing "agreement" in sentence 1 to "arrangement"—"agreements" can certainly be in forms other than writing, but it still carries more of a connotation of a written form than "arrangement" does.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	We can't restrict people from associating with others because they work for the government. Also the part about pensions doesn't really belong under labor markets.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	should say something in there about government should not be involved in LICENSING professions or any other thing that is needed for people to work!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Support, except for the word "believe" since belief should NOT be required, and TRUST in fairness, law, individualism should be emphasized.

11.0 - Labor Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
Commenters	53.1%	46.9%	8.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Not quite there. Wording supporting the right of individual workers to contract with employers without belong to a union should be included. In other words, the LP should support "right to work", inasmuch as many state governments have active policies that preclude this choice. Do not take out this wording: We oppose government-fostered forced retirement. We support the right of free persons to associate or not associate in labor unions, and an employer should have the right to recognize or refuse to recognize a union. We oppose government interference in bargaining, such as compulsory arbitration or imposing an obligation to bargain.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	very good
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	nt sure
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Excellent clarification!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i think an improvent to the ammended language copuld be made by inserting the first setence in the original text for "social engineering requirements" reading "mandated benefits and we support the real of all laws that impedeemployment"
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	No offense, but I think the original plank is better. If we could incorporate more of the ideas of the first into the replacement, I would be fine with that, but as it is I cannot support it.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Your grammar is suspect on this one. Read it aloud. Then think long and hard about how specific you want to be here. You're "right," but how many people will really be willing to give up what they perceive to be safeguards between them and their employer? Chip away at this. Don't promise to knock it down. It's an "Office Space" world.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Why are we taking away government worker's rights to peacefully assemble via a labor union? That souns very in-libertarian to me, because we are removing rights simply because they have the government as their employer.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	However, I like the last sentence of the new wording. It might be added.

11.0 - Labor Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
Commenters	53.1%	46.9%	8.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While I like the last sentence of the suggested revision, I think the language in the original is much clearer and less likely to be misunderstood than the language in the suggested revision (save for the last sentence thereof).
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer this: Employment and compensation agreements between private employers and employees are outside the province of government, and these private contracts should not be impeded by government. We support the repeal of any laws which impede the ability of any person to find employment or the ability of any private employer to offer employment. We support the right of individuals to associate or not associate in labor unions, and we support the right of employers to recognize or refuse to recognize a labor union. We support the right of private sector employers and employees to choose whether or not to bargain with each other through a labor union without government interference. Since government employers are funded by taxpayers, government employee unions ought to be subject to the imposition of an obligation to bargain or compulsory arbitration.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Good idea to separate private-sector and public sector unions.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I'm not 100% sure about the issue of pensions. Will have to think more about that, particularly for the military.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The first sentence of the present text most certainly does argue against any law which would prevent a sex offender from working in a daycare center. Get real. Whether or not a daycare center would like to hire such individuals is up to the daycare center. In fact, libertarians should oppose the government-enforced sex offender registry altogether, and any laws which demand its existence in order to operate. Give me a break. That aside, the new proposal removes the line-item about forced retirement due to government intervention, so I can't support it.

11.0 - Labor Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
Commenters	53.1%	46.9%	8.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Wonderful! I hope we can spread the final platform all over the media when it's finished.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again common sense to most.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe that the third and fourth sentences in the existing verbiage is more clear, concise, and direct than that which is proposed to replace it. I, personally, would rather just see the first sentence be amended to allow for exceptions, such as is noted in the statement of purpose, and see the second sentence rewritten or removed.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Contrary to the rationale set forth arguing for this proposal, dictating who private employers such as day care centers can or cannot hire is NOT a proper role of government. The final sentence of the proposed replacement language is not a bad addition, but since it (like virtually everything else the committee is proposing) tends to tilt our platform in a more conservative direction, it should be accompanied by adding additional details affirming our support for personal liberties so that the overall document does not tilt more to the right in terms of its appeal. Indeed, the first sentence of the proposed replacement language appears to say as much ("libertarians believe employment and compensation agreements between private employers and employees are outside the province of government, and these private contracts should not be impeded by government-mandated benefits and social engineering requirements") -- the existing language simply makes the point more concisely.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	excellent re-write!!
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	This is a much better plank.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is very good.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	province --incorrect/unclear usage?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I suggest changing the phrase "by government-mandated benefits" to "by government mandates" or "by government-mandated regulations". The word "benefit" has a positive connotation despite its context in this phrase.

11.0 - Labor Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
Commenters	53.1%	46.9%	8.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I like this in general, but I support public employee unions. These unions must be allowed due to freedom of association. They also keep the legislature from having too much money to spend on frivolous things. I would support it if you removed the phrase "...oppose government employee unions and..."
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	This needs to be toned down a bit too, but at least comes close to something the average American can understand
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	a free market will sustain itself and each agreement for labor is a private negotiation. A person should not have to pay a 'union' to get or keep a job
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I am against ALL forms of labor unions
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Original is more generic.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I oppose both positions, as the initial plank allows for misunderstanding. Given the unemployment levels in the economy, there is very strong competition for jobs, and the new position may allow employers to take advantage of individuals. Maybe I'm misunderstanding what is meant by "government-mandated benefit" but for example, I believe that overtime pay falls within this categorization. As competition for jobs has increased, individuals may be pressured into unprotected non-exempt work which requires them to work an unsustainable number of hours. Individuals have very limited bargaining power at this time, and the government needs to protect our liberty in that regard.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	pensions are not the reason governments are insolvent, and I see no need for the LP to oppose or support them. This is micromanaging, in my opinion
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Language less clear than earlier language. Can't add that government employees should be forbidden from joining unions; not something supported by a majority of libertarians.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would include language opposing forced contributions from non-union employees to the union. These are sometimes known as Fair Share Fees, and are collected by the Check-Off System.

11.0 - Labor Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
Commenters	53.1%	46.9%	8.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I can accept this, (yes, tis written better than the original), only when business/corporate/government employers can be held fully responsible, AS persons AS the managing officials of all such organizations, for any and all fraud and thievery and breaking of contractual agreements concerning whatever sort of contribution plans that have been lawfully created. The plank as currently written would appear to tacitly coddle a gigantic loophole for continuation of the crony corruption webwork of the managerial class to plunder plan agreement created accounts and then get away with it from not being personally responsible because the corporation has been granted person status with massive elimination of personal responsibility for those managing it (and catching the various frauds of union leaders just as important). Eliminating the enticements for corruption would help, yet also included within this general issue is the matter of gargantuanly bloated self-valuation egos in disproportion to a whole systems sciencing evaluation of all the sorts of labor which must be performed for organizæ
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But in the last sentence don't you mean, "... which are typically NOT found in the private sector." ???
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Support, but this part should be eliminated: "provided that it is conducted without governmental interference such as compulsory arbitration." It is implied by the first part of the sentence and therefore redundant.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Much better!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	One of the few more clearly stated proposals.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I am not really opposed to government employee unions. I just wish voters would hold politicians accountable when they cave into them.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Unions are now obsolete and destructive to the health and welfare of the United States and employees.

11.0 - Labor Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
Commenters	53.1%	46.9%	8.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	alternate proposal: Libertarians support repeal of all laws which impede the ability of any person to find employment. We oppose government-fostered forced retirement. We support the right of free persons to associate or not associate in labor unions, and an employer should have the right to recognize or refuse to recognize a union. We oppose government interference in bargaining, such as compulsory arbitration or imposing an obligation to bargain. Since government employers are protected monopolies funded by taxpayers and not subject to market forces, we oppose government employee unions and advocate replacing government employee defined-benefit pensions with defined-contribution plans which are typically found in the private sector.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Oppose. This proposed plank sounds a bit more constitutionalist, than libertarian. I don't like the sentence about government employers...it seems to give credence to the idea that government employees should be accepted as a norm, and it such a large group that a special sentence has to be added about them. I think the current wording is more clear and to the point.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't like unions.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	much better
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Original says the same thing, and is simply stated.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the changes, but they seem woefully inadequate. We don't address discrimination issues, minimum wage requirements, employer involvement in insurance issues, etc etc.

11.0 - Labor Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
Commenters	53.1%	46.9%	8.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The problem statement unfairly maligns those who have been placed on state-defined sex offender registries, who present recidivism rates comparatively lower than most other offenders. That said, the proposed language accommodates the right of a daycare center owner to contract with a state-defined sex offender. I recommend replacing "Since" with "Because". I would prefer that the proposal was rewritten to distinguish between voluntary governments, to which all principled libertarians do not object, and state governments, to which a significant number of principled libertarians object. For example, replace "are outside the province of government" with "should be free from state intervention" ... replaced "government-mandated" with "state-mandated" ... replace "governmental interference" with "state interference" ... replace "government employers" with "states" ... replace "government employee" with "state employee".
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The original is clear and concise... the re-write, while not in conflict with our beliefs, is not as clear.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Unions aren't just for financial benefits. All employee unions should be allowed to exist, whether private or government, but not allowed to strike for financial benefits, such as pay.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Excellent!!! Superbly written!!!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Line 4 should read "government employees", not "employers."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Needs more detail, but I agree with the basic principles.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This one still needs work in my opinion, but it's improving.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Seems to oppose CBAs.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Best one yet.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	My husband worked for the Federal Government most of his life and did indeed pay into a pension fund with after tax dollars. So not all government workers are free-loaders of the tax dollars.

11.0 - Labor Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
Commenters	53.1%	46.9%	8.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	if employees of the state or federal gov't want a union they should be able to have one
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I live in Wisconsin. I could write several chapters of a book about this.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I feel it would make all jobs public and private more equal. Our government is the nations largest employer, whatever laws we have should be applied to all, not just the private sector.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Seems wordy
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Use a different term than "monopolies" for government. It is false. There are many overlapping governmental entities that require impose conflicting regulations over shared jurisdiction. The inter-governmental lawsuits and regulatory permits cost taxpayers millions, perhaps billions, of dollars per year. I can provide many examples.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	one thing that seems to get lost in the public representation of libertarians is that 'we' are for freedom - freedom in the marketplace and freedom in our personal lives - e.g. limit gov't intrusion into our wallets and bedrooms. i'd almost suggest starting every plank off in that fashion. one other suggestion is to provide more in-depth discussions - or embedded links for the public to get add'l info/facts/supporting or background info that defines our position more completely and some of the specific items we may oppose or be in favor of...
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If individuals are free to bargain - why need unions? Why not just state that U S Citizens have the right to work anywhere legal, for terms that are acceptable to them. (This covers minimum wage also - which should not be set by the government).
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	original is more direct

11.0 - Labor Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
Commenters	53.1%	46.9%	8.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It's okay, but still too wordy and technical. "outside the province of government"?? I mean, they are not outside the province of government if the agreements are violated....if it's a contract...verbal or written...government enforces that if it's broken. I'd be careful here. But in general, yes it's better.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	. . .impeded by government mandates other than reasonable health and safety protections.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Original language is clearer. However, last sentence of new language should be added.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The present language is more direct and to the point. Am not strongly opposed and the new language does make some good points. "governmental" could be "government". At the end drop "which are typically found in the private sector."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would also stipulate that all government contracts should be handed to those anonymous businesses/individuals who meet job requirements with no job requirement ever including employment considerations.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The statement in the red is clearer, and more to-the-point
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Unfortunately, in a perfect world, this would be fine; however, all of the power lies with the employers. They will always find someone willing to work for less and be able to charge people any wage they want, whether it is a living wage or not. A look back at our history shows that. Union power should be curbed, but this seems like it will harm the workers most of all.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Also, government employees should not be paid better than the private sector for the same job. Gov. salaries should be equal or slightly less than the private sector.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The change obfuscates the position on right to work. A change to support retirement plans more in line with the private sector is a policy of implementation not necessarily dictated by libertarian philosophy.

11.0 - Labor Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
Commenters	53.1%	46.9%	8.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Yes, much clearer But it still seems to encourage non-interference for hiring illegal residents.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The right to associate should never be restricted to any individual. Solution, eliminate these public sector jobs to the private sector.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The government shouldn't be an employer, so the last sentence is inappropriate. If you wanted to clarify, you could simply state the correct principle: Government is not a business; it is a public service to protect individual rights. As such, government "workers" may be compensated ONLY through voluntary contributions by citizens who wish to support their activities, just like workers at a nonprofit organization.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would eliminate the first clause of the first sentence (ending with "...the province of government."), mainly because I believe the government has a role in enforcing contracts and in that sense are not "outside the province of government"

11.0 - Labor Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
Commenters	53.1%	46.9%	8.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Yikes! You state in your introduction that sex offenders being allowed to work in day care centers is an issue, yet that is not addressed anywhere in the rewrite? How does the rewrite eliminate the confusion on this and like issues? How is a day care employer to know who is a sex offender? Once again you presume an external government. There would be no government unions and pensions if there were no government workers, and there would be no government workers if there were no government to employ people. And, hence, no taxes and no taxpayers to support government and its unnecessary employees with their government-guaranteed benefits and pensions. What a libertarian concept! Love the private contract mentions, finally. Why does the Libertarian Party maintain the need for any external government? Why aren't the planks and platforms explicitly stating that the goal is to get rid of external states, governments, rulers, in favor of SELF-government based on the libertarian -- as opposed to libertine -- principles of non-aggression, non-theft, and non-fraud? Since t
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What about military personnel? There does need to be some "law" that government can keep a checked balance of private institutions in hiring practice and pay wages.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the new wording, however i dont feel the old wording implies wanting to allow convicted sex offenders to work in daycare etc. as it is stated elsewhere opposition to anyone harming or impeding the rights and safety of others. Which that example would be.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The new language is good, and libertarian, but too specific for a Platform. It is an unnecessary change. Add this kind of expansion of our ideas to position papers instead of needlessly making our Platform even longer.

11.0 - Labor Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
Commenters	53.1%	46.9%	8.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would only add the word 'strongly'. As in - "... not subject to market forces, we (strongly) oppose government employee unions ..." Don't tell my (mostly libertarian) wife I said it, she's a school union member. But it needs to be said. Strongly.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I feel like the first sentence makes it seem like it would make it okay for the employer to discriminate based on sex, race, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, etc, because employment would be outside the realm of government (aka ignoring the EEOC and other Civil Rights laws due to the part that says "social engineering requirements") I oppose Affirmative Action, if that is what that was referring to, but the whole thing kind of made it sound like discrimination based on surface characteristics would be okay (which is really NOT okay.) I do support the nose out by the government- I hate state mandated minimum wages, I think it allows private employers to pay me a low wage and get away with it, without being able to bargain with the private corporation I work for for a raise for excellent performance, I hate that I get taxed about 7% out of my paycheck for medicaid, Social Security, and NYS SDI/SUI- all government agencies. Basically, less government hand outs leaves more money to fix real problems in the country. I like that it still supports labor unions
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, you've taken a simple, easily grasped statement and turned it into a wordy, off-putting paragraph. The ideas are sound, but please, let's make our platform simple, dramatic and powerful. That's what appealed to me when I joined the LP. If I read this new stuff, I'd be turned off. Apparently, you have a writer in love with words, as opposed to ideals.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	remove "we oppose gov't employee unions" doesn't match previous sentence idea about bargaining
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't agree with eliminating pensions.

11.0 - Labor Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
Commenters	53.1%	46.9%	8.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The last part of the final sentence should end at "we oppose government employee unions". The text after that (re: pensions) should not be part of this section.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Yea! I have negotiated with unions in the private sector and there are pros and cons with unions. I'm pleased to read, "we oppose government employee unions." There is no way a government official can adequately negotiate with a union because of the lack of personal consequences that the government official escapes. The union contract instead of affecting the government official affects the taxpayer.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the first proposal better.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	not too aware of the government benefit pensions, perhaps more info on that in an article?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Somehow, I'd like to add words addressing the prevention of events like that the NLRB imposed upon Boeing in South Carolina.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Government employees including legislators should have benefits that do not exceed that of average worker. If workers have to pay into Social Insecurity, then all legislators, workers, teachers etal should have to.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would drop, "...and advocate replacing government employee defined-benefit pensions with defined-contribution plans which are typically found in the private sector." This line goes against the philosophy in a previous sentence. Government employees should also have the freedom to negotiate and bargain without compulsory arbitration. Government employees should not be treated differently than private employees. In fact, government employees are subject to further coercion and compulsion beyond private sector. Government employees deserve equal respect to occupation as private individuals.

11.0 - Labor Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
Commenters	53.1%	46.9%	8.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Don't use "province." While correct, I think, try for a lower grade level than that. While I think defined contribution plans are a good idea, and especially for government, I don't favor having that detail in the platform.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	With prejudice, collective bargaining is a tool used by unions to seek improvement in working conditions and / or wages except that in practice with ANY government employer, strikes which shut down the functioning and service of government cannot be a proper function of a labor union in obtaining its working and wage demands.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Well Said !!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Caveat: All retirees should be grandfathered in since all their financial plans hinge on their current retirement compensation system, not a severely cut back one.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The hiring of a sex offender, like any other hiring, is the business of the business, not the government. Moreover, a great many sex offenders are non-child sex offenders, and are no particular danger in a daycare center.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	If the complaint originally was that the plank was too long, making it longer isn't a worthwhile alternative. The last line doesn't deal with labor markets, it doesn't belong here.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Awsome!!
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	nicely put.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Not sure the pension statement shouldn't be in a separate paragraph. Really has nothing to do with employee/employer relations.

11.0 - Labor Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
Commenters	53.1%	46.9%	8.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	As a former government employee, I'm against the last sentence as it shows a lack of understanding about government unions and pensions. When I joined the government, people in the private sector paid 6% of their income, with an upper limit. <u>I</u> paid 7% of my income, NO UPPER LIMIT into my pension plan. I consider my pension as being a "defined-contribution" plan. And that's CSRS. The newer plan is basically Social Security PLUS individuals putting into the Thrift Savings Plan, DEFINITELY a "defined-contribution" plan. And at the federal level, at least, participation in "government unions" is strictly voluntary, and they really don't have much pull on anything.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	being a GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE who had TWO (2) University Degrees and was working for \$11,000.00 / Year for the WELFARE Office ... the ONLY way that I finally WON a LIVING WAGE was through MY Union (AFSCME) ... I gave up my MEMBERSHIP in the LIBERTARIAN Party over this years ago ... there is NO way that an INDIVIDUAL can Fight the EMPLOYER (the State of Indiana) without Representation by a UNION ... (NOT) my man mitch (DANIELS) took away my Bargaining RIGHTS the day he took OFFICE ... and THEN he SOLD the WELFARE Office to IBM (look how THAT worked out !!!)
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Really well done.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the original better.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	good
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It is about time that government employees be treated like private sector employees.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	To take away federal employees rights to grievances against the government would be to deny them equal protection under the law.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	However, I do support Right to Work laws since previous laws and regulations have slanted power so much in favor of unions.

11.0 - Labor Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
Commenters	53.1%	46.9%	8.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Given the ease with which a person can become a "convicted sex offender," I would oppose a law forbidding them from working in daycare centers (though of course the owners could choose not to employ them). Language should be included that explicitly addresses occupational licenses.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	too granular....implied in "voluntary association"
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The new language overly complicates it.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer the more direct original wording. I do like the last sentence of the proposed amendment.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Perhaps a bullet stating against mandatory equal-opportunity employment as well as thta requires some companies (but not all) to hire underqualified people just to get their check mark. This is hinted vaguely but should be said plainly.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Better. But how about privacy extending to legal convictions that make it almost impossible to get back into society, including employment, even if you want to.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Unfortunately, as we are seeing in several states, government officials see themselves as private companies who have absolutely no respect for public servants. The opposition to govct.-employee unions should be removed.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would drop the last sentence, as it brings in a self contradiction with the first sentence.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Please re-word the second part of the second sentence. What does "it" refer to in "... provided that it is conducted...?"
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Good work.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Employers should be free to hire anyone they wish, and individuals should be free to work without joining a union. Since government employers are protected monopolies funded by taxpayers and not subject to market forces, we oppose government employee unions and advocate replacing government employee defined-benefit pensions with defined-contribution plans which are typically found in the private sector.

11.0 - Labor Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
Commenters	53.1%	46.9%	8.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	must condemn violence and fraud. keeping gov' out is, of course, the key. otherwise support
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is going to be tough to put out there without sounding insensitive. As a party we need to show more distrust and corruption in the lower levels of government. Then the public would demand lowered benefits for government employees. The corruption is not just in the upper levels.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would the wording in the last sentence from "defined-contribution plans which are typically" with "plans based on types"
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Remove last sentence of new proposal.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You need to get off this "social engineering" wording. What are we Republicans?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	NOTE: Private sector has greatly switched to defined contribution plans.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	"...should not be impeded by governmentally coerced participation in social engineering programs such as Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid." Replace sentence "We support the right . . . compulsory arbitration." With "The right of association being a fundamental human right, no individual shall be either be compelled to join a labor union nor denied the right to join one; the right of contract also being fundamental, we support the right of of private sector empolers and employees to choose whether or not to bargain with each other through a labor union."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	No need to explicitly state opposition to government unions.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Just because it makes unnecessary verbiage longer. I'm forgetting where this plank was already covered. The one that mentioned the government living under a balanced budget. Also, "if you aren't hurting someone else, it's okay."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Should you say bargain "collectively" gain than "through a labor union"?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Delete last part of last sentence starting with: "and advocate....."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Too rambling and not consise enough

11.0 - Labor Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
Commenters	53.1%	46.9%	8.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Oppose, but support the proposed addition of: "Since government agencies are protected monopolies funded by taxpayers and not subject to market forces, we oppose government employee unions and advocate replacing government employee defined-benefit pensions with defined-contribution plans which are typically found in the private sector."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This needs to be broadened to avoid the "company store" type of servitude that occurred in the late 1800's Unscrupulous businesses can (and probably will) manipulate short term economic consequences of some people to place them in a position of being "an indentured servant" There must remain some basic minimal laws to prevent this from happening. I do agree with government employees placed on equal footing with the private sector
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Much better!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I liked the cleaner language of the current statement.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I prefer the original version. The proposed text seems to be focused on the current time period
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	all workers should have the right to organize
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Might this also be the place to remind that private employers have the right to offer whatever benefits they and their employees negotiate, and government ought not to require specific insurance coverage that might be abhorrent to the employer?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	ehh, I guess the 'typically found" thing will work itself out.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"Social engineering" is not a well-defined term and should be eliminated.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	sounds to me that we value the private sector employee rights over the rights of the Gov employee - we should all have equal rights when it comes to employment.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Many government employers are disguised social programs.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	like the original

11.0 - Labor Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
Commenters	53.1%	46.9%	8.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Individuals should not be forced to join a union in order to get or keep a job.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the right of workers to form unions and be recognized by management by law if need be. I'm not pleased with management right to fire employees if suspected of union building when not actually working.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Although I agree with the content of the change, the first sentence of the revision requires adequate punctuation. It is a run-on sentence.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	"All citizens have the right to work for their family support without the having to join any association or workers organization." Then the rest
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Needs work . . .
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What about those who have been paying into those pension for 25 years and will be retiring in 10? DO they lose their money? If so, this is unfair taxation on those government employees. Good to see Libertarians are fking hypocrites too
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Labor unions, like govt. ensures force. All freedoms of choice in employment for both employers and employees should be with the individuals, eliminating any other outside intervention and control.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would support this replacing "should not be" with "are not to be" in the first sentence. Anywhere in the document "should not" appears is soft leaving room for movement rather than taking a firm stand.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This plank needs to be updated, but that last sentence -- while current -- has careened way into the weeds of detail. I am also not comfortable with the term "social engineering requirement," as all law is a form of social engineering. This starts to feel uber right wing in tone, which I don't think the LP should be.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Mostly good. However, why should we endorse government employees having pensions at all?

11.0 - Labor Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
Commenters	53.1%	46.9%	8.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This text is missing a lot of hyphens. You might also include right-to-work language, where union membership is not compulsory to hold a job, nor forced dues payments to unions just to have a job without joining the union.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Excellent; very well stated.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do not think anyone should be forced to join a union as a condition of employment, since unions only protect lazy workers
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The intent is good. However, Libertarians "believe?" sounds like a religious pledge. Use a more insistent and positive phrase or words.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Strong support!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"For example, the first sentence of the original would seem to argue against laws forbidding convicted sex offenders from working in daycare centers" I would argue that
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe this would severely limit collective bargaining and create an environment where the employee has little say in his/her treatment and would lead to abuses by employers
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Government shall not regulate markets.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Fiat monopoly is a problem with undue power to control and repress labors wages. Somehow government needs to balance the whole economic system so that only natural monopolies exists and are kept in check by competition at its literal margins...in the theoretical ideal by six other natural monopolies surrounding it.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	So long as the government dominates the economy, and many people can't find work elsewhere, those people should be able to form unions. Furthurmore, this involves telling states how to hire and fire employees and does not belong in a national platform. This will cause many totalitarian union members to turn away from the LP.

11.0 - Labor Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
Commenters	53.1%	46.9%	8.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Public employees work under a monopoly and give up higher pay for some semblance of job security and other benefits. As in the federal government, employees can form unions but should be unable to strike.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Too specific.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Scott Walker, call our office?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Prefer: "Labor contracts should be governed by contract law and not be subject to Government regulations or mandates. Employers and employees have the right to organize and enter into whatever agreements they find beneficial without government interference".
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Best amendments so far. Very well written.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Government employee defined-benefit pensions, while being more expensive do not need to be included in the platform. A financially solvent government could pay for these. Medically discharged and retired military members are government employees.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support it this premise in general. The form of union/govt collusion we have now is a failure and I agree totally with the last sentence. However, inhumane working conditions can become the default state of reality in the workplace over time. This is born out in the violent history that created the unions in the firstplace, and by witnessing what exists in the workplaces of many poor countries today. That the corporation has a disproportionate power over the worker that should be accepted for what it is. There should be some accepted level below which "work" becomes "slavery". If the Libertarian Party can't condense this idea down into a platform plank, then it should step aside on this one.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I like the new statement. It is more positive.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I don't like 2.7.

11.0 - Labor Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
Commenters	53.1%	46.9%	8.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Grammar rule for last sentence and possibly others: can't use "which" unless there's a comma before it. In this case, you might say, "such as are typically found"
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Last sentence is a little too specific to current times. Write it so it historically will stand forever and be always applicable. A broader brush, so to speak.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Not sure what "social engineering" means here. Also, the proposal to oppose the rights of government employees to organize into unions needs more nuanced presentation, if it's needed at all.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Also a triplicate vote. I would add as before that there should be NO government plans at all. There should be NO expense of any kind on the taxpayer for retirement. It is a privilege to work for the People. There is nothing owed them save their salary. One should not "retire" on the backs of the taxpayer to any extent.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	government employee defined-benefit pensions with defined-contribution plans which are typically found in the private sector. We federal employees already contribute just like the private sector. Our right to have a labor union is still an important protection to have. We cannot bargain on pay and benefits or assignment of work. We can bargain on safety, impact and implementation, and work conditions.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'm not sure that the opposition of government employee unions fully honors the rights of those employees, but I do support this proposal more than what it replaces.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The original, in it's simplicity, says it better.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There is value here, but the old text reads much more smoothly on at least one issue: "We support the right of free persons to associate or not associate in labor unions [...]" is simple and straightforward. Maybe we can't write as well as Thomas Jefferson, but we should try!

11.0 - Labor Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
Commenters	53.1%	46.9%	8.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We need to include that where unions are chosen to bargain, no individual shall be required to join that union. "Right to work."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Is there some reason why it should be illegal for a convicted sex offender to work in a daycare if both parties want it? The new option says the same thing as the original, but it is too wordy.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	daycare centers don't need government telling them who they can employ.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Although it would be even better to move many of those public employees to the private sector.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't understand the part about opposing government employee unions.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Change "and" to "or" in "government-mandated benefits and social engineering", and drop "requirements". Drop all the stuff about government employees.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	something just doesn't feel right
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I work for the government
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	unfortunately, Government, like any other employer can exploit their workforce when a labor union is not there to protect INDIVIDUAL'S rights within the workplace. A Public union, operates in the Public workforce the same way government should work overall, to prevent fraud and infringement of personal rights.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Went from being a clear statement to sounding like something out of a contracts class.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	well said
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You are trying to bring back slavery and share cropping.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	cut gov employees
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We need to consider prohibiting the taxation of labor, and instead tax consumption. Encourage rather than punish people for being productive. Punish rather than encourage people for consuming equally for imported products and domestic products. Rich people that don't consume are by definition investing. I could write a book on the subject. ;)
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Very good language.

11.0 - Labor Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
Commenters	53.1%	46.9%	8.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	As soon as monetary inflation is ended, we must then end the minimum wage.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Add something about Right to Work vs. Union Shop. Say how unions should not be prevented from setting up Union Shops if this is done voluntarily (and not coerced by the government)
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Why do federal employees get Presidents day off? I work that day and I pay for them to take the day off with my taxes. How is that?
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	important last sentence
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like, although it would be nice to see more specific opposition to mandatory union membership.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A little "wordy"
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the new one better than the old one, but I don't really like either. I think it's pushing the envelope for any one political party to try and dictate how government employees retirement programs should or should not function- and it simultaneously alienates MANY potential libertarian members and/or sympathizers.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Too verbose. A more concise mix of the two would be better.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Say it again! Get the government off our backs!
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Government employees have too much protection. This change is the least improvement that can be made and as a result should not be contested.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	THE FIRST SENTENCE OF THE 2ND PROPOSAL WOULD ALSO ARGUE AGAINST FORBIDDING A CONVICTED SEX OFFENDER FROM WORKING IN DAYCARE CENTERS - HOW IN THE HECK WOULD A GOVERNMENT, WHICH IS OUTSIDE THE PROVINCE OF EMPLOYMENT AND COMPENSATION AGREEMENTS BETWEEN EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYEES, BE ABLE TO STOP A CONVICTED CHILD MOLESTOR FROM WORKING IN A DAY CARE?!?!?!?!?! I oppose the slanted and poorly thought out "purpose" of 2.7

11.0 - Labor Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
Commenters	53.1%	46.9%	8.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would propose replacing "compulsory arbitration" with "compulsory arbitration, membership, or contribution of financial assistance", since another form of gov't interference is in the creation of the "union shop" where employees are forced to become members of, or pay fees to, unions which they may not feel adequately represent their views.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The Postal Service Unions should be exempt from this. I started in 1956 and Congress was the only way any changes were made. The Unions have worked to make for a faster, safer and pay that was equitable with the Private Bussines. The change need is that the Post Office go back to testing and years of service to move into Management, that would get rid OF THE GOOD OLD BAD MANAGEMENT that results in loos of MONEY.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"Compulsory arbitration" is rare in the private sector. I suggest replacing it with "national or state labor-relations boards."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	One reason I pay taxes is so that I am protected against fraud - so it is not "outside the province of government" - that I am protected by the legal system with EVERY transaction I make
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Final sentence is factually untrue -- public employers compete directly with private employers for talent in the open market. Public employees are not indentured servants, they are entitled as free Americans to negotiate the terms of their employment on equal grounds with private sector employees.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't support "laws forbidding convicted sex offenders from working in daycare centers", do you?
Oppose Support	Likely Unlikely	No No	Non-Member Non-Member	The new revision is wordier and less clear. I feel that an individual should not be compeld to join a union, just because a majority of the employees choose to do so.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Yes! It is not the place of the federal government to micro-manage businesses!
Support Support	Unlikely Unlikely	No No	Non-Member Non-Member	Change "Libertarians" back to "We." Outstanding rewrite.

11.0 - Labor Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
Commenters	53.1%	46.9%	8.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I think workers in both the private & gov't sector should have a right to choose if they want to join a union. But can not be descrimanited against if they don't join one. If a person doesn't want to join a union, they would be in control of negoitating their workers rights. FYI: Sorry for the spelling. I'm typing this out at a late hour w/ verry little sleep. (So I hope it make since too!)
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Better, but defined-contribution plans are no more Libertarian than defined-benefit plans. Preferable in the current situation, but not philosophically.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You have to be more specific like "I WILL GIVE TO EACH AMERICAN A \$75,000 LIVING CARD IF YOU ELECT ME FOR U.S. PRESIDENT"; "I WILL ISSUE \$50 TRILLION NEW FIAT MONEY ELIMINATING THE FEDERAL RESERVE"; "WE WILL MANUFACTURE ONE HUNDRED PERCENT IN AMERICA USING THE FEDERAL LANDS CREATING 100 JOBS". If you need help call me to 571-288-7383. My family could donate also \$100 million to your PAC. Thanks Alberto Lopez WWW.EBLM.US

11.0 - Labor Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
Commenters	53.1%	46.9%	8.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I have several objections. First, I would want something indicating that Libertarians support ordinary protections against fraud and other unfairness in contracts. The Anglo-American idea of a contract is a creature of both law and cultural practice, not some mystical thing that can be oversimplified. Libertarians need to show we understand this. As it is, it's too easy for outsiders to say "Libertarians are fine with it when big corporations cheat consumers", and I think the wording of both the old and proposed planks leave us open to that. I don't actually oppose government employee unions. I would be open to arguments that in situations where the idea of a government employee union is coherent, we should question whether the government is doing something it ought to be doing in the first place. Government employers often are <u>not</u> protected monopolies, and they often do have to compete in the market for labor. I am also concerned about the fact that forbidding unions in this situation would just allow government employers to abuse their position of power. I believe Libertarians shou
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Right on! Governments do not 'bargain' with unions, they give OUR money away!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You've just complicated things compared to the original, and added ambiguity (e.g., what does "social engineering" actually mean?). What "right" exists regarding collective bargaining (or not)? Do you really expect people not versed in libertarian philosophy to understand this, and the underpinnings? Why not make it simpler? You should shorten this, and make things more explicit. Opposition to government employee unions seems wrong to me. Personally, I don't like it, but, in principle, exactly why do you oppose unions for employees that work for a monopoly (of any kind)?
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Excellent replacement of the original. Much clearer and more positive, as you say.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Much better!

11.0 - Labor Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
Commenters	53.1%	46.9%	8.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It was all good until the part about the government employee pensions. Having been a government employee and the spouse of one, I would not be happy with a defined-contribution pension like a 401-K. I think we should drop any reference to government employee pensions all together.
Support Oppose	Unlikely Unlikely	No No	Non-Member Non-Member	Good wording. keep proposal but allow voluntary gov't employee unions provided that gov't negotiate with them in terms of costs. Because public workers cannot strike, they must be able to negotiate (1st amendment). LP should support any voluntary association of people advocating for itself and oppose any forced association or one that is required to exist. Even gov't workers have the right to argue for their pay.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Wow. I have been talking about this for a year, and have not heard anyone else discuss it (defined benefit vs defined contribution)
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I support labor unions. The right and liberty of workers to self-organize should be a cherished part of the libertarian platform, including government employee unions.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Would change clear, concise language with more muddled language.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Outstanding change! The new first sentence shoots down things like federally mandated healthcare for all employees by their employer. De-linking healthcare from the workplace has to happen; this is a step in that direction.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Consider adding "or social engineering experiments" after "... and social engineering requirements."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support a change in general, but find the new wording confusing. I also don't think most voters are too concerned with government employee benefits with all the other issues at hand.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	YES!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Yes!!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I very much appreciate and support the last sentence of this proposal.

11.0 - Labor Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
Commenters	53.1%	46.9%	8.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do not favor abolition of defined-benefit pension plans, tho I do oppose excessively-generous pensions.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	ITIOTS!!!!!!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A statement allowing labor union competetion would be a good idea.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Suggest freezing government salaries as needed to make gov. and private compensation equal for equal work.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Fantastic.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Keep the existing language.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This rewrite seems to accomplish what is intended of it
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Too long and rambling.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I see the new wording as kind of "clunky". There should be a way to reword what you want to say more simply and in fewer words.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Not clearly explained and worded
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support public unions because it allows the People to define what it expects of the union workers. There are still bad bosses in government, and those bosses are held even less accountable than the private sector.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree with the government employee union proposal but the Libertatian party should not discourage the forming of unions by the people who organize to raise their standard of living which benefits all workers.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Tough one. Without labor unions there would be no middle class. And, as President Lincoln said in his first Inaugural Address, "Labor is the master of capital. Without labor, there would be no capital." [Paraphrasing.]
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like this proposal.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Call Reader's Digest & CONDENSE it
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	we oppose government employee unions- the thought is a good one but then you can end up with the good ole boy network.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Government employees need unions like the private sector. Just no striking.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A good change. It's a little long, and I think the last sentence is out of place, but overall a good move.

11.0 - Labor Markets

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
Commenters	53.1%	46.9%	8.9%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe that it is important that employers not be allowed to take advantage of workers, and they will when given an opportunity. One of governments roles is, in my opinion, to make certain that its citizenry isn't abused. I believe unions have their place but ... should be forced to keep their members educated. I do not support gov't employee unions and support defined contribution plans from the private sector.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I favor right-to-work. I should not have to pay dues to an organization just to hold a job with any employer.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I don't think we need this part. "we oppose government employee unions and advocate replacing government employee defined-benefit pensions with defined-contribution plans which are typically found in the private sector." That sounds like it should be a policy recommendation, not a platform piece.

12.0 - Education

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
Commenters	56.1%	43.9%	9.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The grammar in the 2nd sentence is atrocious. Try this: "Since the education of children is a parental responsibility we would remove government interference and restore authority to parents to determine the best course of action for each family to achieve that end."
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Removing the 'managed locally' opens up the LP to criticism that we would support large national corporations being in charge of schools. Private bureaucracy is every bit as impersonal, unaccountable, and inefficient as government bureaucracy.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	abolish the Dept of Education
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Thank, GOD! I hated 2.8.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer the original wording myself.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	how about "we would restore authority and require parents to determine the education of their children" lets not support irresponsible parenting
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Meh.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	the government should not refuse a parent choices in education or mandate that a child must attend a certain school based solely on the parent's place of residence

12.0 - Education

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
Commenters	56.1%	43.9%	9.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	<p>I absolutely oppose this proposal. This would put us back to a time when only those who could afford education would receive it. The poor would be ignorant and our country would be weak as a result. In Jefferson' words "I think by far the most important bill in our whole code, is that for the diffusion of knowledge among the people. No other sure foundation can be devised for the preservation of freedom and happiness... The tax which will be paid for this purpose is not more than the thousandth part of what will be paid to kings, priests and nobles who will rise up among us if we leave the people in ignorance." --Thomas Jefferson</p> <p>Education is here placed among the articles of public care, not that it would be proposed to take its ordinary branches out of the hands of private enterprise, which manages so much better all the concerns to which it is equal; but a public institution can alone supply those sciences which, though rarely called for, are yet necessary to complete the circle, all the parts of which contribute to the improvement of the country, and some of ther</p>
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	<p>I'm sorry but this is all the time I have for this review but I think you get the idea where I'm coming from. Hope it helps. Sincerely, Sally Hayes - Gainesville FL</p>
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	<p>I think an educated people is good for prosperity. Though I have a lot of issues with the way public education is run, I don't think poverty should condemn a child to ignorance, because that hinders the prospect of prosperity and equal economic opportunity for that child. So if only those who can afford it get educated, we would regress centuries. Could we rephrase it so that every child has access to secular, quality education? And yes, government should stay out except in matters of access to education for everyone? And yes, parents are responsible for the education of their children and should held accordingly accountable if they fail to provide a way for a student to come to school well feed, well rested, and ready to learn?</p>

12.0 - Education

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
Commenters	56.1%	43.9%	9.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would add language that state and local school boards should be the lead for establishing standards, not the Federal Government
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Defenition of a public school: one that operates based on community standards (not federal). Therefore: federal interference in any local district is a violation of the tenth amendment.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Some people start at a very low base. I think some "puplic education" option is needed. I am OK with vouchers but concerned about "religious" schools that teach non scientific content.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The plank should read:"Education is best provided at the local level. Mandatory-attendance education institutions should be managed at no higher than the COUNTY level. State-operated institutions SHOULD BE ABOLISHED and ONLY privately funded colleges should exist WITHOUT government interference and/or influence.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But how so? How about, "Parents should retain the right to, and obligation of, providing for the education of their minor children. Parents failing to provide personal funds for the education of their minor children should be awarded funds for that purpose based on the minimum state allocation of funds reserved for the education of each child using public funds."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'll leave this issue to parents to work out.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There is a common interest in educating youth as well as a parental interest.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The references to moral values and local control are good. I wouldn't go much beyond that. In principle I do not object if local towns, municipalities, and communities decide to erect schools using taxpayer funds.

12.0 - Education

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
Commenters	56.1%	43.9%	9.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While I don't specifically oppose the spirit of this language, there needs to be some type of educational standards. One should be able to reasonably assume that a high school diploma means the same thing (in terms of subjects taken and mastered) whether the individual holding the diploma acquired it from a public, private, parochial or home school, and regardless of the state or locality in which it was obtained. I grudgingly acknowledge that the only way to achieve such standards is through oversight and/or regulation on a national scale. . . and such a plan would obviously require funding.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Poor, Incompetent or Educators that Chose to Indoctrinate rather than educate students Will find themselves having to Actually Educating Students with Useful Skills and Knowledge. Or finding Niche Schools that they fit into,,, or they can Get a job Washing Dishes.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think you should add that the job of schools is to educate, not provide social services, food, psychological assistance, etc.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Some parents do not know what their child needs to learn in order to succeed.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Education must be a level playing field. One shouldn't be denied education because of birth into a poor family.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Not an exciting proposal.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Can we "recognize" that a pure and truthful education is one of the very MOST important foundatons for a continuously free and prosperous nation? Can you work this into the proposal? The way government-controlled education is going these days, soon we will have brain-washed young people who have no idea what's really happening now, and how we got that way. Do we want that???

12.0 - Education

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
Commenters	56.1%	43.9%	9.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The words "fee market" are very volatile and I would argue that government may actually have a place in some education. In this case "without interference from federal government" may be a better choice, the original wording used "managed locally" which leaves the door open for a local school district managed by local governments without federal inference. The last line of the proposed plank leaves two interpretations, either parents should pay for all of it themselves (you lose most of your left wingers there) or it can be interpreted as parents should be given the money so they can then apply it as they chose (you lose all your right wingers there who see it being used for drugs and booze).
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You still need some statement to affirm the rights of children not to be abused by negligent, ignorant, or otherwise incompetent parents. Some parenting practices (think Taliban) should be prohibited by law.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support this generally, but I think the line in the original about schools being managed locally is useful and should not be redacted.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Education is too big and too costly to depend on the profit motive, and too vital to have universally available to fail.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There is no reason that people who are not parents should pay for the service of educating other's children. This is not explicit in the proposed amendment.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The world is now too large for this - which doesn't mean that the purposes of the public school system could not be severely limited or that other choices should not be available.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	teachers' unions and government interference is a major problem why are children are functionally illiterate.

12.0 - Education

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
Commenters	56.1%	43.9%	9.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is a slippery slope. One would have to assume success in the repeal of income tax to consistently find the money needed for education. The cost is much too high for individuals to obtain the degree of education necessary to continue progress and moving our nation forward. Until this happens, the government should, in my opinion, have the one responsibility of financing education as related to the role of government protecting Americans. Government SHOULD NOT DETERMINE CONTENT of instruction but offer very attainable varying financing for over three quarters of the population starting with impoverished receiving the most access and access varying up to the most wealthy having the least.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the sentence that was deleted in the suggestion. "Schools should be managed locally..." so I prefer the original.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You are assuming that parents will care-who will take responsibility for the generation of poor, ignorant, useless citizens that will be generated. How will society care for them. What is the long term plan.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	more succinct than the deleted declaration
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This appears to be too open ended and gives an opening to end all public education, which I will not support. Public education serves a very good purpose and long as controlled at the local level. Private education or charter education is not practical for all and failing to provide for education at the local level would be detrimental to many communities in America and create deeper problems in areas that we try to counteract. This needs to be rethought and rewritten.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If this really means "vouchers," then it's fine. The last sentence, however, should be better defined in this regard.

12.0 - Education

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
Commenters	56.1%	43.9%	9.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"quality, accountability and efficiency" should be "quality, accountability, and efficiency". Whoever started treating that last comma as optional was never a QA engineer.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Change the wording to: "we would restore to parents the authority to determine...".
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	While it may be better written, I think the idea of removing all mention of moral value form our platform is a poor decision in 2012? Moreover any plank dealinf with education I would want to offically include the phrase "seperation of school and state" as I find it very powerful
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Right on!
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Strongly Support. This is a great improvement.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would be in favor of such a proposal if the funds were not being utilized for religious purposes. Religion already has many advantages, taxes and otherwise, and if people choose to send their children to a religious school, so be it, that is their choice. As soon as we allow those funds to go to religious institutions, we not only give those religious institutions an unfair advantage (because of tax advantages, etc.) over other private or public institutions, but we also entangle government with religion.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I actually believe compulsory public education should be abolished; there would be many fewer people with collectivist opinions if it wasn't for public schooling. They would be better educated, too.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We the people should provide 8 grades of learning to the youth. Completely voluntary because not all are educable. [Economy of scale fits here.] All education beyond that level shall be arranged by the parents and the students personal friends.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Excellent

12.0 - Education

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
Commenters	56.1%	43.9%	9.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Similar to healthcare, kids can't provide a good education for themselves. If your parents are losers, then you become an idiot? We do have to at least try to help our kids... Not by force, but give them a choice.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	should read: without interference from FEDERAL government. States, Counties, cities could form their own schools
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	to expand on the last sentence: "No individual who chooses to home school or to send his/her child/children to a private school shall be compelled to pay taxes to support public school students and facilities. In like manner, no person who utilizes the public school system shall be compelled to pay for vouchers used to finance home schooling or private school educations."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Sounds a lot better
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The last sentence is much too general to be effectively understood and acted upon.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, I oppose both the original and the rewrite...as it seems that many families would not be able to afford any education for their children if it were only a free market item. This will of course doom poorer families to remain forever poor and uneducated, which I cannot support.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'd rather hire Ichabod Crane than allow kids to be miseducated by many of the current schools! Bring back the one-room and the 'mild corporal punishment for disruptive or violent behaviour' guideline!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Love, love, love this one! My daughter (now 18) is about to graduate from a public high school and I've had to teach her some history that the public school propagandists would never touch (and also point out their lies).
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would like to see some language RE states and local governments may choose to provide education to those parents who cannot or do not wish to provide it themselves, but it is not a legitimate function of the federal government to provide or regulate local education.

12.0 - Education

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
Commenters	56.1%	43.9%	9.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Education may be a parental responsibility, but all parents are not created equally nor are they all responsible, whether they made that choice or not... the child pays as does society over the ensuing years.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Parents should have control only if it is their money that they are spending on their children's education
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But you need to eliminate federal funding prerequisites wherein the federal government bribes states to implement it's policies or go unfunded. This ALWAYS amounted to overt corruption of the (once) sovereign state.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	very good
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Extremely oppose! If the tax dollars were not collected, how many people would set aside \$5,000-\$10,000 per year, per child, for the education of their children? While many people think the education system is not performing as well as it could , this proposal amounts to wholesale defeat/retreat. Few people would embrace such a radical proposal. Get rid of it or retreat drastically to a defensible argument.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I absolutely support this, but can imagine my liberal friends arguing that it doesn't address how poor families will fund their children's education.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	AMEN
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	State run schools are propaganda mills not institutions of higher learning
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i'd still like to see a reference to the unconstitutional Department of Education and the explicit intent to abolish this institution completely.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would include the phrase "like any other service" in the opening line, other than that I support this change.

12.0 - Education

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
Commenters	56.1%	43.9%	9.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Yes, I like the wording better; and yes education is a parental responsibility but saying so opens the door to someone defining how that responsibility should be exercised. Perhaps this is how it should be since some parents will not take the necessary steps to educate their children just as they may fail to take steps to feed their children. We could mention home school, charter schools as alternatives to public education.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	New wording is better but still subpar. The plank should more clearly state that the Federal government has no place in the education system and that individuals should not be forced to pay to educate anyone. The current wording makes it sound like parents do not have control over how their children are educated, which is not true.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Should have a statement about the abolition of government education. You cannot have true parental control with any sort of government education in existence.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Republicans support something like this with a voucher program. We might want to add something in to where we distance ourselves from that. With the way the wording is, it looks like we lean that direction.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Boy, this one is very tricky. An educated population is essential for a nation's success. Since not all parents see any benefit to education, I think that government does have a roll to play here. However, I'm not quite certain just what that roll should be.

12.0 - Education

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
Commenters	56.1%	43.9%	9.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is an area where the party does a particularly bad job explaining or even proposing solutions for education. Education, as a plank in the platform, should be removed until the party has a real and actionable plan that has a chance of success. Too many "private" or "charter" schools are a sham and are worse than the public schools. Until we can put something in place that can improve education for children - and we can prove it - we're just supporting half-baked for profit schools.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I highly approve of the elimination of "linked to moral value"
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It's unclear if this principle extends down to the local government level...does this prohibit towns from establishing public schools that are funded completely locally? Is that overreaching by the federal government? Similar question on the state level - does this abolish state departments of education? What is the LP's position on states' rights? (I've got 7 more pages of planks to go through, so maybe the answer is forthcoming...)
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Not sure about this one. What if a parent cannot afford a private school?? This plank seems to be against public/tax financed education.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Include elimination the Dept of Education. Fed gov't should play NO roll in this area
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Too many irresponsible parents, must make educational opportunities available to children under the age of 16.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the new wording better although having control of ALL funds expended seems broad. Certain people do not believe all courses of education are helpful or relevant and that seems like it could create issue.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Education is best provided by the free market, achieving greater quality, accountability and efficiency with more diversity of choice. Recognizing that government mandated education is unconstitutional we would restore all educational decisions and responsibilities to the parent.

12.0 - Education

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
Commenters	56.1%	43.9%	9.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the removal of the "moral values" aspect and instead focus on the accountability of parents in the basic educational needs of their children.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	neither is very useful
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe that most parents want the best for the kids, however, how do we look after the kids from parents that should not really have kids? It seems a shame to saddle the child because of consequence of parents.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	great
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer the original language.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Consider that there are many 'parents' who have not a clue nor a care about their child's education.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I disagree. I think public school is good, but do agree it's the parents responsibility. I feel the state government or local communities should offer schools.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	May add some language on the concept that the free market, by way of allowing diversity to flourish, facilitates more individualized modes of education. Not all children learn the same way. Standardization and one-size-fits-all solutions to education inevitably lead to poor performance and inefficiency. A one-size-fits-all method will guarantee that only a small percentage of children will benefit from that particular method.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think that there should be a core requirement of basic knowledge/skills that should be required by a government for children somehow. I could see chaos coming from this, as perhaps some parents aren't capable of teaching their children and wouldn't be able to afford a private school...this is a pretty massive platform. I would support a voucher program instead-- getting to choose where my existing tax money goes for kid's education and where my kid goes.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	New wording is pithier, so ok.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would add that the federal government is not constitutionally allowed to be involved in education.

12.0 - Education

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
Commenters	56.1%	43.9%	9.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I am not 100% certain of the new wording. It seems to fall completely on the realm of parents which might be preferred, but it seems to ignore the organizing of neighborhoods or communities for public schooling
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	In Illinois, we have a constitutional mandate for providing a free education. How would the above statement fit into that?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	However, public school corporations are in fact chosen by parents by local vote. Public schools can be effective.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Children should not be required to go to school.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Parents "shall" have ... The use of should allows differing conclusions.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is too vague and too broad. It's hard to understand the meaning of this stance.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think there is a tradition of education spending dating back to the Land Act of 1785. I support school choice combined with funding.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Don't know that most young parents would know what to do with their education moneys but I do think it should left up to communities instead of the federal government.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I oppose both the original and the revised. Education should be INDIVIDUAL, not family-based. I agree that parents are better decision-makers for their children than govt., however, ageism and discrimination in favor of families do not belong in the platform.

12.0 - Education

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
Commenters	56.1%	43.9%	9.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There is no reason to take out the wording that "Schools should be managed locally to achieve greater accountability and parental involvement." There needs to be specific wording opposing negating local control in any way. In general, the plank is not quite there. The public schools are being paid for by taxes, and this violates the right of the taxpayer to subsidize only those forms of education he finds compatible with liberty, or to refrain from subsidizing the education of other people's children entirely. This plank tacitly assumes taxation for the education of other people's children will continue. I ask people, would you go to a stranger's house, knock, and when he answers, point a gun in his face and demand he hand over money for my children's education (or for any other purpose)? If he says No, I tell him, then don't get the government to do your dirty work for you. The plank also does not recognize the right of parents to educate their own children, and it should explicitly recognize this right.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	the sentence regarding managing school locally should not be removed
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The libertarian party should oppose all state schooling in all cause. There is no such thing a public education. The word "public" implies that we all consent. Some of us do not.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	for the sake of absolute clarity, it could be added, that we support the separation of schools and govnrment at all levels including local.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Good changes here, very nice.

12.0 - Education

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
Commenters	56.1%	43.9%	9.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Right idea again but court after court has decided that the state has a compelling interest in the education of children. Proposing zero government interference eliminates even the imposition of simple standards that almost everybody would agree with. How parents help their kids to meet those standards should be their responsibility, but somebody has to set a more-or-less universal parameter. The word to describe education is "attainment." Attain what?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While I support the suggested revision, I do not like how it excises the phrase "like any other service" from the first sentence. People generally understand that services are best provided by the market, but don't think of education as a service unless you specifically point out that it is a service like any other. I also think the sentence about schools being managed locally should be re-added.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Individuals have been given the private right to pursue the education of their own children. We support the authority of parents to determine the education of their children, without interference from government. We believe that public and private education is best provided within a free market, achieving greater quality, efficiency, accountability, diversity of choice, and parental involvement. We support parental control of and responsibility for funds collected and expended for their children's education. We believe public schools should be managed locally and funded competitively within their local market.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	New language has much greater brevity and clarity.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would need more detailed scenarios of how totally private education would work before making a decision to support or oppose this plank.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support this change except for removing the statement about managing schools locally. Why was that removed?

12.0 - Education

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
Commenters	56.1%	43.9%	9.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Please consider "a free market", over "the free market". Also please recognize that education is not just for children, and most career-advancing education can only be used and appreciated by working-age adults.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	More common sense. Could work in the long run.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I am on the fence about this issue. I understand the intent of this proposal, but let's face it: parents of some of the brightest young minds would not be able to afford an education for their children. This nation may be missing out on some of the brightest young minds.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	This proposal does not fix anything that particularly needs fixing, but it does create more ambiguity in our platform, by referring to educating children as a "responsibility", while Plank 3.5 states that it is a right: "Parents, or other guardians, have the right to raise their children according to their own standards and beliefs." The language of this proposal also fails to acknowledge that children may have guardians or other persons responsible for their education. Part of the Education plank that *does* badly need fixing, but which the proposal fails to address, is the language, "Parents should have control of and responsibility for all funds expended for their children's education". Clearly they should have no such thing! If I want to spend my money to erect an educational billboard about the Bill of Rights near an educational facility, for the purposes of educating children going to school there who are likely to see it, the parents of those children should NOT have control of or responsibility for the funds I expend on this project.

12.0 - Education

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
Commenters	56.1%	43.9%	9.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is a State issue where State Constitutions, controlled by the People, prevail. As a property taxpayer where my taxes are used for education even though I have no children I oppose using my tax dollars for "religious indoctrination" in education at the whim of the parents. I do oppose all federal aid to education and there should be no connection between the federal government and education whether it's funding for states or tax breaks for individuals.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe that free market choices should be available, but I also believe that, without some support, those at financial disadvantage will remain so, and their children would have a more difficult time finding quality education. An educated population would be of benefit to society as a whole.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If parents can not afford to send kids to school our streets will be full of illiterate gang members. This is not a good idea in so many ways, on so many levels. Children need to be in school, poor or not.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I think this would be better achieved through the advocacy of local control of education rather than privatizing it immediately. The average American is not yet willing to take on the responsibility for the cost of education.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	On the last sentence, I would like to see "Parents and charities" instead of just "Parents"
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Now, who will educate the parents?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't like either. It leaves no room for States to set their own educational policies. The last sentence seems too harsh, implying that everyone should have to send their children to private schools. Most of us were educated in public schools. The federal government has no business in education, but the states can have a public school system if they so choose.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	with the elimination of "Parents should have control of and responsibility for all funds expended for their children's education."

12.0 - Education

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
Commenters	56.1%	43.9%	9.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	It sounds ok but considering how bad all the others are, don't trust it.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	We need to reassure voters that although we would return control of education to the local level we would not eliminate public education for k-12 entirely
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, this is a conclusion without evidence. Parents have the right to choose, even if they make a poor choice. What exactly does it mean to say parents have responsibility for funds? If it means no taxpayer money should be spent on education, say that. If it means parents can take funds for education and buy a boat, say that.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	insert "and incurred" between funds and for near end of proposal.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Amen.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Fine, for as far as it goes. America, however, has obviously chosen the path of effectuating love and compassion for all those other than developmentally "normal". The costs of this tis beyond the means of many, maybe most parents. Can and will the contributions giving public to secular and theological organizations cover the greater than normal expenses for enabling these non-normals to gain the most of their human life, such as it may be? And if not, then what? Till the heavenly era of zero taxation and fully voluntary contribution to all social governance institutions is wrought into existence, then of course, less warring surveillance policestate apparatus and more educational apparatus is a better public service use of our taxmonies. As a society, responsibly attending to the welfare of special needs children is an important part of the educational issue in genuine whole focus. Leaving the issue unmentioned will likely not go well with the many ordinary folks who already are very aware of the difficulty in resolving the matter, especially those living wi
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Should include a recommendation to eliminate the Dept of Ed.

12.0 - Education

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
Commenters	56.1%	43.9%	9.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Support, except for ambiguity of last sentence. Should parents have control and responsibility for funds expended by private scholarships for their children's education?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You assume all parents are responsible. Where is the rights of children if parents does not want to educate the child?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	No education funds should be collected coercively (e.g., through taxation).
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The last sentence is what presents a problem when you talk about economics. You have not explained what you would do with the present system. That needs change first. Going from the extremely ineffective public school system where all children are left behind to what I think you proposing is quite a leap! I suggest rethinking this position.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I think we need schools for those who cannot afford an education, if a student shows desire and promise. On the otherhand, the Cyrene system has too much control over OUR children.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Yes, the new proposal is much clearer & succinct. A very good improvement.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	much better
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I feel that somewhere in this proposal should be added that Taxpayer funds should not be spent on education. Whatever funds that are spent on education should be raised locally as well as policies for the operation of the education system. Maybe by adding in the last para. parents "locally" should have control of and responsibilit for.....
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The current wording sounds like we support school vouchers. I, for one do not support vouchers.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Better written.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	State government and municipal governments should for the most part maintain public education. I believe it is positive nation building and pushes the liberty continuum in our American society.

12.0 - Education

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
Commenters	56.1%	43.9%	9.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I actually agree with everything written; however, I do think that government should play a small role in education: supervisor. The government shouldn't be conducting education, but it should minimally certify schools and teachers (in terms of facilities, educational requirements for teachers, post-graduate certifications, etc), and provide funding to all schools.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Here's a re-written first sentence: "A free market in educational goods and services facilitates superior quality, accountability, and efficiency, and provides abundant choices."
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Here is a case where you made it clearer, without adding unneeded words or sentences...
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I oppose both the original and proposed. I support public education. If the parent decides to deviate they must prove the alternate education meets the education provided through the public sector. Otherwise the nation will become of nation of illiterates who knows only religion.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe that education is a prerequisite for a society in which people exercise their own freedoms and respect those of others. Millions of Americans have been well educated in public school systems. I still believe that public schools can work, but only if they are managed at very local levels at which parents feel empowered to participate. I support decentralization, not privatization.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Hard for the man on the street to ingest.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While I support keeping control of education on a local level, there have been times in the past when lack of personal money prevented children from being offered an education. And let's face it there are some parents who would rather their children work to support the family than get an education. In this case I support the child's right over the parental right, not to mention the cost to society that lack of educational opportunities can present.

12.0 - Education

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
Commenters	56.1%	43.9%	9.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	local property taxes fund local public schools. how would parental control work ?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	My only concern is that there are a lot of parents who do not have the skills or discipline to insure their child is properly educated. Without a sound education these children will often times "fall through the cracks" and pose either a financial burden or behavioral risk to society.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	it is better than the one it replaces, but remember a lot of folks actually do LIKE their public school and the teachers therein
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Not sure what you're saying here. Do parents vote on school curricula every year, or does it refer to school choice?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It would be nice to see some mention of our not supporting government funding of schools. For example, you could insert a second sentence along the lines of: "Therefore, libertarians do not support government funding of schools at any level."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Well-done!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Main concern is the problem of irresponsible parents about which nothing is said
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	good & strong
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Too broad
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Very bad idea to believe that all parents have equal proficiency in understanding the educational requirements of their children....what if the parents are alcoholics, drug addicts, mentally ill..??
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would like to see a 2.8.1 this section. In it I would like to explain the interim fix for our goal and where we are now. Such as; "We support vouchers until such a time that government spending and taxes can be lowered to give parents the ability to afford a free market education."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The statement is fine, but I do have a question: This implies education is a mandate, not a free choice. Is that what is intended? I believe people should be educated to want education, because forcing education is not successful.

12.0 - Education

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
Commenters	56.1%	43.9%	9.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, in a perfect world, this would be fine; however, I have seen enough of my own family members who do not value education at all to realize that this is not a good idea. Kids can't be counted on to make the right choice, so who makes the choice if their parents fail to?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Support elimination of the Dept of Educ. in government. This is a State and local issue.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A little clearer.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i would include something favoring local schooling.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I have a problem with the last sentence. Suppose I offer parents a free education for their childred (out of my pocket) on the condition that I determine the content, and they agree. I would add to the last sentence "for all OF THEIR OWN funds, INCLUDING THOSE TAKEN THROUGH TAXES..."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would prefer to leave in the sentence about schools being managed locally.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would prefer that you simply come out and state the correct principle: Government has no authority to provide or to meddle in any way whatsoever with education, except to protect individual rights (such as upholding contracts in court). All education is private. You might also clarify that no parent has the right to brainwash or abuse their children. Although home schooling is the best model of education, it is NOT appropriate for parents who are incompetent and/or abusive. That is a violation of their children's individual rights. The government does have the authority to rule that a parent is abusing a child, feeding them lies, or otherwise violating their individual rights.

12.0 - Education

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
Commenters	56.1%	43.9%	9.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, government is presumed. Why? Rewrite should be: "Education is an exclusively parental right and responsibility. In a free market it is parents who choose, without outside interference, their children's education, whether in their own homes, private tutors, or private or community schools -- or even simply "in the school of life." This would eliminate property taxes even on people who do not have children or who are home- or private-schooling their children, or who choose no formal educational model for their children, and would eliminate government control of education and indoctrination of defenseless and helpless children. In a government-free, truly free market, parents have unfettered freedom to choose what and how their children learn, and how much or how little to spend on educating their children."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would like something about individual states setting up educational standards for schools to follow.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	So what is the "standard" for education and how much, plus what core subjects are covered. Public schools needs to be covered.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I would add. "If they choose, parents may empower local authorities to assist in the education of their children." and I would delete "without interference from government." Some may want local public schools.

12.0 - Education

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
Commenters	56.1%	43.9%	9.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	How the hell would poor citizens afford schooling for their children? You can't take something like education and completely privatize it. I went to a public high school and university and came out of college debt free due to cheap tuition and got a great education. The point is to keep education affordable. PS, I know somebody who was "homeschooled" you know, left up to the "parents who know best", and he is SO undereducated he can barely read, has poor social skills, and has no hope of having any type of good paying job outside of manual labor for the rest of his life. Yeah, fantastic idea to leave education up to the free market. NOT. I'm all for de-regulating SOME things, like the stupid regents exams in NYS, or maybe having the parents have more say in what their children take, but you CAN NOT completely privatize education because SO MANY KIDS WILL BE LEFT BEHIND.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Please consider adding NO FEDERAL FUNDS of any kind. Federal funding gives the govt. leverage to enact foolish policies which may sound good, but achieve little or nothing. i.e. No Child Left Behind
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Fianlly! An improvement! You made it clearer. Last sentence is a little vague. You can't be talking about vouchers because you advocate free-market education, so what are you referring to?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Need to add here, particularly if not asserted elsewhere: "We support repeal of compulsory education laws."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Change "Education is best provided by the free market, achieving greater quality, accountability and efficiency with more diversity of choice." to "Schools should be managed locally to achieve greater accountability and parental involvement."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would put the first sentence at the end of the paragraph.

12.0 - Education

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
Commenters	56.1%	43.9%	9.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What if a parent refuses to accept this responsibility? Do we just allow their child not to be educated? There does seem some baseline governmental responsibility to protect a child against parental negligence. I am sure this plank is complete.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Just say "we support school choice for all and vouchers for all, including the right to assign unusuad vouchers to a child of their choosing."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	you are referring to greater say in what is being taught in the classrooms at a local level i believe. i agree if so, perhaps an elected parent thing like a pta? i think more critical thinking classes would be important at the high school level, computer literacy, literacy, philosophy...
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Public shool systems should be run at the local level without intrusion by the federal government in any way.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This plank is difficult either way
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The last sentence implies that non-parents need not be forced to contribute any funds for education. This question should be made clear.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	That are so many levels of government supervision of education, its amazing that there is anything left for teachers. Incentives for good teachers and disciplinary actions for those that don't measure up. Do away with no child left behins....
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would change, "...without interference from government..." to "...with as little interference or oversight from government as neccessary to protect children from abuse."

12.0 - Education

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
Commenters	56.1%	43.9%	9.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	With prejudice, ALL funding shall not be laid upon tax payers who may not have children. And, NO compulsory educational institution shall exist in America. Compulsory education is the tool of tyrants. go to: http://chelm.freeyellow.com/page30.html to learn more about why there must be separation of school and state just as we have a policy of separation of church and state. Both churches and schools are used of tyrants to inculcate their audiences. We have a free press for this reason! We must maintain freedom in all education of the public.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	A larger emphasis on parent RESPONSIBILITY with education would be even better.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Don't like the original either.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	PARENTS on the most part are LAZY, selfish, & lethargic "educators" ... if the STATE did NOT provide GOALS & CURRICULUM there would BE no education System ... by the way ... LEAVE the HeadStart Program alone too !
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Maybe fit in how freedom and creativity would allow developing new techniques of education that leverage technology improving effectiveness and reducing cost.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Just excellent. I never liked the "moral values" element.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree with the above regarding free market quality, etc. What worries me is the above basically says that the choice of whether or not to educate a child lies with the parent. I disagree - all citizens should be educated to some basic level to get them functional in society. How do you reconcile right to choose and free markets with need for and access to education for all? I don't know, but education is a place where I veer from the complete laissez faire doctrine.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	maybe identify that DOE should be abolished and all functions of Education be returned to state & local municipalities.

12.0 - Education

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
Commenters	56.1%	43.9%	9.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I tentatively support this, even this system has the easy capability of being subverted for individual gains.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	when do children acquire some or all responsibility for their own education?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would replace the last sentence to read: "Parents must bear the full costs of the education of their children in accordance with their personal responsibility to them."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support to proposed change to the wording of this Plank. However, this wording leads me to believe that government should NOT be involved in the funding of education. I believe government should fund K-12 education.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If this could be construed as supporting voucher programs that allow the parents to be taxed to begin with, then I would oppose it.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't like the prior wording either. An educated citizenry is a public good, like hydroelectric dams and sewage treatment. Public schools have huge problems, but avoid the first amendment violations of vouchers paying for religious education.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Reco. changing "...parents to determine the education of their children...." to "...parents to have input...." Last sentence could develop into thorny hassles. I reco. it be reworded.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Suggest to last sentence be amended to read, "It is the parents' right and responsibility to choose how and by whom their children are educated."

12.0 - Education

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
Commenters	56.1%	43.9%	9.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The revision seems to imply that that children will be dependent on homeschooling or parents are the sole provider of funds for education. Perhaps this is intentional. I support parts of the first proposal, particularly that mentioning of locally managed education. I am comfortable with spending a reasonable amount of tax dollars on local education (no federal programs) and feel it is beneficial for the children, community, and local employment and property values. I think a merging of the the two proposals would be best. Discussing parental responsibility via locally managed education. It is up to the parents and community to provide the education they want.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	since public schools will still need to be provided for low income families, I believe that they should be handled solely on the local or state level and never again federal.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Would this imply that personal taxes could be sent to a public school of choice or all schools should be private?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I am a prime example of a parent who has had trouble bridging their past education with the demands of modern technology. Also some parents have the attitudes that "their" child is not getting the attention they deserve, whether that is true or not. To compete in the future world, we need a national curriculum that assures ALL American children can compete for jobs.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would prefer something along the lines, "Government is the use of force and coercion and thus has no place in education, at any level."
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I prefer the original workding.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I would add that the Department of Education should be abolished as unconstitutional.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	With the caveat that parental responsibility means RESPONSIBILITY exercised to the benefit of the child. Parental control of funds okay if parent is in position to exercise sound judgment.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	strongly support

12.0 - Education

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
Commenters	56.1%	43.9%	9.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The reasoning for this position is well-defined in the original text. Without it, the rationale, while still present, is less forceful. It is a key problem that government-controlled and obligatory identical education erodes the ability of the parents to impart their respective value systems upon their children.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Rephrase first sentence so it doesn't appear to be a gluing-together of two separate sentences.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Funds for education should come from the parents, the extended family, or private donations. They should not be controlled solely by the parents, but by the groups that are providing them.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Wish the government role could be recognized by the Libertarian Party. Where parents are responsible, great! Reality is we are a huge country and many parents are not ready, willing or able. Failures here undermine the entire social experiment.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Add: "Congress, having no authority under Article I of the Constitution shall be divested of all involvement in the arena of education. States with constitutional requirements to provide education to its citizenry should move toward a free market-based education system as expeditiously as possible."
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I LIKE THE ORIGINAL SENTENCE.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would also support the State right of administering to the local districts, but still keeping each district independent as to where the funds are spent.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I work as a software engineer and I'm not fond of opinions being printed as facts. How can you give authority back to parents who don't want it? Maybe you have to modify the first rule, "If you aren't hurting someone, then it's okay. Once you have children, hurting can include not educating those that can't educate themselves." If you're going to spawn youngsters, you must take care of them else you are hurting them. It all goes back to rule #1.

12.0 - Education

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
Commenters	56.1%	43.9%	9.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The old plank is fine, so is the new but it really doesn't improve upon the first.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It would be wonderful,BUT,the Feds are not going to be able to control the masses unless THEY can keep their children under the false teachings of Social Darwinism. We can dream on though!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Further, make education self funded. Not through taxes. you have children, you fund their education. You dont have children, then no taxes to force you to fund somebody else's children.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like removing the moral values. Does this mean that if I home school my kids I should get the money the public school would have gotten? I am opposed to that.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the "moral values aspect".
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This topic is difficult. Many poor people see no need for education for their children. They believe that people like themselves do not belong in academia so their off-spring enter adulthood crippled. The party should rethink this subject.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It is certainly an improvement over the previous language. The founders of this country explicitly intended for education to be free and compulsory, as a tool for preparing children to participate in the democratic government. Provided that the Libertarian platform does not extend to the point of compromising universal access to primary education regardless of financial situation, this language is acceptable.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Either support or oppose mandatory free public education; and establish the funding source if it will be supported. The old wording and the new are cowardice.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I question the workability of this plank as I do not feel that it fully addresses the negative effect of parents in fact not home schooling in a way that produces good academic rigor needed for the leaders of tomorrow.

12.0 - Education

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
Commenters	56.1%	43.9%	9.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The Constitution of the United States does not include, and therefore by definition exclude, federal involvement in education. Until such a time as the Consttution is amended, The Department of Eduction should be eliminated and the Federal laws passed regarding educational policy or practice should be ruled unconstituional.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Excellent decision to avoid presumptions of morals and values.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support this revision, but recommend changing the second sentence to read: "...restore authority to parents and local shool boards to determine..."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If the parents have to pay for they're child's basic education and face an economic disaster, then the child's education becomes secondary to the family's basic needs. Children should be provided an education by going to school a) full time until age 16 b) universal curriculum nationwide c) a sliding scale fee based on number of children in school d) school dress code. Parents should have the option not to have the child(ren) enrolled in a public school, but also be provided with the identical materials used in the school and the child(ren) will be subject to the same proficiency requirements as their peers. This should be a progressive school system where children are allowed to advance as they demonstate the mastery of the skills needed for advancement and this should be provided as an option all the way to advanced degrees.....this country wastes much academic talent because of the inability for some to afford a higher education
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	In an idealistic LP world we'd all have more money in our pockets and could afford to buy a good education for our kids, but you gotta face reality here...there's little historical evidence that markets alone will serve all of the nations children.

12.0 - Education

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
Commenters	56.1%	43.9%	9.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I oppose any taxpayer money going to religious teachings that are contrary to reason or logic (eg "intelligent design"). So, I'm not clear if parents are expected to pay fully for their child's education, or if the town/city taxes would do so, or what. The problem is, if the town/city taxes pay, then this would result in a taxpayer funded education of religion... separation of church and state would be violated.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like efficient wording and it should be applied to the verbose plank proposals.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	It's better than the original text but I can't support it. This needs more thought and also needs to answer how do parents with limited funds and no to minimal education of their own provide an education for their children.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	absolutely, our children do not need to be indoctrinated into an authoritarian society, and force fed ideals that they may not agree with.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It is clearer.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I wonder if this could be a bit less subtle about the amazing wasteland public education has become. But it's a plank, not a book.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Instead of "would restore" in the second sentence, use the words "recognize the authority of" parents...
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Tax payer funds should never be FORCED to be used for ANYTHING private. This includes education.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would like to see the "Schools should be managed locally to achieve greater accountability and parental involvement" part added back.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The federal government has no right to set educational standards or regulate curriculum. This is a state and local right and responsibility.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You speak of rights but don't mention who's responsibility it is to pay for them- everyone or just the parents?

12.0 - Education

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
Commenters	56.1%	43.9%	9.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is still poorly worded. I'm 45 years old, should my parent's still have authority over my education? Should they control funds expended for my education? What if a third party made available a scholarship to a child, should parents have control over the funds or just an opportunity to accept or decline the scholarship?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	However, education should be a private matter and parents should bear the burden of educating their children.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would add something about children with disabilities and that the added expediture of disability would also be the responsibility of the parent/guardian.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	No, I don't like the phrase "all funds"...parents should have choice of school, but within that school the school has the responsibility and authority of spending funds. I understand the intent of the wording, but it could be misinterpreted
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Govt. has no Constitutional authority to be involved in determining, directing, intruding, intervening, or control in any form of education.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Standard must be created and assured.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would sugest that wording be put in that parents must take FULL responsiblity for the education of there childern and if they wish to send them to gov. schools, it is their call.

12.0 - Education

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
Commenters	56.1%	43.9%	9.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Are we talking about all public education or just the federal government's involvement in education down to the local level? Because I support this position when applied to the federal government. but if a local government wants to offer a public education option that is between the residents and local government. I mention this because I am often accused of wanting to get rid of all local schools and leave poor children from broken homes without access to education. I am usually vindicated when I explain how federal government policies and lobbying by Teachers' Unions have a lot to do with the sorry state of education today but that if our city did not have the mandates from federal government and stranglehold of unions we and our city government along with private initiatives could make education work well for all residents regardless of income background.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Excepting racial bias, I do not support Federal control of education; however, I believe in local (State or County wide) public education funding. Keep the private institutions honest, and allow that poor parents may conceive gifted offspring.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Reword to get rid of "should".
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I still think everyone should have access to at least a high-school education
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe the "moral values" aspect is very important.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again "should" is lame. It is as if the party is asking instead of demanding that right.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It is not clear to me what this is saying? No tax payer money for education? No free education? Tax payers paying for perochial and private schools?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	And possibly strengthen it with an additional sentence that we further recognize that the US Constitution does not grant to the Federal government any power to regulate education, and thus stipulate that it is Constitutionally prohibited for the Federal Government to do so, and is rather reserved to the States or to the People.

12.0 - Education

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
Commenters	56.1%	43.9%	9.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The moral values ought be stressed thus it should be left as is.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Government shall not regulate children, parents or child development.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Consider adding additional language on the role of public schools as a choice that parents can make in choosing their children's education.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	To increase the free market effect home educators should be able to deduct the cost of their home education from their income and/or improvements tax
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	this section should address taxation to sponsor education. (If taxes are supported, then it should go to the public system, as taxes cannot support secular schools and it also weakens public schools by dividing the money.) This section should also address that libertarians do not support government sponsored education beyond the 12th grade.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I feel a little uncomfortable w/this. Children are vulnerable and some parents are just not interested in the childs education. Children need some sort of advocate if they feel that their parents are ignoring their education. This serves to level the playing field for childrens advancement.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Both are dreadfully written. The closing sentence of the proposed amendment will cause endless confusion. Regardless of what's adopted, change "achieving" to "allowing."

12.0 - Education

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
Commenters	56.1%	43.9%	9.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Prefer : "Because the U.S. Constitution does not specify education as a function of the Federal government the 10th Amendment cedes education to the states or the people. The federal government should remove itself from control and funding of education and eliminate the Department of Education. State and local education systems should be judged on academic results and freed from bureaucratic restraints to maximize those results. Regimented government education needs to be reduced and eventually eliminated in favor of free market alternatives".
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think that local government should be responsible for schools .
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We should add that while there is public schooling, childless adults and/or parents whose children attend private schools should not have to pay for the public school system.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Right on!
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I like education as it is, a mix of public and private schools.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Education is much to important to be left to the government.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I would draw the line when parents deny their children a sufficient education. Education can and should be free, and government free. There are ways to do it. Children should not be made to suffer ill education due to being born into poverty. Details of this need to be discussed - how can this be achieved without a government program. There are ways to do this too.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What about kids without a parent around? Can we add legal guardian or other responsible adult?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The last sentence could be misconstrued as advocating for an end to publicly-financed education.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A voucher system must be enacted to divert funds from property taxes to schools the student attends.

12.0 - Education

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
Commenters	56.1%	43.9%	9.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The problem is that we need an educated population and some could not afford to pay for their children's education. Of course the second part is that they can't afford to pay for their children's education because they were so poorly prepared by their own "government" school education.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'm not sure that this works beyond the elementary school level. Home schooling works only if the parents are themselves educated sufficiently to educate their children. This is particularly an issue in science education, which is vital to our nation maintaining it's leadership in the world.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The emphasis STILL is not on parental responsibility. Try this instead: Education is a parental responsibility. Recognizing that education of children is best provided [in a] free market, we would restore authority to parents to determine the education of their children, without interference from government. Parents should have control of and responsibility for all funds expended for their children's education - achieving greater quality, accountability and efficiency, with more diversity of choice. This is also a triplicate vote.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Excellent!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Don't change it. It is better the way it is.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There are a great number of people who are parents who cannot take care of themselves let alone a child...their stupidity, irresponsibility, and ignorance should not be allowed to impact the learning ability of a child.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I am actually neutral, but whoever put the survey together didn't include a "neutral" button.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'm not really seeing any actual improvement in most of these rewrites.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This definitely flows better.

12.0 - Education

	Support	Oppose	All	
All Respondents	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%	
Commenters	56.1%	43.9%	9.2%	
Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Better than the old one. Why dance around this? "As the competition of free markets always creates the highest quality product for the lowest cost, we support any system that moves toward a free market in education, in contrast to government-mandated monopolies and bureaucracies".
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Are not local governments okay to handle education? In an ideal situation, what would we desire? I think that very local level education control is fine, but federal level is improper.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The proposed language is much clearer.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Oxford comma needed in first sentence.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Realistically, I think we'll always have a public education system that is overseen by a government body. I can support the proposed wording along with language stating that the Federal government should have no role in public education. Additional wording should also state that public education is strictly a state and local matter and that primary oversight of a public school belongs to local school boards, which usually consist of students' parents and other relatives, who have a far greater vested interest in the school's success than a Congressman from seven states away.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	That would mean that we believe only the wealthy have the right to educate their children properly.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is better.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I simply do not support this position. I believe we need a public education system, and there are many people who simply do not have the funds to pay for their childrens education which is not the childs fault.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Secular Public Schools are the tenth plank of 'The Communist Manifesto.'

12.0 - Education

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
Commenters	56.1%	43.9%	9.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I'm distrubed by the thought that some parents would not bother giving their children an education. Those most likely to neglect this responsibility are most likely to have less money and more children, and look for more government handouts, perpetuating the habit in their uneducated children. Can we phrase a solution in this plank?
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	better, simpler language
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	w00t
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	much better
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This seems to oppose public education which I believe is a function of government; local government not federal.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	oppose both - does this still involve public education - would that put a person, which is the parent of a school-aged child, in charge of my tax money???
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	By but necessity, a "buffer fund" is needed through some tax payments, to be used for rare cases.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While the federal government has no place in education, the requirement of public schooling availalble to all is one of the bedrocks this country was built upon. States should establish curriculums and proficiency standards, and locally elected school boards should run the schools. Private and aprochial schools should be free to do as they see fit. The market will measure all their outcomes!
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Shorter is better.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	When you are talking about this, you obviously refer to children. But earlier, you define "adults" as ones with rights. There needs to be some recognition that children also have rights, and there is a legitimate role in informing children of rights and in protecting the rights of children. Public education advocates use this as a reason for public education. In each local community, there would have to be some resources for this as a legitimate function, rather than almost all local resources being spent on a dysfunctional school system. Localities would have a responsibility for the rights of children.

12.0 - Education

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
Commenters	56.1%	43.9%	9.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Does this say there is a right for parents to choose to not educate their children? If so, is this what we really want to state?
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	It is in the best interest of society in general that the population be educated. I am not sure a purely private system would work
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A few minor changes of wording, and extremely subtle changes of meaning, but excellent and more concise and straightforward.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	This is where me & the party don't line-up. Both my parents were teachers & have very strong views on the issue. Way too many to put in this questionnaire. But this is something I believe we need more debate on.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	OK
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You have to be more specific like "I WILL GIVE TO EACH AMERICAN A \$75,000 LIVING CARD IF YOU ELECT ME FOR U.S. PRESIDENT"; "I WILL ISSUE \$50 TRILLION NEW FIAT MONEY ELIMINATING THE FEDERAL RESERVE"; "WE WILL MANUFACTURE ONE HUNDRED PERCENT IN AMERICA USING THE FEDERAL LANDS CREATING 100 JOBS". If you need help call me to 571-288-7383. My family could donate also \$100 million to your PAC. Thanks Alberto Lopez WWW.EBLM.US

12.0 - Education

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
Commenters	56.1%	43.9%	9.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't believe that recognizing absolute parental authority, which this would appear to do, is a truly Libertarian position. When I was an undergrad, I was one of the founding members of a student group with some name like "students for limited government" -- basically a non-party affiliated libertarian organization. We had a speaker come in to talk to us about school privatization, and we found him to be such a horrifying person that none of us would want children entrusted to his care. I think our position changed from "government bad, parents good" to "government bad, parents sometimes worse". Anyone in power can abuse that power -- when the authority of parents is simply backed up by the state as if it were an extension of itself, children aren't necessarily better off. A system of checks and balances works better to keep everyone fair and honest. I would prefer the platform treat education like it does abortion. Education is an insanely complicated, controversial, minefield of a topic, and Libertarians do ourselves no favors by oversimplifying it and
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think you've made a few philosophical mistakes, but I still support this. For example: a free market education system might not actually achieve the goals you state (even though I prefer a free market system). You should not write things in such absolute terms. Instead, you should insert language that notes that we think a free market *better* than the current system, but certainly not *perfect*.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Very good.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Teachers should have a say too.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Good wording.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Parents should have the privilege of paying for the education of their children. With that privilege would come perfect parental control. There should be no "public" schools at any level.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Focus more on school choice, not parental responsibility. Be careful to avoid the corporatization of schools, a dangerous mix of public and private money and resources.

12.0 - Education

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
Commenters	56.1%	43.9%	9.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	States should be able to decide for themselves whether or not their government will provide education.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The dept of health, education and welfare should be eliminated as it is illegal anyway.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I appreciate that the words "moral values" have been removed. These are very subjective and personal.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Schools necessarily do teach moral values, and that's a good reason why parents should have control of schools. Also, I do think local schools are generally a good idea, which is absent from the new language.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Support as a former Superintendent of Schools and Milton Freeman follower
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It's okay, but we still are not addressing the criticism that there are some parents who will not assume their responsibilities toward their own children. They don't do it now, with government mandates in place; why would they do it without? (We can formulate an answer, I think.)
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Mostly support. Get rid of the hypothetical "would" and "should", replace them with "will".
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Emphasize local control, eliminating the dept. of education. Many parents no longer see a need for an education. I suppose they think, "why work when the gov. will provide everything I need". I do not trust parents to ensure their kids get an education. Some minimum standards need to be set by someone else.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'm a little worried about this one. I see kids in low income areas and from poor parents getting the short stick pretty regularly. I know Libertarians and others point to the charter schools as an example of how the private sector can take care of education. But the majority of those charter schools are supported by government money. So it's still a function of government...but it's some government other than the local one.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	right on!

12.0 - Education

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
Commenters	56.1%	43.9%	9.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The International Declaration of Human Rights demands compulsory education. Not even a libertarian government can allow a parent to keep their child in ignorance. This is a case where the government has a legitimate right to oversee how a parent raises their children.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Generally OK, but the language of local control is important, since it extends beyond parents to teachers and others.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	No comment
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Does this imply that government would still pay the bill? They should.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Absolutely oppose. We have a bunch of uneducated and stupid parents who commit child abuse by indoctrinating their children. Case in point - Rick Santorum. I am a product of a public school education and went on to get degrees from Whittier, USC, Harvard Grad School and Harvard Law.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This would allow extremists, terrorists, and fundamentalist fanatics to keep their children in the darkness of ignorance. Children have rights and are not property
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The pursuit of happiness is impossible without education. Equal education opportunity for all.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Yes yes yes
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	How is this carried out and enforced?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think in this case, "free market" should maybe be replaced with "private sector".
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I favor an addendum at the end, recognizing a role for local cooperatives (local governments) in the structure of their children's education, since these governments are directly responsible to those people.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Maybe something about government as a last resort?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Support, but with reservations. What is our position re: parents who are irresponsible with the funds expended for their children's education? Who determines whether it's irresponsible? What do we do with lazy parents who don't make any effort to have their children educated?

12.0 - Education

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%
Commenters	56.1%	43.9%	9.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	And the free market means that people with children pay for their own children's education and not the general populace that does not want to have children
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support this, but believe this is an area where you may have a crime committed by a parent, and thus some level of governance is required. Parents should be free to decide how to best educate their children, however, standards need be set in order to ensure the proper stewardship of that right.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Without a centralized state mandated education people would fall through the cracks and only the wealthy would have an education. However I feel parents should have a lot more to say over what is taught in schools and how education is funded. Who gets the money , the kids or the Education Unions?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Absolutely agree. i feel that there should be language in this stating the more diverse culture of being taught in different territories of our country, and not having all children on the same federal path.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	"Free market" is such a loaded term, how about "Markets". Also, many people would receive funding via charitable organizations and funding, not necessarily from their own control.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't see why parents should have control of funds other people may voluntarily make available for the education of others. Funds may be offered with conditions.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It'll never passed the high powered unions, but if we could get Charter Schools legal in all 50 states it would give parents a choice. We in Washington State cannot have Charter Schools.

13.0 - Health Care

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	92.5%	7.5%	100.0%
Commenters	71.4%	28.6%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Here you have again used the word "include" in the colloquial manner. The word, in a legal sense, is used to *exclude* that which is not listed, so a more logical approach would be to say, "...including, among others, end-of-life decisions."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	repeal obama-care
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The free market health care system we have now is bankrupting americans. Rather than creating lower prices driven by competition, the industry charges top dollar for most services. The choice of health care should be determined by the individual, but the industry is just another broken free market idea that is just out for profit and not the benefit of Americans health...
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If any, needs to be in the plank. How did we get to the third party payer and why can't we go back to house calls?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"We recognize the freedom and responsibility of individuals to determine the level of" Choices have consequences, that should be clear
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Excellent!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	HMO ruined health care.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	adding the parenthetical here will lead to numerous such revisions in the future....let's assume a modicum of intelligence on the part of the reader and leave this alone.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Why focus on health INSURANCE? Couldn't we say that a patient can enter a health relationship with any professional or institution without a 3rd profiteering intermediate party?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You should add something about people having the RIGHT to CHOOSE when their life should end. If they are in pain or suffering from a terminal disease they should have the right to die with dignity. We should not offer a kindness to our own pets we are unwilling to offer to our parents. This section should also talk about the execution of people's individual wishes in their wills in the case of a persistent vegetative state.

13.0 - Health Care

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	92.5%	7.5%	100.0%
Commenters	71.4%	28.6%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Unfortunately those without insurance will be a burden on taxpayers.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There should be something here about not mandating that health insurance coverage be a condition of employment. There also needs to be a statement recognizing that people are obligated to pay for services rendered, even if that means they will become destitute and leave their families in poverty due to stupid health care decisions. We cannot say people have a choice without recognizing the social cost of their stupid choices. We must openly accept that children will be tossed onto the public dole due to the irresponsible decisions of the numerous idiot parents running around these days. Just saying the parents should pay won't make it happen.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Need a workable proposal.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Seem unnecessary
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Still need to decide what to do with the guy with poor health, no insurance, and shows up at the Emergency Room. Do I still pay for him?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I whole-heartedly agree that people should be able to choose whether or not to carry health insurance; however, the requirement for health care providers (such as ERs) to provide care whether or not the patient has insurance (or other means of payment) drives up the cost of health care, and with it, health insurance. If we are allow people to choose not to carry health insurance, we must also allow providers to refuse service to those without either insurance or ability to pay. Otherwise, the responsibility/accountability is only one-way, and can never be effective.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	What about opposition to Medicare, Medicaid, and other health care entitlement programs that skew the free market and inflate prices? The government is responsible for the sorry state of health care in this nation and those two programs are major contributors.

13.0 - Health Care

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	92.5%	7.5%	100.0%
Commenters	71.4%	28.6%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Might include a reference to the fact that we have the best health care available in the world. (If it ain't broke, don't fix it.)
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The pharmaceutical and insurance cartels should not be allowed to lobby government representatives.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Maybe we should add that medical providers, regardless of their "type" of practice -- holistic, allopathic or naturopathic, will be FREE of government interference, regulation or prosecution, if no harm is being done to the consumer?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You also need to support the right of medical practitioners to REFUSE TREATMENT of those who cannot or will not pay.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	The Plank should also state that the tax break should be eliminated from the business and given to the individual. Additional state mandates of coverages should be eliminated.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Perhaps it should be made clear that, like any other personal choice, the individual is responsible for the consequences of his medical /health care decisions.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Amen.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	but clarify that a legitimate role of government is to assure the availability of a free market and that the insurance companies play fair. Also as for "if any" - those choosing that also choose the consequences. And that some alternative is available for those lacking an ability to pay to receive some basic level of care. This might be achieved on a voluntary basis and / or with some sort of incentives but we cannot have people dying on the streets through lack of care!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	add the idea of "this should not determine the access of health care. All Americans have the right to procedure in matters dealing in life or death scenario."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There should be no limit to what insurance can do, include language to this effect
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"If any" is not necessary

13.0 - Health Care

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	92.5%	7.5%	100.0%
Commenters	71.4%	28.6%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	once again we give rights with no responsibility. What is the plan to care for those who choose no insurance? Is society responsible? What about a personal responsibility clause. How much free health care will the people get who choose not to pay for insurance vs those who choose to pay for ins?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Everybody must have insurance. If they choose not to purchase a policy from an insurance company, then they have self-insurance. Choosing to self-insure is one of our responsibilities as individuals. This should clearly be reflected in our platform.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"the level of health insurance they want (if any)" could be just "the health insurance they want (if any)" -- "level" (amount?) is only one relevant variable.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Add to the end of the second sentence: ", provided such choices and decisions do not impose any financial obligation on the part of unwilling individuals or taxpayer funds."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	great
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is particularly well said.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	add "and associated consequences" after "(if any)."
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	There are good points here, but overall I oppose it more than support it.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	why is "the level of health care they want" repeated?
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Everyone deserves care with respect to the patient not the corporate greed.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Across state lines will open a bag of worms. don't forget the Tenth Amendment.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	All persons are free to choose a lifestyle that for the most part will determine his medical needs in the future. No other persons or group shall come together in an altruistic manner to offset the results of those choices.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The proposal is acceptable, except for "end of life decisions"...I would be afraid of an instance where the person was not able to make that decision wisely.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	0 is a level. Seemed clear enough before.

13.0 - Health Care

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	92.5%	7.5%	100.0%
Commenters	71.4%	28.6%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	For much the same reason I favor the requirement for motorists to carry liability insurance, I do so for catastrophic health insurance. Folks say that one can choose not to drive if one doesn't want to pay for car insurance, but that doesn't apply to health insurance. The problem I have is that if I am in an accident, I want to be treated without having to show proof of insurance. If hospitals must treat all emergencies and I don't want to have to pay for those that can't, it is reasonable to require everyone to have catastrophic health insurance.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Redundant...
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I believe that the word "choose" more clearly expresses the intent of this plank than "determine" does. "We recognize the freedom of individuals to choose ..."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think "none at all" is implicit. the "if any" would need to follow each item in the list (insurance, care, providers, etc.) which would make the sentence very long and awkward. Or insert a sentence after the one in question stating: We recognize the freedom of individuals to decline the use of insurance, health care, etc....
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This would be good to show the major concern with the individual mandate
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Ban the Patient Perversion and Un-Affordable Care Act!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Excellent!!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	In addition, there should be something about taxpayers funding health care for those who choose not to purchase health insurance. This kind of funding should be done by private individuals and private groups, and not any government.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Citizens should have the right to purchase medications and devices without needing approval from the federal government. FDA approval could be voluntarily sought by drug companies if they want it and are willing to pay for the FDA expenses. Insurance companies could require FDA approval prior to covering any drug/device, but the government should not require that.

13.0 - Health Care

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	92.5%	7.5%	100.0%
Commenters	71.4%	28.6%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Does across state lines also include across country lines? Employers and Gov't should not be involved in a person/family health care decision.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Providers need not be licensed by the state and drugs should be available without a prescription
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The real problem is that there are no market forces on medical costs. There needs to be medical savings accounts.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But price fixing and windfall profiteering by the medical sector would have to be outlawed first, or health care will mushroom beyond the ability of anyone to pay. THAT IS THE PROBLEM WITH HEALTH CARE IN THE FIRST PLACE.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	About Time
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	However, an even simpler wording would be beneficial: "We favor restoring a free market health care system. We recognize the freedom of individuals to make their own decisions regarding their health care, including health insurance, if desired. The Federal government has no Constitutional authority to make health care decisions for individuals."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This seems to be an unnecessary change only to make the point that people may choose to have no health insurance at all. Their interest in paying out of pocket for health services is amply explained by the recognition of "the freedom of individuals to determine..."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support it on its fact; but don't think it goes nearly far enough. The federal gestapo has exactly zero business telling me what I can or cannot do regarding my health. Period.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Those who choose not to insure themselves should not have access to government funded free health care, rather their option should be charities alone.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think it is a disgrace that this country ranks (Somewhere around) 23rd in infant mortality. This is largely due to the poor having inadequate medical coverage and often, being too ignorant to even realize they should be seeing a physician on a regular basis.

13.0 - Health Care

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	92.5%	7.5%	100.0%
Commenters	71.4%	28.6%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Generally I support this change, but a health care statement should also include the accountability and responsibility of the individual to pay for their own health care based on their lifestyle choices. I don't want to pay for your multi-year treatment of smoking with my tax dollars because you chose to smoke and not buy health insurance.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We need to also restate here that government does not own the individual - individuals own their government.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Would also reinforce that this isn't an entitlement or "right" that people have, just like any other good or service in life. And no one should be forced to purchase, not purchase or otherwise molested by the government related to this topic.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	unnecessary noise
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I would strike the last sentence however. Insurance is regulated at the state level and remedies for fraud might not exist for a person whose policy is purchased in another state.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You might also look into John Mackey's proposals from 2009 in response to the (then-proposed) 'Obamacare': http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204251404574342170072865070.html Especially need some mention of Medicare reform, as Medicare is a huge chunk of the federal budget.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	All but the last statement. You realize that the "across state lines" purchases of insurances would be moot if all governments stay out of it. State governments define what has to be covered..some states are more lenient than others which is why it is cheaper in some states. Also some states create an insurance monopoly as well.You also have to address the problem of government requirement that hospitals treat in the E/R everyone even tho they have no insurance and cannot pay. Having been in the Health Care Technology field for over 30 years I know what this means.

13.0 - Health Care

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	92.5%	7.5%	100.0%
Commenters	71.4%	28.6%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Also, consumers should be capped on law suit payouts, as this makes it impossible for a doctor, hospital, ect, to work without a huge insurance policy to protect themselves in case something 'Might" happen. No company, doctor or individual should have to buy insurance from any insurance company. Doctors should be willing to take responsibility for any choices they make regarding said insurance. Only then can we have a free market.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The USA health care system is horribly broken. Our model that health is big business is incorrect, The FDA should be closed. Ketchup is not a vegetable Food is not processed, processed package edible things should labeled as such
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Spot on.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Should have catastrophic coverage only. Get rid of both state and federal CDS schedules that are based on emotions and politics not science!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do not believe children born into poor families should have no health maintenance. I feel we need to take care of those less fortunate also.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the concept, but given the state of the dispute in America over this topic, I believe it would behoove us to explicitly state the option to choose no health insurance at all.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Those who do not have means to pay for medical care may be looked after by the compassion of others but do not have a right to such care. Those who choose to help the needy should do so voluntarily and not use this as an excuse to force others to pay for such care.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	the gov. should not be envolved ??????
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Bad English. "Persons", not "People"
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Should clarify the right of the citizen to use deadly force against police, to resist involuntary hospitalization, which is some times what it takes to say NO to drugs.

13.0 - Health Care

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	92.5%	7.5%	100.0%
Commenters	71.4%	28.6%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Agreed. Perhaps again emphasize that free markets facilitate more choice, more options, varied levels of pricing to accommodate people of all income levels. A common misconception is that free markets lead to monopolies. I think it is really important to educate people on the fallacy of that argument.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would add that the federal government cannot constitutionally be involved in health care in any way.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	My only issue is patients refusing treatment, inoculations, for communicable diseases. Such personal decisions put all the rest of us at risk.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	However I would recommend commas, not parens.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Why not include 'if any' to each section of the plank? I am being facetious.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I oppose the change, but I'd also like to point out a typo in the survey. There is duplication in the statement: the level of health insurance they want (if any), the level of health care they want
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If this is territory you wish to continue a Plank upon, you must include language to the personal financial responsibilities of those who choose "NONE AT ALL"
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	should say something in there about being able to choose medical providers who might not be vetted by the government, drugs too! I do not think we need to go to government to give doctors/nurses or other providers a license before we can use them!!! Government FDA is expensive and useless and harmful, we need to get rid of it. We should not be forced into using ONLY those things approved by the government!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Freedom of choice

13.0 - Health Care

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	92.5%	7.5%	100.0%
Commenters	71.4%	28.6%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the addition of the words, but the wording "including end-of-life decisions" should be omitted. The reason is twofold: 1. it is unethical for a doctor to hasten the death of any patient and 2. patients are being defrauded and coerced into agreeing with poorly understood wording in advance directives that will permit doctors to violate the patient's wishes, and their right to change their minds in favor of life and ongoing reasonable care is being ignored. The plank should recognize that all patients have a right to ordinary care which includes food and fluids, by whatever means, until patients' bodies are no longer capable of utilizing them (which happens within days of natural death). While no person is entitled to expensive care, especially at other people's expense, either through government or insurance, there is a vast difference between this and the nebulous wording about end-of-life decisions. A person ALWAYS has the right to REFUSE medical care, and this is pretty much universally recognized, although there are doctors who will impose treatment o
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	meaningless change
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We need to call for an end to Government Sponsored Health Care Monopolies like the system here in MA is currently under.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It may also be advantageous to say something about repealing all the protections to healthcare insurance companies that prohibit the free market from taking hold as well. It may not be necessary given the first sentence, but I wanted to say something just in case.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"across state lines" is restrictive and should be replaced by a statement that supports international transactions.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Could be better worded.

13.0 - Health Care

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	92.5%	7.5%	100.0%
Commenters	71.4%	28.6%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Here's why I oppose this: if you're going to add "(if any)" after "they want" in one place, you have to add it every time this says "they want." If you do it just the first time, that implies that we are not fine with people choosing to forgo all healthcare, medicines, and treatments, and to avoid all healthcare providers. So, in conclusion, either add the "(if any)" throughout the plank, or not at all.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	offers all options of health insurance. Good idea.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Might consider adding a comment reflecting the need for a "willing provider."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Please remember the freedom of (licensed?) health care providers to accept payment in forms of their choosing, not be forced to agree to terms dictated by insurance companies.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Might still have to address people without health care that receive treatment and how to pay for them when they are unable.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	An unequivocally positive addition to the platform! I'm shocked!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Bankruptcy laws need to be amended so that a person can't run up high medical bills and then simply bailout of any responsibility to pay them.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	That free market should be direct to consumer, without distortions created by intermediaries such as government OR business.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	They should also be free to purchase insurance across national boundaries as well.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Again, I would lean more toward the terminology of liberalizing consumers choices of level of coverage. Most people are afraid to be "dumped" into the free market. They are too habituated to being rescued. Baby steps will work better than jumping into the ocean right away.

13.0 - Health Care

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	92.5%	7.5%	100.0%
Commenters	71.4%	28.6%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Why are there no laws making the conversion to cheaper generic prescriptions when they become available? As 1 of the the purchasing coordinators for the largest supplier of medications to nursing home patients, I am stunned when our tax dollars are being spent on only Name brand drugs. 1 prescription can cost Thousands of dollars more than the generic. If you want to fix health care-start with a local pharmacist, not a politician
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Free and OPEN market system.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If this change is made, there is a redundant statement of the same words following the blue text that needs to be removed or edited.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	language needed for the suspension of government subsidized health care for those who elect to be without health insurance.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We favor a free market health care system. Period.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	finally something decent!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	insert "without government mandates" at end.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Yes, much better!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would prefer it it read "they want to pay for," instead of "they want." As the saying goes: People in Hell want ice water.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The amendment is good, but I have a problem with the idea, since affordable full coverage healthcare is unavailable to most citizens and must be subsidized somehow.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What if someone without the insurance get sick or have accident and will come to ER or hospital?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i feel that it should be mentioned that if a person decides not to have insurance and they can afford it they should suffer what ever fate that decision brings
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I have concerns for those who cannot afford health care, who are unable to work through no fault of their own.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Sure, I'm not sure the addition is needed, but I can see where it does clarify the statement.

13.0 - Health Care

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	92.5%	7.5%	100.0%
Commenters	71.4%	28.6%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would also like to see once again reaffirm that if you choose "wrong " thus not able to afford medical care then your choice so your consequences so "government " not paying bill for you.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	and to die for not having the ability to pay?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	In addition, I support including the following: "It would become illegal for employers to provide health care insurance as a benefit." I believe this because A) it discriminates against the unemployed, B) because the employer/health care complex (like the military/industrial complex) is fraudulent, uncompetitive, and incompetent, and C) the status quo hurts small business development and thus U.S. competitiveness.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Replace "lines" with "borders."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would add the following: A personal choice to not purchase health insurance implies that medical costs associated with such a choice should be borne by the individual and their family, not the community or citizenry. Medical care providers have the right to refuse to provide care to those who cannot pay, or who have elected not to purchase insurance.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support both a public healthcare run by the state and local government with doctors paid for by the federal government and a private health care market. Public healthcare would provide family practice and emergency healthcare. Private healthcare would be for cosmetic, abortions, and births. I oppose all health insurance as it is not healthcare.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Not a necessary change. Level implies zero.

13.0 - Health Care

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	92.5%	7.5%	100.0%
Commenters	71.4%	28.6%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A recommendation regarding the proposed "(if any)" change vis-a-vis personal responsibility/accountability: If a person chooses not to have any health insurance, then that person needs to assume the consequence(s) of that decision, and not burden the taxpayer with the obligation to cover his/her healthcare "free of charge".
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Absolutely oppose. We are all going to die, and none of us knows ex ante if our health needs in life will be great or small. Since I do not care to live in a society that denies care to people who did not obtain insurance for themselves, I favor one in which we all acknowledge our mortality and health risks honestly and agree to take care of each other. I support completely private for profit medical care, but medical insurance should be a not-for-profit sector as it was for many decades when we all had cover from the original "Blues," Blue Cross and Blue Shield.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While I support the free market, I wonder if insurance companies would offer affordable & reliable health insurance in such a market. So far it has not proven to be the case. Would this mean that hospitals would continue to take anyone and have those who have health insurance foot the bill? This has also been the case.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	My concern is that individuals who choose not to acquire health insurance, but they eventually need medical care, who is going to pay for it? To withhold life-saving medical attention would be immoral in my opinion. I have worked in the senior living and health care industry for over 25 years and this is a very tricky issue.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	My dissertation was on how Public Health is the venue for governmental intervention in health alone and that abortion is not healthcare by any logical definition.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Can we add a line specifically calling for the repeal of Obamacare on the grounds that is unconstitutionally requires us to participate?

13.0 - Health Care

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	92.5%	7.5%	100.0%
Commenters	71.4%	28.6%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Need to sound compassionate here by paving path for way out rather than cutting the cord. Have to be able to sell this.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	each of the phrases should have the "if any" option. A better way to address this would be to add a sentence to clarify the option. "This includes the freedom to choose no care, no treatment, no insurance, and/or no medicine."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	OMG YES
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A must add.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Markets should be free to advertise prices so consumers can make responsible choices for care.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Insurance companies are a large part of the high cost of health care. I oppose ALL insurance companies since the free market would make costs reasonable if they did not exist. Then all americans could afford care.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	People can not expect government to pick up their health care costs, Government can facilitate a low cost major health care plan for those who desire it and will pay for it.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Well-done again!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	..restoring a market-based health care system in which individual consumers freely cooperate with providers of medical services and insurance to determine all aspects of their care, including . . .
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	need for the parenthetical phrase suggests the overall sentence needs work
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think this opens us to the charge that its ok to not pay for insurance and take advantage of "free services" when needed. It also would be good to have a statement of responsibility. However, I can't see how to do it without getting into an involved discussion not important to our target reader.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I think that this could be better worded
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	No health insurance is a level of care. We do not need to put it in.

13.0 - Health Care

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	92.5%	7.5%	100.0%
Commenters	71.4%	28.6%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Tighten the wording: restoring is sufficient, without "and reviving" Can we "recognize" a state that does not currently exist? We support individual freedom to buy or not buy health insurance, without government mandated benefits or pricing; to buy or not buy health care; to select from medicines and treatments without government interference; and to make end of life decisions. Providers and insurers should also be free, not compelled to accept patients or clients.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Why shouldn't I be able to purchase health insurance, or health care covered by any insurance, across international boundaries?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support this with reservations. I think the government does have a role in enhancing citizens' health and providing services to those who - for whatever reason - have nowhere else to turn. I recognize the many problems of government provided health care and prefer a free market solution, but there must also be components in which there is government involvement.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	End Medicaid and Medicare. Give states block grants to use as they see fit. End HIPPA and JAHCO. End Stark Laws. Allow physicians to own a hospital and grow. Uninsured patients don't need the "Ferrari" of health care, they need a "soup kitchen". Free, cheap care. If you get it for free, you can't sue. It should be legal to have a private hospital, hospitals in CA are crippled with the burden of caring for anyone who walks through the doors. Uninsured should go to a designated free clinic/ hospital.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Not really necessary, though.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Add: and if individuals decide to forgo health insurance they will live with the consequence of their choice, and forgo treatments, even if life saving, if they do not have the resources to afford them.

13.0 - Health Care

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	92.5%	7.5%	100.0%
Commenters	71.4%	28.6%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Perhaps there should be something about how eliminating medical licensing (and indeed all licensing for every profession) as part of a return to a REAL free market will send medical prices plummeting as a result of increased competition. Or is that covered in another plank? I didn't see it in the "labor" section...
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Good catch.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	To achieve this goal we may need to push for the Repeal of the 17th Amendment
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	First sentence isn't even necessary. "including end-of-life decisions" should also declare "as long as no third parties are employed to end anyone's life, as this would create a "murder for hire" class, which could not be effectively codified, regulated, or prosecuted for wrongful deaths." If you look at the morass the "right to die" movement created in the Netherlands, why would you want that imported here? We should all have to carry cards protecting ourselves from someone "ending our lives" rather than explicitly provide for ending our own on our own terms? Just as conception must be protected as life, so must "end of life decisions" be explicitly spelled out and guarded against euthanist social engineering.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This plank is weak. We need to bash socialism. Maybe some 'if all your friends jumped off a bridge ...' type logic to refute the 'all-the-other-kids-are-doing-it' argument of statists.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A side note, if a person opts out of having health care, I think they should have to carry a card saying so, so if they suddenly like, have a medical emergency, they have made their decision and will not be treated at all, or "on the state" or if they desire treatment, they should pay out of pocket the total expenses of the treatment; should they die despite medical assistance, the cost burden should be placed on the family. Personal responsibility. One should understand the risks associated with no health insurance.

13.0 - Health Care

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	92.5%	7.5%	100.0%
Commenters	71.4%	28.6%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	As long as there some control over monopolies
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Mostly good, but adding the last sentence speaks to one specific example of why government regulations are harmful. The point is to remove regulations, not name individual regulations to remove.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Who pays for catastrophic, or even routine medical care for those who choose not to have insurance? There is no such thing as free care -- "a free lunch"!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Any statement about liberty and healthcare needs to address whether or not we as a society are okay with letting people die as a result of not having health coverage. Everyone likes to talk about being forced to buy something they don't want but no one talks about how the healthcare system is forced to take care of those who don't buy coverage.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Having no insurance is a choice that will most likely mean inadequate care when the need arises, unless the person has very large resources to draw from. People making this choice must not expect others to then come to rescue them from their own shortsightedness. Freedom comes with responsibility.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I am uncertain about being able to buy across state lines. It was allowing banks to cross state lines that led to the abuses of huge nationwide banks.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	should hedge all other statements that fall then, care providers they want if any and so forth
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i'm a little leary of the end-of-life decisions.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	where does the burden fall if someone doesn't have insurance for an emergency? many doctors would not refuse care...
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Delete redundant statement which is a repeat of the corrected statement, "...the level of health care they want..."

13.0 - Health Care

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	92.5%	7.5%	100.0%
Commenters	71.4%	28.6%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Ban all health insurance. Why should one profession demand insurance as the ONLY acceptable method of payment. Now, the legal profession is getting the idea that insurance is a good idea. What's next, roof insurance, gardening insurance, barbering and hair dressing insurance, manicure insurance, grocery insurance? This policy of the medical profession demanding insurance as a method of payment for services has taken medicine out of competition with other economic participants. Doctors don't make house calls today. 50 years ago, they competed with laborers, barbers, gardeners, roofers, plumbers, auto mechanics, steel workers and concrete finishers. Labor unions have won medical insurance for their clients and subjected every other participant in the economy to competing with the reimbursement medical insurance provides. Abolish medical insurance and require the medical establishment to compete in the open market at market prices.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	and "if any" is the chosen method the taxpayers should not have to foot the bill for that persons choice. Almost evryone can pay something depending on you economic standing. If as a Libertarian you have opted for free choice the accept those consequences that follow them.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	redundant, "no insurance" is a level of insurance.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Would prefer addition of a statement opposing government mandated health care; especially forced purchase of health care.

13.0 - Health Care

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	92.5%	7.5%	100.0%
Commenters	71.4%	28.6%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Of course, the socialists (most of the people in the country even if they don't recognize it) say that it's not about what people want, but what they NEED, and that they can't afford what they need "without government help." That's why so many people voted for Obama in the first place -- "FREE" HEALTH CARE. Not being a writer myself, I can't propose a better platform, but I think this particular platform needs further addressing to remove the "want" portion, and spotlight on government not getting involved in specifying medical insurance and treatment. In the meantime, this is a good as anything.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	End Obamacare
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Since Libertarians are against government interfering with services that should be provided by the free-market, including healthcare. Should we not call out that we are opposed to Medicare - the biggest government run program in the economy? How can we oppose ObamaCare and not oppose Medicare? We are hypocrites if we are silent on government run Medicare.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The USA needs a guaranteed Health Care SYSTEM devoid of "free market" corrupt Greedy INSURANCE COMPANIES ... INSURANCE has RUINED the USA & now wants to OWN the USA ... OBAMA CARE is the 1st positive stroke I've lived through since the inception of MEDICARE & MEDICADE (which could BOTH be dismantled WITH Obama-Care !!!)
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the concept and the phrasing, but most people do not realize we have not had a free-market healthcare in 50-100 years. Between the AMA and the FDA and local laws, there is SO much control. New technologies are also preventing people from being treated and cured.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Excellent.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Many people can not afford the current medical care. I would favor Medicare for all and strict regulation to prevent looting.

13.0 - Health Care

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	92.5%	7.5%	100.0%
Commenters	71.4%	28.6%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	individuals and groups...I think individuals should be free to establish themselves as a group if desired, and that group could decide the aspects listed above & work with the health care providers, not just individuals
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"We recognize the freedom" in the first line seems a little awkward. How about "We support the right" instead?
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Instead of using a banking system creating money out of debt, the government should create money out of the need of every American for healthcare. The government can pay for all medical expenses for all individuals who should go into the free market and choose the healthcare quality and provider of their choice.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Need to add: care providers should not be forced to provide care without adequate compensation. Charity care is to be provided on mutually agreeable terms.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The second sentence is now grammatically incorrect.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Good clarification.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Extending insurance beyond state lines would take oversight of the insurance industry from the states and place control with the federal government. I would support 2.9 if the last sentence were removed.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	across state and national lines.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Health care needs to be treated as a community resource not a liability or a profit magnet as it is treated today.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would be happier if this plank explicitly addressed the health insurance market distortion caused by Federal tax distinctions between private and employer-provided insurance policies, including the group insurance limitations (such as the requirement for coverage of preexisting conditions) imposed by the tax laws.

13.0 - Health Care

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	92.5%	7.5%	100.0%
Commenters	71.4%	28.6%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Additionally, the tax payors of the USA should not be responsible for paying for other people's healthcare. At the very least, the federal government should stay out of the healthcare business, and by the 10th amendment, this issue should go to the states, or to the people to decide.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I am in favor of national health care, the same health care that our military and elected officials have access to. We keep overlooking the fact that one of the reasons for runaway costs is lack of prosecution of fraud by doctors, hospitals and individuals.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Good change. I would offset the "if any" language by commas instead of parentheses.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Modify the last sentence. "Health insurance should be purchased like life, car, and homeowner's insurance to reduce costs, increase competition, and improve coverage. The government should allow its sale across state lines and should cease promoting employer-based insurance programs through tax code manipulation."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I am a nurse. Don't get me started.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	As a party we need to emphasize the importance that the individual plays in the healthcare system. Encourage our doctors to be up front with the cost of a procedure.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We should come up with universal standards of Health insurance (e.g. HMO, PPO, Major Medical...) and then allow the insurance companies to compete nationally for your business.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"Across state lines" is key. Don't lose that.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Good stuff!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Very important clarification.

13.0 - Health Care

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	92.5%	7.5%	100.0%
Commenters	71.4%	28.6%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	My only concern with this is what as a society we do with individuals who choose not to have health insurance and then need something major to save their life. Who then becomes responsible for the cost of that procedure. I know that plank 1 talks about our individual responsibility, but will we really let someone die after a car accident because they don't have health insurance (I'm not sure I could make that choice).
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	suggest getting rid of the unsightly parentheses by saying "... they want or none, the level ..."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	also, IF there is a State or Federal insurance, persons would have the right to buy in, just the same as private insurance. We also have to be careful of costs and to take care of the working poor (Local communities). The insurance industry has also gone the way of the banks, out of control.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'm not a fan of health insurance. I like everything else though. Maybe leave out the last sentence. I suppose if people want to provide a middle man to eat up their money along with the health care system, then that's their prerogative. Seems like it would be cheaper just to pay one person.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I have some Mennonite and Amish friends,who do NOT want health insurance. They take care of their own. This is a threat to Feds.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	And the elimination of the EMTALA of 1978, forcing hospitals to treat anybody that walks in the door if they cannot pay.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The freedom proposed in fundamental to the party. However poor folk expect, e.g., a broken leg should be set. Many even expect a heart transplant. Some of the expected gratis services are beyond the abilities of most hospitals, clinics, and physicians. This must be clarified.

13.0 - Health Care

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	92.5%	7.5%	100.0%
Commenters	71.4%	28.6%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't think we can responsibly support people in choosing to have no health insurance until the larger systemic problems are solved. People who have insurance or other means to pay for their health care will necessarily pay for care for those who do not, whether due to government meddling or due to market forces. I am not interested in paying for other people's bad choices, and for now, requiring people to have health insurance is the only way to mitigate that. Once the larger issue is fixed, I'm good with this proposal.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	De fang the AMA.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	we already have a universal health care system. the way we pay for it looks like a three stoogies plumbing project. anyone who breaks their leg or has a heat attack goes to the hospital and get treated weather they can pay or not thats why an asprin costs ten dollars. if you want to stop hospitals from treating poor people tell me how you are going to do that
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	If you include text that explains a person should take responsibility if they don't have insurance than it is better. If not, then lots of people can opt out of insurance and still expect the Government to help them.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	With strong anti-trust provisions to ensure free market principles rule. No collusion!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	In principle I support this but in reality are hospitals really going to turn away sick people? Somebody pays.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the clarification, but recommend revising as follows: "...determine the level of health insurance, health care, and care providers they want, if any, and the medicines..."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	not necessary. over-stating that which seems implied is a danger. "Level" obviously can mean "0"

13.0 - Health Care

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	92.5%	7.5%	100.0%
Commenters	71.4%	28.6%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'm sitting at a bar with my socialist buddy. Homeless old grandmother, without insurance, falls on the sidewalk and breaks her hip. She's crying in pain. My socialist drinking buddy, in typical self-important fashion, points his finger at me and demands, "So, you libertarian, are you going to leave her to suffer, or give her Medicare?"
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think the addition of language that makes it clear that this "free individual" must also accept responsibility for the economic COST of his 'don't insure' decision.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While I support freedom of choice here, the problem is that a person who chooses "none" could end up a burden on "the system" if they are injured and unable to pay (eg an accident victim who is saved in the hospital, but found to be unable to pay). So, who pays for this work in the end? This is one of many reasons we have the problems we have today. Either you stop providing healthcare until payment is proven (hard to do in certain cases) and create a "show me your papers" situation before getting healthcare. Or you care for everyone, and deal with payments later... which is basically a universal healthcare system. I prefer the latter, as I don't know of any way in-between?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A reminder about NOT having health insurance being the sick person's financial responsibility and NOT anyone else's would be nice here.

13.0 - Health Care

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	92.5%	7.5%	100.0%
Commenters	71.4%	28.6%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	And insurance companies need to be banned from activities that give them any influence over the laws that are created enforcing consumers to buy insurance. And, there needs to be ceilings on lawsuits and what benefits can come from them for lawyers and individuals. Maybe along the lines of Breton Law. There seems to be a cycle of charge more insurance, pay bigger lawsuits, limit coverage, charge more...I don't think it's helping the medical profession, insurance companies or individuals. This applies to all forms of insurance.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe we need some regulation of the cost of health care so that insurance is accessible to all Americans, i also believe a person with a terminal illness should not be made to suffer any longer than necessary, we euthanize animals to relieve their suffering , why are we not as compassionate with humans?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	People should also be free to purchase health insurance across national borders.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Perfect.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	How about; "We favor a free market health care system". And let it go.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	what about those seriously ill without resources ???who and how would they receive care???
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Unnecessary.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This implies that our previous system was working. We need to also limit insane court fines (rather bar a bad doctor than fine him) to reduce costs and bring costs down to where insurance is only needed for catastrophic ailments, no need for insurance to pay for general checkups that cost thousands of dollars.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Tax payer funds should never be FORCED to be used for ANYTHING private. Again singling out any one thing is not necessary.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Henry Ford saw the need to pay his workers a wage that would enable them to buy the product that they help build. Yet the lesson is lost on something so vital as a doctors visit.

13.0 - Health Care

	Support	Oppose	All	
All Respondents	92.5%	7.5%	100.0%	
Commenters	71.4%	28.6%	11.2%	
Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Too many "we"s. This should be a statement of principle that everyone can sign onto, not just what "we" believe. This is a general comment on many of the issue statement. I feel that they should all be rewritten as "invitations" not as "us vs. them."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	add something about government in the health insurance and pharm industries that drives cost up...i.e. the FDA, which is an abhorrent failure.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Federal government has no Constitutional authority to dictate terms of insurance coverage.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Govt. has no authority fore any type involement in any type of health care or services.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Very well put, I liked the words "if any"
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Medical practice is very cartelized. We should favor reduced restrictions of entry.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Although "if any" sidesteps the matter of uninsured flooding emergency rooms, etc.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again I support this at the federal level however I am not against local government elected by their residents having localized social safety nets. I believe the LP needs to make it more clear whether we are talking about all government or federal government
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Better: Individual health care (including how to pay for it) is a personal decision, not subject to government interference or regulation. Insurance decisions are best made by individuals according to their need, not by government at any level. People should be free to make end-of life decisions with the assistance of their loved ones and health care providers without interference from government.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like Ron Paul's vision of health care.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Somewhere spell out that people will get only that health care that they can pay for, and that no one will be obligated to pay for others' health services. Government shall have no part in setting the conditions for care people will be allowed to receive.

13.0 - Health Care

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	92.5%	7.5%	100.0%
Commenters	71.4%	28.6%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The current insurance industry is not a free market health care system. In addition, individuals with serious health issues and no to little income cannot afford health care at the current rates without assistance from the government
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This should also apply to all forms of insurance
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Rewrite! Change "favor" to "insist", "should" to "must"
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think we should work on this plank even more - the health care industry seems hugely inefficient, and both protected (AMA, protected monopolies, etc.), and attacked (lawsuits). Perhaps an example or two as to a couple obstacles we have for a free market health care system would be good, in addition to the interstate insurance.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support free market health care but also feel it is wrong for insurance companies to drop a loyal consumer who has paid there hard earned money for coverage. There needs to be consumer protection laws and regulations for this purpose which I feel is criminal. Individuals should get what they pay for.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Though I agree to most of this plank, it does not address the availability of health insurance for those that cannot afford adequate health insurance and appears to imply that they are out of luck.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Government shall not regulate medicine.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I feel the "if any" should point out that it means no health coverage in a catastrophic health situation. This could be a good way to encourage more people to join the insurance pool to help protect members from catastrophic health problems
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We should address the restricted market for caregivers that results from licensing controls. Quality of caregivers can be assured better through privately run information bureaus than by state licensing boards populated by the professionals regulated.

13.0 - Health Care

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	92.5%	7.5%	100.0%
Commenters	71.4%	28.6%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Assited suicide is one of a persons most personal rights when faced with a painful, incurable condition or disease; or a condition which causes them to live in unbearable physical or mental pain.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Not inspiring but OK.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Doesn't go nearly far enough. The only way this will work is to abolish Medicare, Medicaid, the FDA, and all current govt enforced insurance and drug corporation monopolies. Anything half ass will prolong the absolutely failed system we have now. Realistically however, this is probably a utopian position that may be foolish for us as a party to take. We need to get over ourselves sometimes and accept reality. We would be better off trying to achieve an all government single payer system than trying to repeal Obamacare in favor of what we have now. This is spoken from one who was denied a desparately needed bone marrow transplant even though my wife and I were both working and had and been covered by insurance for the prior 25 years. I had to sue the companies and live long enough while doing so, almost three years, to win. I got the transplant, but another six months and the insurance companies would have won. I would have been dead. I just can't support what we have now anymore. Without govt involvement, healthcare would be affordable enough that I could have found another way to
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	But, I would omit the parenthesis and stick with parenthetical commas. Just to clarify, by "end-of-life decisions" you do mean "right to die", yes?
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I'm out of this one, too. I prefer a one-payer medicare for all, perhaps means tested. I am becoming a "Progressive".
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I support with reservations because I believe we are limiting ourselves. It's bad enough that the government limits us. Health care can be made to be such that insurance becomes obsolete without a government program.

13.0 - Health Care

	Support	Oppose	All	
All Respondents	92.5%	7.5%	100.0%	
Commenters	71.4%	28.6%	11.2%	
Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We should explicitly support decoupling tax breaks for employers from provision of health coverage, as that creates a far more unfree market than state lines do. "The tax structure should neither favor nor penalize any business that wishes to offer health insurance to employees, nor individuals who wish to purchase health insurance as such."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This phrase is repeated "the level of health care they want," .
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The added words are unnecessary. If you can choose the level of insurance, you can choose ZERO insurance.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	YES
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	the change is superfluous and awkward.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	OK. Also note that marijuana, which has many positive medicinal uses should be freely available (decriminalized and deregulated). This would enable millions of people to opt for self-medication of a variety of common ills, and for pain management, rather than being forced to buy expensive medicines. Also, the government's medical reimbursement obligation would be cut significantly if people could legally grow their own cannabis at home (as they were able to do until 1937).
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'd move the health insurance clause to the last sentence like this: "People should be free to purchase health insurance, if they desire any, to any level they want, across state lines. A huge problem with the current debate is a conflation between care and insurance. This would put care in its proper preeminent place of emphasis and put insurance comments together.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Technically, every item in that list - care, providers, medicine, treatment, etc. - should include "if any."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The federal government has no role in providing or dictating health care services.

13.0 - Health Care

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	92.5%	7.5%	100.0%
Commenters	71.4%	28.6%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support this in general, but I would like to see a sentence to the effect of "We oppose government incentives that tie health care to employment, since this limits choice in health care providers, and creates artificial barriers against individuals employment choices".
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is redundant and disturbs the flow of the message.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Generally support. Plank is too long. Can be shorter and to the point. We don't get extra points for using more words. This is not a 5-page high school English assignment.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	People should be free to opt-out of insurance...and suffer whatever consequences befall.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree with the wording as it applies to adults. I think many will argue that government should at least protect children from parents who make poor decisions regarding health care. I struggle with this one myself. I don't like government intervention. But, children can be helpless sometimes. Adults, on the other hand, can lie in the bed they make.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Add: "The government has no authority to mandate that any individual purchase health insurance or health care. Mandates of this kind violate the principle of self-ownership."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would support this proposal if it included Hospitals and Health Care Providers could reject treating a patient if the Hospital or Health Care provider thought the patient could not afford to pay for the services. And adding the statement that Medicaid would be eliminated.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I remember how it was& it worked till blueX;kaiser started dictated to med practice mgm
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This seems like it should have been a no brainer but if it's causing some issues with people then perhaps it should be clarified.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	!

13.0 - Health Care

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	92.5%	7.5%	100.0%
Commenters	71.4%	28.6%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	People have the right to basic medical treatment, and government has a role in organizing, and setting minimum standards for health care.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Forcing anyone to do anything by force of law is a violation of Gandhian Philosophy.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Sounds great, BUT, there are MANY people who do want to purchase health insurance at a reasonable price and it's not available. There were no individual health insurance plans being sold in WA state a few years back. People SHOULD be able to shop and choose to buy the coverage they want, no matter if they're self- or even un-employed. Cities, counties, churches . . . any group should be able to purchase insurance at group rates for their members.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Add to that the fact that the current system is not free market at all. As Friedman points out, virtually no hospitals are privately owned.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	But why not an explicit statement against the insurance mandate?
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Absolutely a good change.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	if any, a very necessary improvement
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A little of topic but I would like to see a point about the high cost of health care being due to constant government interference with the free market and subsidization through Medicare and other programs.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Need to add Government does NOT have the power or authority to force individuals to purchase anything, including insurance.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	"We support abolishing EMTALA on hospitals." (This rule is the basis for high healthcare costs and is an inherent and significant disregard of the free markets. This law is the genesis of healthcare reform.)
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Fifty years ago I treated patients free of charge who had no means and drug companies were happy to provide me with drug samples for them. Then the federal government got involved.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Obama care is one of the few programs I support.

13.0 - Health Care

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	92.5%	7.5%	100.0%
Commenters	71.4%	28.6%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	the "if any" should be before each ",".....
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Each "they want" should be followed by "to purchase".
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think we should have a statement opposing any governmental subsidies based upon employer provided healthcare, or any government provided healthcare whatsoever.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Duh!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	With this - we as health care consumers should know the cost of procedures listed by doc and or hospital. This way insurance doesn't regulate fake discount pricing and people can determine the service and price they want to pay for procedures b
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	include company benifets agreed to by employer and employees. as well as to carry vested benifets and receive them at maturity. or cash buyoff if agreed to.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I suggest adding the following: "Governmental preferences for fee-for-service programs must end immediately, as this is the single largest factor contributing to the incredibly and unsustainably high medical expenditures in the United States."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Why not health care they want (if any), care providers they want (if any)... etc. Just extra words with no addition or clarification of meaning.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Government's role in health care should be to ensure fair and equitable access to health care and insurance at the expense of the individual. Elimination of groups and associated discounts is necessary to prevent exclusion of individuals due to unequal pricing. Rates should be posted so that individuals can choose the best doctor for the affordable price.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Government should be out of the nanny state business.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Thank you for supporting the right to self-pay.

13.0 - Health Care

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	92.5%	7.5%	100.0%
Commenters	71.4%	28.6%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	the FDA should not have the force of law, in my opinion. And the AMA should not be allowed to restrict the number of med students admitted to colleges. The AMA should not have control over research. Alternative health care providers must be allowed freedom of speech to promote their products even if not approved by FDA.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	People need to be responsible for their choices. Language should be added stating that the government will assume no responsibility for poor decisions made by parents
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	if you do add "if any" as a qualifiier, add it to health care and care providers otherwise, it seems out of place.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't see this as needing any clarification. Having no health care at all is an obvious choice and doesn't need extra wording to be specified.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Obamacare Sucks! We all know that. But I am a diabetic & gov't could play a role in health care, to where it wouldn't be socialism. "Big Pharma" is a corrupt industry, that has caused people to go bankrupt, just to stay alive.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Unnecessary and makes it more awkward.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You have to be more specific like "I WILL GIVE TO EACH AMERICAN A \$75,000 LIVING CARD IF YOU ELECT ME FOR U.S. PRESIDENT"; "I WILL ISSUE \$50 TRILLION NEW FIAT MONEY ELIMINATING THE FEDERAL RESERVE"; "WE WILL MANUFACTURE ONE HUNDRED PERCENT IN AMERICA USING THE FEDERAL LANDS CREATING 100 JOBS". If you need help call me to 571-288-7383. My family could donate also \$100 million to your PAC. Thanks Alberto Lopez WWW.EBLM.US
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Looks good to me! See, I don't disagree with everything.

13.0 - Health Care

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	92.5%	7.5%	100.0%
Commenters	71.4%	28.6%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I generally support this, and yet, it has some serious flaws. For example, how does purchasing health insurance across state lines impact the notion of "state rights"? I also think you need to clarify (for the non-libertarians) that we do not view coercive systems for health care as an option. Example: I might want a high level of health care, but that does not give me the right to force a physician to give me that level of health care against his will. You also open up another can of worms with the "end-of-life" thing. While I personally think we should allow things like assisted suicide for sane individuals, your proposed statement does not really make a distinction, and can provide fodder for our adversaries.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I personally like universal health care. It works in many other countries - Canada, Germany are good examples. But I understand this plank is in keeping with the Libertarian philosophy that it is not government's role to do this.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This may not be the section, but removing some of the restrictions that doctors have if they accept medicare/medicaid. For example, they CANT give free service if they accept it. This is of course not as nice as say, getting the government out of Health care completely.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Somehow we need to oppose government incentives for employer-provided "health insurance." With all individuals purchasing directly from insurance companies, most problems would disappear
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	add: we favor repealing all laws that inhibit health care competition, especially the Health Maintenance Organization Act of 1973.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The individual liberty to not be abused and exploited by corrupt pharmaceutical and insurance companies who care more about profit than health is essential yet ignored in this statement.

13.0 - Health Care

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	92.5%	7.5%	100.0%
Commenters	71.4%	28.6%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I would add to the first sentence so it reads: "...free market health care system, in which private individuals deal directly with their healthcare provider rather than through their employer." I believe this aspect of healthcare reform should be specifically expressed, as the current system of employer-provided healthcare doesn't work and is choking business growth, especially among small businesses.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Neither the new nor the old language addresses the problem of adverse selection, but Libertarians may not believe it exists.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Persons who elect not to purchase health care insurance should be responsible for the costs of any medical care they receive and not expect free health care except in emergency situations.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There should be recognition that health care is a purchased service and that if you do not pay for it, you should not get it.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I need this myself.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You have to prove that a libertarian alternative saves lives for less cost. Otherwise, I go for a pragmatic approach, even if it is socialist.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	No comment
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	What about government mandates requiring hospitals to provide care to those who have no intion to pay?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	As a Medicare recipient, I can say it beats anything I've ever had. Right now we have insurance company monopolies.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This should include the right to purchase all medications over the counter without a prescription.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It says the level of health care they want twice
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	level of health insurance they desire
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It has to include; "across state lines"
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Although it is implicit in the "free market" statement in sentence one, I would like to see an explicit statement that government subsidies, price controls, (ect), are opposed.

13.0 - Health Care

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	92.5%	7.5%	100.0%
Commenters	71.4%	28.6%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Support BUT along with the "if any" should one choose to not have health coverage, they bear the responsibility of that choice financially.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	individuals should be changed to able-minded adults
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	People should also be be prepared to face the consequences of choosing not to procure insurance. Otherwise, society will continue to find themselves on the hook for those who have not had the foresight to purchase insurance. Furthermore, the ignorant and wasteful practice of suing doctors for non-perfect performance should be regulated by requiring plaintiffs to be responsible for the court costs and attorneys fees for the defendant in the result of a loss.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The Government has greater purchasing power than individuals and can provide a better comprehensive insurance policy with providers than individuals. A Universal Plan is not out of the question as long as it is not Obamacare. This needs working on.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	may be the most important subject. i do not support any forced medicine at all. it scares me.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Insurance across state lines is something I support. Let the free market dictate who and to what extent the citizenry is healthy. But, the government has to make certain that colusion doesn't occur betwixt such parties.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	And government employees, with the exception of the military, should be required to provide their own health care insurance.
Support Oppose	Unlikely Unlikely	No No	Non-Member Non-Member	good change Even though I dislike the intrusion of government into personal matters, I have come to believe that a certain minimum standard of health care should be guaranteed by the government.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	the "if any" words are redundant and impede the flow of words

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We need to stress that no one who is not a citizen is eligible for any of the benefits of citizenship, that no immigrant can become a citizen without being able to support their family, and that children of non-citizens do not automatically possess American citizenship.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Really bad wording, I stand in opposition to open borders
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Some restrictions should be placed on imports; if production of any imported product produces pollution which harms innocent people, those companies should be penalized for the harm they are causing and the unfair advantage they achieve by harming others.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Please keep the American Nationalism out of our platform. Also, don't remove the free movement of labor across national borders from our platform.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	after assistance, and having no previous criminal record, to....
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Yes, but migration should be a two-way venture. I want to live oceanside in Mexico. Have you seen ALL of the stumbling blocks for a Canadian or American to live there?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	American Dream is a concept, I wish it not to be used as mentioned in other planks.Gov. Welfare is to be eliminated so you can't say it exists.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'm torn on that. We can't sustain the world, much less ourselves, but I have trouble saying "ok, I'll support efficient 'Americans' but not inefficient 'foreigners.' And what is "public assistance?" Welfare? Foodstamps? Public schools? Roads? What if they are as efficient as other people already here- they go to school for a few years then stay and become efficient? I'm just torn.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	lose the "not requiring public assistance", individuals requiring public assistance are a credible threat to the security, health and property of others. Its redundant and appears petty.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do not believe in open-border policy. It is good for the government to put the interests of American citizens first.

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Starting to sound like a neocon here...
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The changes are acceptable with the exception of the "not requiring public assistance" portion. I agree with the sentiment, but it isn't well articulated. Simply opposing the welfare state in a separate plank is sufficient.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	it should be easier for law abiding people who want to come to the US to work to do so
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Only difference is now we don't want temporarily poor people who are strivers? No thanks, not American or catering to liberty.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	sentence 2 needs repeal or modification. Given the failures that lead to the 911 action, how does this sentence restrain, posing a credible "threat", act? And it also does not affect subtle actors, such as Obama, whose birth in West Africa, to a CIA Operative & a British subject, leads toward the socialist actions, of today.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Why would you add Free Trade with Migration. If they migrating because Fair Trade has ruined their own trade then Fair Trade has to change. Or are they migrating due to "irresponsible choices"?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree in concept but don't really like the wording. I don't think we need to say that all people across all borders should be able to come here for the "American Dream." It's a nice idea but for as long as there is free services such as health care, education, etc. available it seems an impossible task to let people into the country and then deny them these services. In addition it seems an odd place to differentiate between open borders but barring people that cause a credible threat. To do the latter we would still need to vet all immigrants.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The last sentence seems like it should be first.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	First sentence is going to be an issue - especially if those who come to the country end up in a situation that may require public assistance (layoffs, etc.) Would they then be required to leave the country??? Not good.

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It is hard to assess "foreign nationals posing a credible threat". We could say that those that entered as adults could be deported for crimes committed in this country instead of serving jail time here?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	States should be sovereign again and able to grant citizenship at the state level.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do not support free migration. I live in a border state, I know the pain of an influx of unskilled laborers and what a hardship it poses to the state.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There are a few hundred million who would qualify who would qualify to move to the US. under your definition. Big problem, no easy solution.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The plank should read:"We support the free movement of goodies and persons ONLY across INTRA-American borders."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"...not requiring public assistance" would be better stated, "able and willing to support themselves and thier families." Also, the phrase, "...those already here..." is unnecessary and slightly hostile. It is enough to say, "To ensure the general welfare we would..."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I see this plank being perceived as a Wall Street Journal position. Certainly there are worse perceptions, but it won't be helpful.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The only issue with free trade is that other countries dont like to play fair and subsidizes their goods for an unfair advantage.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Who decides? Free trade, yes. GATT enabled job transfer, not so much. Immigration, yes. Illegal immigration, no. Why do you need to obfuscate so much? KISS.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would support this if the word "legally" was inserted before the phrase "to come to our country. . ."
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	"We welcome those not requiring public assistance" is at once judgmental and implies that we think public assistance is okay in some cases. It is better to state we support eliminating the welfare state which will mean only responsible people will immigrate here.

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Need some kind of comment to the effect that our current immigration laws need to be scraped in their entirety and rewritten from scratch with some common sense used. Esp in the requirements to have access to our country, and to become naturalized citizens.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I strongly believe we need to say something about the need for and justice of making it more doable to enter our country legally. Right now, it's virtually impossible, and people end up having to spend thousands of dollars in overt, legal bribes, not to mention lawyer's fees.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would remove the last sentence.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't like a blanket ban on those "requiring public assistance", especially in the case of refugees and political asylum seekers, who often come to this country penniless but later contribute greatly to it.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Well, for the most part, it's okay. But, many millions of foreign nationals, who are NOT any sort of threat to our nation, are entering our country illegally, then taking jobs and "social support" monies from legitimate citizens in need. I live in a small apartment complex full of mexicans who drive cadillacs, etc., yet don't speak any english. There is only one other tenant here who is caucasian, like me. The rest (approx. 30+) are very likely illegals. This proposal seems to be an open invitation for Jose, Maria and their 4 children to enter the country freely, and either take jobs from existing citizens, or add to the drain on the social welfare system. Please consider this.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We are going to have to come up with credible ways to manage the flow of people that has minimal infringement on individual rights. This is bound to upset many in our own party as well as most left wingers and the right wingers may think we're letting too many in. The plank itself is solid.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The original plank has superior language in terms of welcoming human movement across borders.

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Nothing wrong with the original language.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Tariffs are not unconstitutional, they were in place during Americas heyday in order to protect American workers.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This isn't any more clear than before. On top of that, it introduces "...credible threat to security...". Who determines what is a credible threat?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	prefer the original wording although the limitations on benefits of citizenship could be clearly defined at a number of levels with an emphasis on how movement up the levels can be earned. Also, is English as a national language coming up somewhere?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think we could and maybe should consider privatizing immigration in America, or at least making it super easy to get work permits
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Free trade is a two-edged sword. If we advocate free trade inbound and other countries restrict our outbound trade because of manipulated monetary policies we are only kidding ourselves.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"security, health or property" should be "security, health, or property". Cf: "I dedicate this book to my parents, Ayn Rand and God." -- the final comma is, once again, not optional.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Change "However" to "Nonetheless".
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Who is the government to say what a threat is. Libertarians should welcome all people regardless of which side of an artificial line used to control people one is born. Latinos are growing in population in the US and they particularly are hurt br the two party system. Rs abd Ds are both strongly against open boarders our pro immigration stance helps appeal to Latinos, as well as good morals. Moreover I would like to see the existing plank strike the sentence starting with the word "However".
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Do we think immigrants are beggars and if so, is that OK? Adding "general welfare of those already here" makes the exclusion sound worse, not better. We believe in due process, not some bureaucrat judging "credible threat"

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Much better!
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	The statement "We welcome those not requiring public assistance to come to our country to embrace the American dream, as their pursuit of happiness enriches their lives and our own" is poorly worded. Included in this statement should be a clarification that government WILL NOT provide public assistance to any non-resident.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Shake hands don't come in offending or claiming defense when we am for open arms and not bering arms.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Well done
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I am opposed to 'free trade' as it has come to be known. The constitution has a clear mechanism to govern international transactions. This mechanism also helps provides funding and the need for government! Immigration and migration should be governed on an as nation by nation does. Say - tit for tat.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	tariffs and excise taxes are meant to level the playing field for our companys
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Much better stated.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I'm not certain that we can say with certainty that free trade improves the standard of living. For whom does it improve the standard? I think of poverty in Mexico and factory labor in China as examples of problems that have not improved with free trade.

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	We should welcome the poor today as others welcomed the poor (many of our ancestors) who came to this land ages ago to make a better life for themselves. The American dream is not only to be offered to those who can fend for themselves. Should not the blind, sick and orphaned children be welcomed into our arms...!? Did not the Pilgrims and many other early settlers come here as near paupers and live in indentured servitude...!? I believe that the original plank is closer to our values, though I would amend it as follows: Because Libertarians understand that free trade improves standards of living and reduces the likelihood of war, we support the free movement of goods and capital across national borders. But economic freedom also demands the unrestricted movement of human as well as financial capital across national borders. Likewise, the ideals of political freedom and escape from tyranny demand that individuals not be unreasonably constrained by government in the crossing of political boundaries in seeking the American dream. However, we support control over the entry in
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the concept but do we need the "American Dream" term? Can we just say we understand the value of immigration, etc.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I disagree with the Libertarian view on immigration. I believe every country has a right to preserve itself, and limited immigration is a way to maintain preservation.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would replace "those not requiring public assistance" with "all self-sufficient and productive persons". Put a semicolon after American dream and change "as" to "we know"

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Remove the attraction to come into the country illegally and have "anchor babies" that practically guaratnees the parents of those children will be permitted to remain so as not to split up families. Change the law to say something like "Children born to individuals illegally in the US shall not be automatically granted citizenship but shall, upon reaching the age of majority, be permitted to return as candidates for fast-tracking of naturalization should there be no compelling reason to deny it."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Without major tax reform, these same immigrants could use public facilities, such as roads, without contributing to the financial upkeep. The phrase "free movement" seems like open borders. I would try for some middle ground here.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like it a LOT better. It shows that Libertarians belive in an open boarder, but there are rules to me here and to protect the welfare of America. The best change of plank so far!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"requiring public assistance" . . . I thought we welcomed the poor. Give me your tired, your poor, the wretched refuse of your teeming shore . . .
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We should ban 'jail dumping' and limit the migration of non-refugee low-skilled foreign nationals. We should NOT rely on another Maginot or Hadrian style wall to implement our border security; they're proven failures.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would change the first sentence to read "We should encourage and streamline legal immigration for those who have the means and skills to make a positive contribution to our society and not require public assistance."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The first one is a better statement.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like it. I am against open borders because of the welfare issue.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I might just add you may want to say something about ending birthright citizenship as a way of removing one major incentive for immigration.

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The title should be "3.4 Free Trade and Immigration" Birds migrate, people immigrate. Replace We with Libertarians. Remove the middle sentence. This is obvious - no one is going to advocate letting bad people in: "However, to ensure the general welfare of those already here, we would bar from entry those foreign nationals posing a credible threat to security, health or property. Because "
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Free trade is not fair trade we need to defend American workers against Nation that use slave labor and play games with their currency
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Why address freeloading first, Free Trade is listed first
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I oppose the elimination of the part "economic freedom demands the unrestricted movement of human as well as financial capital across the national borders. This thought could be included in the final paragraph of the new wording. We need to separate the issues of open borders and the welfare state. If anyone migrates to this country to take advantage of the welfare system; that is our fault for building an entitlement society. We need to roll back the welfare state and rely upon private help for those who can establish a legitimate need for assistance. Personally, I would prefer helping a South American national who risk his lifes and sneaks across the border in hopes of finding productive employment and cannot find it, then a national who has squandered their opportunities for education and employment because they were just too damn lazy to take responsibility for themselves. Private charities can make that distinction.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Original wording is fine.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The free movement of goods could include WMD if not monitored.

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	This is not a practical or enforceable plank. I would support "documented" free movement of foreign nationals and workers but, not all persons. Would we not give them access to "services" once they are in the country. Since we are not living in a state of liberty, this would make the hardship on our citizens even more burdensome.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Say something about the current system being flooded with bureaucracy making the average time for someone to legally immigrate to the US to be extraordinarily long (I believe it's over 10 years).
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do not like the language stating you would bar anyone that would pose a credible threat considering there is really no way of knowing that without a huge invasion of their privacy. I understand the fear but it feels like you are contradicting other areas of the plank.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	suggest: enriches our lives, as well as theirs.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Refugees, by definition, would need aid. If we continue our tradition of providing refuge, we would need a mechanism to provide for temporary aid, or would we wait for private groups to stand surety before letting in political refugees?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Perhaps the phrase "free movement of goods", we support individual choice over movement of goods and capital across national borders, and oppose any government coerced movement of goods/capital across the border that is not directly tied to trade among the nations. As Libertarians, we believe that Article 1 section 8 of the Constitution strictly limits the role of Federal government to actual COMMERCE between states and nations - not wealth redistribution by government to foreign government with no strings attached for social engineering experiments abroad.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The existing plank needs improvement, but the proposed one doesn't provide it.

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There isn't free trade in Cuba. Free US trade with Cuba' s communist party would not improve standard of living in cuba. It would perpetuate the Cuban regime, which uses resources to repress the people. Further, Cuba is bankrupt. And why would any US company in their right mind want to trade with somebody that does not pay? Does that make any sense? US companies are after US government farm subsidies and US financing which would in fact finance the Cuban regime.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	old wording is stronger on this most important of topics
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support this statement, but I do believe that we need to take a much stronger stance on securing the border.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Change "...to ensure the general welfare..." to "...to protect the general welfare..." I have major doubts about the truth of the statement "free trade improves standards of living", given that most (if not all) nations we trade with have their own central banks and monetary policies that create uneven playing fields. For example, for years we have exported much of our manufacturing base to China, because we have also exported our inflation there. Theirs is a command economy whose central bank is at war with ours, much to our detriment. "Free trade" has not solved this problem, it has exacerbated it. So, much like those who would like to see welfare reform occur before we start allowing any and every immigrant cross the borders, I would like to see monetary policy reform occur before we allow any and every good and capital cross the borders. To reiterate: we have had so-called 'free trade' policies for quite a while now, and these have resulted in economic damage here in the US, rather than the promised raising of living standards.

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Do not like that first sentence as it might eliminate those seeking to escape political/religious persecution (e.g. Cuban refugees, Lebanese Christians) as they all received "public assistance" to get them settled in..not all public assistance is welfare.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We recognize that the strength of a free society is embodied in its sovereignty among all nations, and that our borders are to be considered inviolate.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	US employers shall in due diligence employ US citizens to the fullest extent. Once labor field is exhausted then and then then look outside borders.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	That s a little clearer
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Maybe "not demanding public assistance" would be better. When you say "requiring" I fear that readers will come to believe the Libertarian Party does not like the poor. It is a fact that people at times may need some assistance, the government just doesn't have a right to force us to help others. Government isn't here to instill moral values, but to protect out liberties. If something like that is included, then I would support the proposal.

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Are a party of "tele-marketers"? What is it with the "American Dream"? There is NO SUCH THING. Give it up. Moreover it differs from person to person. If the person is a communist, then "the American Dream" surely isn't what many libertarians would think. On another note, I agree with the statements made along the lines of free trade. I'm not so sure about migration. This is not clear what we mean by this. Assume, if you will, that a very large percentage of foreign nationals want to come to the U.S. Let's say that is about 3 billion men, women, and children and we have determined that NONE pose a threat to security, health or property. Is it in the best interest of the United States (us) to welcome such a large number of individuals into the country? Granted this is a fantastic scenario but the Libertarian party is a political party of the United States, not of a global country. What are we after here?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I further support making the process to coming to America legally much easier.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	if they come legally and are checked at the border and given shots, so they don't bring there illnesses into our country?????
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	what about those that do require "public assistance"and who don't pose a threat to security like those seeking political asylum or refugees? do we turn away those from Burma or Sudan?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think it would be prudent to require learning of American, this would preclude favoring Hispanics over other potential immigrants.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Free trade reducing the likelihood of war is a huge point. Love it.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Under even a libertarian-leaning minarchical philosophy, a government can/should protect their borders.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Right on!
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Adamantly oppose!!! Strike out However,...sentence! Who will bar from entry? Who will decide? What is an objective criteria. NO, NO NO a thousand times NO!

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	recognizes the reality that we cannot have a welfare state _and_ unrestricted immigration
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Change is too right wing.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The plank needs to discuss the necessary elimination of unconstitutional federal welfare programs. Otherwise, this is good.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Keep in the words "escape from tyranny"
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Also insert language about entering the country legally.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, terms such as "the American dream" and "pursuit of happiness" are relative and not necessarily clear.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe grammar rules inhibit use of "however" to start a sentence, but I'm not completely positive.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Reinstate the lined out version.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the idea but not the new language.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do not like the part about 'not requiring public assistance'. That seem irrelevant to the point. You are mixing issues. Otherwise I like it.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	The "those already here" language seems to refer to the immigrants who were the subject of the first sentence rather than to all within our borders.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While I understand how the new statement might make people feel better about the party, especially disenfranchised GOP voters, but this change is a huge transition that I do not support. I think it is perfectly possible for a candidate to be more moderate in order to start swinging voters towards open immigration without changing the party's position on the matter.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Caveat to liberty...'requiring public assistance'. who is and who is not allowed to embrace the american dream and/or cross political borders...now has LP requirements. Bull pucky.

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think the original language is preferable. Occasional preambles and such supporting a plank are okay for the platform, but this plank reads like the opening of an essay—which the platform is not. Also, some of the language (esp "American dream") sounds too much like Republicrat rhetoric (esp the Repub part).
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	It doesn't emphasize the free movement of people as well as the original. Add the free movement of labor to the last sentence and I might go for it.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	how are you going to address the concerns that they might not need public assistance exactly when they come but might/will need it at some point later. I dont think the real issue is them all lining up at the welfare office the moment they cross the border or even that most of them don;t do it at all but there IS that perception out there...
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support free trade as long as it is unilateral, both sides agreeing to terms that do not hinder the process.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'm torn on this one. We must remove the welfare state before this can happen.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	excellent. fixes contradictory statement of previous platform.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I still don't like it much but it's marginally better than what we have now.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Change the word welfare to prosperity. If the founders and framers had done that in the Constitution's preamble, I don't believe we would have the welfare state we presently do.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There are no borders. Look at a photo of the earth. There aren't any borders on it. Any individual born on this planet has a natural right to move where they choose and do as they choose so long as they do not initiate force against the person or property of others.

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i am uncomfortable specifying any class of individual that proposes a threat. i fully believe that when legal tender laws are repealed this will help to fix the balance of capital of all types those being attracted to the USA would be affected only by the freedom qualities it possesses over all other alternatives. we need to simply remove all welfare and other like boundaries. ex. you could then pay any individual in any currency that is agreed upon given beneficial treatment to the host of the stronger currency.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Annual immigration limits should be imposed and enforced to avoid overwhelming infrastructure and resources.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like some of the additions of the new plank, but we need to emphasize the "Political freedom and escape from tyranny" part as well. Can we combine these two planks into a more comprehensive package?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The first sentence says only rich people can come here and again the "American dream" sounds nationalistic. "Public" assistance could be from a church or neighbor or employer, so it is not defined well here and sounds snobbish. Suggest "we welcome those not requiring US government assistance" to come to our country to enrich their lives, as their pursuit of happiness enriches the lives of others as well."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would only edit the last sentence of the original plank. "However, we support control over the entry into our country of foreign nationals who would require public assistance or pose a credible threat to security, health, or property."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Bingo! Enthusiastic classical liberalism fettered just a wee bit by bowing to the reality of immigration. Good on ya.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't like how the first phrase is worded. It sounds very harsh.

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	This is insufficient -- with the following addition I will support it: "Since other nations are not bound by Libertarian principles, where they utilize the initiation of force or fraud, whether manifested in currency manipulation, effective impressed or slave labor, environmental arbitrage or other means the United States should use its Constitutional power to impose tariffs to redress such wrongs, recognizing the limitations and dangers that over-reach pose in implementation."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is good. I would like to see something about the abolishing of so-called "no-fly" lists, because these can be manipulated for political purposes. Also, the over-militarization of our borders/airports, because a government could turn these means to prevent people the liberty of leaving rather than entering.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The only thing I like about the suggested change is the comment about free trade reducing the likelihood of war.

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We believe that individuals have been given the freedom to pursue happiness which demands the unrestricted movement of individuals, financial capital, goods, across political boundaries. We believe that individuals who are able to establish peaceable and productive reason for movement across political boundaries should not be unreasonably constrained. However, we support our government in the enforcement of our refusal to allow the entry into our country of foreign nationals, financial capital, goods, and services that pose a credible threat to the life, liberty, or property of peaceable individuals, domestic or foreign. We believe these efforts will better secure the rights of life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness of all people. We believe these efforts will improve the general welfare and reduce the likelihood of war for the individuals within our country. The phrase, "not requiring public assistance," could later be abused to deny police, fire, and ambulance services; deny public health services that may arise after arrival, and deny the public education of children born of f
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	How do we go about insuring that no immigrant ever requires public assistance? Perhaps we could make them sign something as the cross the border saying that they would never take advantage of a government benefit freely provided to those born here. That should work.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Prefer to keep the second sentence of the original version regarding individuals not being unreasonable constrained in crossing political boundaries.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think the current text simply reads better.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Better, but who decides who poses "a credible threat?" Immigration quotas have always been racist policies, using our fear of the foreign to ensure an easily-frightened pool of cheap labor for companies that hire those branded "illegal".

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	would support if we dropped "those not requiring public assistance". Its potentially obnoxious.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The biggest drin on local and states are the foreigners using our welfare systems ment for the citizens.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i support legal immigration, any illegal immigrants should be deported and black listed from any immigration applications.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I am neutral on this one
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Terrible proposal that would delete our support of freedom of movement. Our platform should not surrender to the short-term xenophobic prejudices that typically arise during economic downturns. Immigration also improves standards of living and reduces the likelihood of war, just as free trade does, because it increases cultural connections and understandings between people in different countries. Besides the misguided nature of the overall change, this proposal contains numerous more specific issues. Contrary to the implication of the proposed language, nobody "requires" government assistance. And the insertion of the "American dream" language (also proposed to be inserted into Plank 2.4) introduces a needlessly nationalistic tone.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	[to replace the more vague American Dream with more concrete terms from founding documents:] to embrace the American dream, as their pursuit of happiness enriches --> to pursue life, liberty and happiness to enrich
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Once again, this "to embrace the Amercan Dream" stuff is bereft of meaning, and is a catchphrase designed to suit U. S. Exceptionalist mentality. Those five words should simply be deleted.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I dislike the addition of the phrase "requiring public assistance". Such assistance, as suggested by the plank, is not appropriate for any individuals despite their country of origin. We should favor individual freedom, which means more open borders.

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Needs to be toned down. People are afraid of immigration. Something like "as the economy grows, more and more will be attracted to it and more and more can be incorporated, making it grow even faster."
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I do have a concern that this sounds like we are excluding the possibility of providing sanctuary to political exiles who might, in their circumstances, also need public assistance. Perhaps "public assistance" is too euphemistic. Would it be clearer to say "welfare" or "government handouts"?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Original is more free-immigration.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This would apparently restrict those who seek political asylum from oppressive regimes to those who are wealthy (or at least solvent).
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Dumb to add welfare restriction because someone who does NOT need it the week they come in may need it two weeks later. Are you going to kick them out? Plus, the first sentence should be about free trade NOT barring people who want welfare.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Clear as mud. No one "requires public assistance", the responsibility for our welfare laws is on us, not immigrants. I don't support laws that "enrich [immigrants] lives, nor do I advocate policies just because they could "enrich" my life. The original was much clearer.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The original is better worded and more precise.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Please clarify what security measures would be required to enforce your selection process? Many people think that you are just going to open up the border but you obviously have criteria for those who will be allowed in; this needs to be reinforced.

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Yes, again, much better! And a couple of comments. Not mentioned yet an attending issue currently of great importance to Americans is what happens to all those already here? Amnesty? Concerted program efforts to engender/entice non-citizens into the citizenship process? Surely not nefarious policy means for causing flee from America for sake of their life (as a fanatic here in Kansas is promulgating). Not mentioning the Libertarian position on this issue will not be good enough for many folks. And second, would rather see the ending of the last sentence read like this "..., we support the free and safe movement of persons, goods and capital across national borders."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Simplistic. What if 500,000,000 people from China will come to the Country? And how you prove that "free trade" does what you claims it does? What about import duties instead of income taxes as it was before?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I welcome the poor. I would forbid the governments from giving welfare to non-citizens. My aunt lives here. She gets a social security check monthly from her home country. That is their problem. I welcome retirees who want live here and cash their foreign checks.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	These people need to immigrate legally to the country. Need to get rid of NAFTA first.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	this proposal could be construed to say that libertarians actually oppose immigration!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Yes, I like the new wording better.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	<3
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	mostly better. Although one could make the case that issues of protectionism and trade barriers are very closely related economically to issues of immigration, I wonder if these two issues might be better treated as two separate planks. Just a thought.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Free trade and migration are two separate issues. Separate them

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would support the proposal if the phrase "We welcome those not requiring public assistance" Would we support a requirement for all immigrants to produce an income statement? You need to remove the word "health" would we support barring people because they have a cold?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Would it make sense to break Free Trade and Migration into two separate, shorter planks?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	To allow the free flow of Labor across our national borders don't we need to address the issue of citizenship being granted to anyone being born in the country? We need to support the free movement of goods, capital and labor; but need to reserve citizenship to those who earn it; or we encourage unlawful entry.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I get that the migration issue is a morass for principled libertarians, but I prefer the existing plank over this proposal. This proposed plank enlists me in an effort to bar foreign nationals from entry into the country. No, thank you. I note at this point in the survey that use of the serial comma appears to be in disfavor among the majority of this Platform Committee.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	"We welcome those not requiring public assistance to come to our country to embrace the American dream, as their pursuit of happiness enriches their lives and our own." Really? We oppose tax funded - forced - welfare. As such, what would it matter whether an immigrant "requiring public assistance" comes to the country or not? If so, they would have made a very poor choice in immigrating to a country without forced tax funded welfare. Remember, our platform is not a place for the "chicken or the egg" discussion, the platform is the place for us to describe what a libertarian society would operate like. Candidates can take a stance on which to accomplish first, ending welfare, or opening the borders... or wether he's implement both at the same time...

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I actually think an ever broader open-border solution is better
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I oppose both the original and proposed, but agree with the proposed second sentence.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think the old version says it better.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Very well written! I would support the wording as-is, however I do have one suggestion: Revise the "We welcome those not requiring public assistance..." to something a bit more positive, such as "We welcome those not intending to require public assistance...", "We welcome those intending to be productive members of society...", etc.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Only thing I would change is the title of the plank. If we're first going to talk about migration and then free trade, then the title should be "Migration and Free Trade".
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is better than what it replaces, but seems to legalize the current invasion of illegal immigrants.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	meh
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Tentatively, since I favor open borders in general.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Too simplistic.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If you are not a Native American, this once applied to your ancestors!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This will only truly work when other nations do the same, but as individuals we don't have to work with other nations if we don't choose to.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the first one better....although incorporate from this one the bit about "pursuit of happiness"
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i like the original. and i like the suggested revision - as 'support' and clarification of the position. but i want to keep the original plank language.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I am against illegal entry - but support legal entry. We should not reward illegal behavior.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Don't like the old or new version. Immigration needs to be controlled by a legal registration process. Free trade needs minimal regulations to make sure that foreign governments (like China) are not manipulating their currency. We need a level playing field in free trade.

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	define credible treat to security
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The existing final sentence could be revised to take care of the concern about "welfare" immigrants, along the lines of "However, we support control over the entry into our country of foreign nationals who require public assistance or who pose a credible threat to security, health or property."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is two separate issues. The first I agree with but I oppose the second. I do not think we should allow free trade unless we remove restricting agencies in the US which prevent American businesses from being able to compete such as the EPA, DEQ, IRS, Dept of Agriculture, OSHA and FDA. In addition, countries which do not uphold laws such as child labor prevent us from true free trade since in this country we do not exploit children and therefore cannot equally trade with countries such as China.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	And encourage decreasing the government mandated burdens on those wishing to travel or go to school in america.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It's much better.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	To the extent that immigrants using welfare, is a problem, it a problem of welfare and not a problem of immigration. Fix welfare and the immigration-welfare link will be fixed too.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	very good reason for rewriting it but the new one isn't much better
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"those not requiring public assistance": I know what you mean but it comes across like "keep the poor out of the country." I strongly suggest this phrase be completely rethought/reworked.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer the original. The importation or immigrants who receive benefits from a welfare state is not an immigration issue but a social welfare issue and does not belong in this plank.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Who determines whether someone "requires public assistance?"
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The phrase "the general welfare" has underpinned so much bad, coercive policy, it is hard to stomach us using it.

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I am not sure I would bar from entry those people who come here for medical procedures or thier immediate family. This statement appears to say we would.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If people need assistance, it is more efficient to provide it here than through some third-party bureaucrat elsewhere. I do not believe there is any substantial evidence that hordes come here to live off our welfare system. I also oppose the second sentence; to my knowledge, there is no credible way to predict the intent of another person; opinions do not suffice.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer the old version with the first sentence of the new version tacked onto the front of the old version.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Previous language is clearer.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Of all the recommendations for changes, this one I staunchly oppose!!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	MUCH better
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	No one "requires" public assistance. Otherwise the wording is fine. I suppose "We welcome those who are too proud or principled to consider accepting public assistance to cross our borders and would like to shove those already here that do accept it over the border in the other direction." is too controversial?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Add something discouraging immigration of non-self sufficient people.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Those who come to this country legally, usually take full responsibility for their lives. But it is degrading to state the above over public asst. Usually its the ones that came here illegally, so their child will be born here, that get the aide. Completely out of line; a disgrace.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Remove "general welfare" as it has been badly interpeted over the last 100 years.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would support everything in this Plank involving immigration, but I believe that restrictions on trade are a useful non-violent tool in dealing with other countries governments.

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I recently cancelled my party membership because party leaders have issued statements in support of open borders and amnesty for illegals, which this plank does not address. It's sad that otherwise intelligent people don't seem to have an appreciation for the benefits conferred by cultural continuity. I suggest a reading of John Jay in the Federalist Papers. In short, people, we need a true immigration plank.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I cautiously support the re-write - however I am concerned that the beginning of the statement would seem to prevent refugees from despotic countries, who would have no money from being allowed in - I don't support that.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Solution, end public assistance period, foreign or domestic.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Absolutely awful. Firstly, there is no such thing as public assistance. Secondly, libertarians do not support government "ensuring the general welfare of those already here", nor do they support "barring from entry" anyone. Simply be honest and state the correct principle: Government has no authority to meddle in any way whatsoever in commerce or migration, except to protect individual rights (such as upholding contracts in court). Immigrants who do not obtain citizenship cannot expect protection from government.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	human capital?

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Rather: "Libertarians recognize and welcome positive voluntary contributions to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness of all peoples. We believe that to effect a free, productive society without freeloaders and the threats of terrorism, government must get out of the business of providing "free" healthcare, education, unemployment benefits, "social security," and all the associated programs that make it possible and profitable to live among productive people without also being productive, instead taking the fruits of others' productivity through government to live at their expense. No border protections are needed if no free services and government benefits at the expense of taxpayers exist. Free trade without government interference or involvement eliminates these parasitical detriments, as well as terroristic threats, to a free and open society."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Would support if the first sentence didn't sound so callous. I appreciate the sentiment, just not the tone.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If your country is overrun with illegal immigrants (check Ireland, England, Spain) free trade will not be workable.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The new statement is only a partial improvement. It needs editing. The old statement is better overall.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"... free movement of goods and capital (and freedom loving people) across (our) national borders."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Sounds good.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What about those already here and already on public assistance?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	First is much better.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Not as the people have rights to be protected to have a middle class and not be under by cheap labor and lose their jobs don't agree or agree with this one americans come first
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would delete these words: "to embrace the American dream." Different folks have different definitions of the American dream. Don't think it's a term we should use simply because it's vague.

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Inscription on statue of liberty does not include a means test so neither should the LP. The prime persons "posing a credible threat to security, health or property" are the neocons and their brethren, not "foreign nationals."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't like the vague term "American dream," it really doesn't add anything to the plank.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"those not requiring public assistance" sounds ungenerous, addressing a problem that is more generally addressed in other planks.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	However, the term "American dream" is so cliché and is not a necessary statement, in my opinion. I think the LP should not worry so much about being uplifting, but rather about clearly communicating Libertarian ideals. Instead of 'American dream', 'freedom' or 'liberty' I think would be more appropriate.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The re-write is much clearer and covers my concerns with the previous version.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is tough and we are putting practicality over principle a bit, but I certainly understand it. Sometimes we do have to welcome the poor in order for them to reach economic freedom.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Trade between nations are slave building
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the first proposal better
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We welcome persons to this country that can make contributions to security, health and happiness. We oppose the illegal immigration of those who would pose a threat to our life, liberty and happiness.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Switch the order between goods and people. Free trade in goods and services first, and then get to the sticky questions about people.

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	With prejudice, I support this concept excepting population density. Islam now threatens the American culture with a birth rate 5 times greater than natural born citizen couples produce. The threat is the replacement of our Constitutional Representative Republic with Sharia law and Islamic religion and culture. With prejudice, all illegal immigrants must not be allowed to work or live in the United States because it weakens the economy by depriving citizens here of available jobs and increases criminal activity due to drug smuggling and drug cartel activity.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There are many countries in South America who have adopted almost the same approach to americans who want to repatriate.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We support free trade and freedom of migration. Who decides who poses a credible threat to security, health or property? Whose security? Whose health? Whose property?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You may need to add wording against sending funds to countries acting against our country's best interests.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Pessimistically written. While the intention is noted, something along the lines of "We welcome all able-bodied individuals and those they support to come to our country..." is the same thing but not demonizing welfare queens.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	either one is fine with me
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Who determines if someone will need public assistance, and how will they make the determination? Looks like a regulatory nightmare is being created.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	While I generally support the statement about free trade, I do believe our government has the responsibility to protect US businesses from the unfair practices of other countries which subsidize their businesses.

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is an improvement, but I would favor a stronger immigration policy, which emphasizes that permission to enter the country is by permission only, and those entering without permission are considered illegal and subject to deportation.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Everything an ILLEGAL does after entering the USA is ILLEGAL (including having an OFFspring!) Anchor children is Bovine Defecation & should be REMOVED from the BOOKS
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, remove Libertarian.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Mexico is invading the USA, intentionally sending their poor here to work and send money back to Mexico which helps the elite. The elite of Mexico are profiting while driving down Americas standard of living. No illegal immigration should be allowed.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The replacement is not better than the original. If there is a problem with the welfare state attracting the wrong immigrants, fix the welfare state-- don't make that a point of immigration policy. Free minds and free markets include free transit, and the end of borders. Trying to identify someone who poses a "threat" before they arrive is like so many social engineering goals: stopping "crime" before any has occurred. It's a waste of resources and a useless limit on freedom. Also: again with the "American dream" language? Can we please ditch the platitudes and stick to policy? Individuals do not dream collectively.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	How do you know who needs and/or will need assistance?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	we don't want to appear to welcome ANY and ALL who want to come to our country UNLESS it is through VALID methods such as waiting list
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Better

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Too vague. Word it like this instead. "Except for individuals posing a credible threat to security, health or property, we welcome foreign nationals into our country to prusue the American dream, albeit without the assistance of government programs that subsidize the income or healthcare of citizens and residents, as it is our goal to eliminate such programs."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	what is "public assistance"? some would construe this to be police help
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would replace the word "requiring" in the first line with "seeking".
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	good that you recognize the existence of individuals that live to destroy others under the guise of religion
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Everything here is fine, but free trade and migration seem to be separate issues, so you should have a separate plank for each.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This would work if you can successfully remove ALL restrictions on our businesses here in the USA. Otherwise trade needs to be regulated to ensure the USA has a level playing field here at home.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Those wishing to come to our contry must be made aware that there are certain expectations of them.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	As with an earlier change, I would suggest striking "American dream" from this, as that term is entirely subjective and cannot be defined.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	We do not have an immigration problem. We have an invasion problem. The platform needs to address this matter much more thoroughly and precisely.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	How would each foreign national be assessed for suitability, and by who?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The phrase " not requiring public assistance" implies public assistance exists, which I don't think we want to support.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We welcome anyone who does not require ...

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Changing it like this takes us away from principle. I don't care if a Mexican or an Iowan is using the Welfare State's "resources," it's still an inappropriate use of government funds. If anything, the Mexican is more upwardly mobile and has MORE justification for using the system than the domestically born person. After all, places like Sonora & Chihuahua are WARZONES.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It is unreasonable to only let people with money into our country. If they are fleeing political or religious persecution, they most likely have had their finances taken away from them by force. It would be cruel and recklessly irresponsible of us as a people to turn them away.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The original is better. Government is not responsible to support free trade, but "fair" trade among countries, free trade is only among individuals. Immigration must be controlled and regulated to ensure the security and safety of all, those living here and those coming here so that they are not exploited unfairly.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Immigration through legal means to support this idea is rational, but illegal immigration should be stopped completely.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	don't see much improvement in what is a wordy and ambiguous plank.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't like the old or new language. Who decides the "credible threat"? The government of course and this loophole leads directly to closed borders. Peaceful people should be able to move anywhere they want as long as they are not trespassing.

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	"We welcome immigrants to come to our country to embrace the American dream, as their pursuit of happiness enriches their lives and our own, but they should not have access to social welfare programs until they are citizens." That does not condone social welfare programs. It only says that they can't access those programs that exist. The way it's worded has an undertone of, "no handicapped folks allowed," when the main concern are the broodmares.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This change unnecessarily reinforces the stereotype of the immigrant who is attracted by our welfare benefits. Research I have read indicates that immigrants use welfare at lower dollar per family rates than natural born Americans. The proposal reads as more hostile to immigrants than the prior version and therefore I am opposed.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Better. Still not great.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Nobody will enforce this. That's the problem now.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I recommend a change in the last sentence. Begin the sentence with, "As Libertarians, we understand free trade improves.....". Omit the word "that" from the sentence. Also, end the sentence at "war". Start a new sentence at "We support the free". I believe these changes will read better.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Eliminate the word health. This puts bureaucrats in charge of health, a bad decision.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Immigrants escaping oppressive regimes, war, famine, or just a lack of opportunity should still be allowed to come here EVEN if they require public assistance. Public assistance should be abolished and those "needing" it can be provided for by private charities and individuals. Barring them from this country is only necessary if there is a public assistance program, and such programs are not part of the Libertarian view of things. We should only bar criminals and even then remember that other countries criminalize things that Libertarians would not.

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I still like the original statement better, although I agree that some reference to the welfare state needs to be added. But to me, the new statement sounds like we're saying we support them being here as long as their good and capital come with them, which isn't quite the same thing. To me, the second statement focuses too much on what they can do for our economy (which IS important), but it seems to downplay the HUMAN factor, and the idea of freedom.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't know if it is necessary, but how would the libertarian party suggest we keep out foreigners who pose a threat...does it mean a border fence? does it mean a national id so we know who can or can't be in our country?
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	"goods and labor" Add: "Because the rule of law is necessary for a prosperous society, we do not support amnesty for those who have entered the country illegally. However, America's illegal immigration problem represents an economic problem that the black market tries to cure, we support greater access to worker visas to help resolve the underlying problem that free hand of the market fixes with or without the blessing of current immigration policies."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	No strong opinion one way or the other.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer the existing statement.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	As long as immigrants,foreign nationals,or whatever you call them, CANNOT leach off our welfare system/SS,unless they pay into it. PERIOD !!!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Poorly worded, but ok. We are the only country that I know of that takes in immigrants only to put them on public assistance. No other country would even think of doing that.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Very few immigrants come for welfare. We all use public assistance: roads, schools, police, etc.

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Public assistance to be limited to American citizens!! Immigrants to be allowed freedom of movement with the understanding they do not qualify for endless welfare...
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	As Libertarians, we don't support public assistance anyway. We can be welcoming of people who may have some limitations (i.e., "require assistance"), and this new language seems a bit elitist if it keeps the language regarding "those not requiring public assistance".
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is a terrible proposal. The original statement fails to take note of the welfare-state idea because we have ALREADY said that we oppose the welfare state. Whereas the first claims the principles of free travel and trade the second puts priority on stopping Mexicans from crossing the border... and everyone knows that this means Mexicans, there is no sense in denying that. We are not Republicans, this should not be written this way.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Excellent way to address the complaints about non-citizens using taxpayer-funded services.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Sounds too much like a some pre-condition where the state will determine who MIGHT request welfare versus those who don't.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support this as long as we understand that the boarder IS controlled, as it is imperative that a country control and defend its boarders. Without this CONTROL and DEFENSE of one's boarders they have no legitimate claim to nationhood.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We do need more stringent security at the borders because the people who know that they are undesirables are not going to try to enter the country by legal means.....I would like the Libertarians to support stricter border measures and entry points controls

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't like the "public assistance" language at all. A city bus provides public assistance, as does the Post Office, State Department offices, drivers license facilities, etc. Wouldn't something like "economic support from government" be more appropriate?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I dislike the former and the latter. National borders are imaginary lines, and crossing them should be no different from, say, crossing the line between Indiana and Michigan.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The original needs work but the proposal isn't an improvement.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	In restoring the principles of individual liberty and responsibility to our form of government, the major problems associated with immigration and threats to our security would be greatly reduced.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	As a former diplomat, I can tell you that the problem of anchor babies and free healthcare for "tourists" is MUCH bigger than you think. And determining whether an immigrant will avail him/herself of public assistance is impossible.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Although both passages are problematic, using the word "welcome" in the revised bit is a strong choice.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Free trade, secure borders and a rational immigration policy shouldn't be this hard. The last sentence is just too long. Starting with 'because' lames it right off. Also the 'free movement of goods and capital' isn't quite right. There are dozens of reasons and every right for a nation to require inspection of items entering its borders.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Do not agree with the last sentence! The border needs to be sealed, especially the southern one!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do not support free trade, but the revised platform serves as an improvement for the majority of libertarians who support it.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would move the last sentence of this proposal to the beginning, and change it to say "the free movement of goods, labor, and capital across national borders."

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Our government spends entirely too much money educating immigrants in their own language and printing documents in languages other than that of the common language of english.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Sounds like we are welcoming the rich. The rest can stay out. Although I do not support welfare, I oppose this language.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	THE USA cannot afford unlimited immigration today. With the welfare state we have in place the new immigrants from impoverished countries will drain the taxpayers dry...A very foolish idea!!!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	People seeking a better way of life is like trying to stop cold air from seeking hot air.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	"We's"
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What is the definition of creditable threat...?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support this proposal but would prefer a similar but reworded version. "We welcome those not requiring public assistance" implies that libertarians support public assistance in general.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While I understand and agree with the intent of the first sentence, it sounds harsh. What is the criteria for determining if someone wishing entry will need assistance?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A definite improvement!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	morons. We believe in free markets. China doesn't. They manipulate their currency (worse than us) manipulate work force. Free trade with china is not free trade.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The tenth amendment ensures the States have the needed authority to determine their needs. All legislation re: imigration should be under their controls, not federal madates.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Who determines what a "credible threat" Is? To me, a credible threat is ANY illegal immigrant. If they are willing to break our laws to come here, they are willing to break our laws once here. "credible threat" should be defined first.

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Preferred original phrasing. The concern over the welfare state should be addressed in a separate plank and shouldn't be used to water down and make exceptions to the original beliefs.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	With emphasis on making sure there is not need of public assistance or threats to security, health, or property!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'd probably lose the "and reduces the likelihood of war," since most US wars since Korea had nothing to do with trade.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think the original phrasing is fine
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We welcome those requiring public assistance, we just reject their claim to it. Should insert language about "voluntary migration" to discourage trafficking. Who would be the arbiter of who poses "a credible threat..." and what safeguards would we impose to keep that body from making arbitrary decisions.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Instead of "those not requiring public assistance", which is a negative and very specific to: "We welcome productive individuals . . .".
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The current language is just fine.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But I question how you will determine what constitutes a "credible threat to security, health or property"--is that like defining some people as enemy combatants without proof? Will it require some kind of profiling?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	How can a libertarian write this? >Who< is going to judge "foreign nationals" as "posing a credible threat to security, health or property", please???? This should be left to private judgment.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think the purpose of the change is warranted, but I'm not satisfied with the implementation. It seems as though we think public assistance is okay and don't want poor people coming here. I think that if government assistance were waived, or even better eliminated entirely, we would very much like to have those people come to the US, as they would stand to gain the most from coming to the US and I think most appreciate what the US has to offer.

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Services should be included with goods and capital.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do, however, insist that immigrants arrive legally (i.e. with proper documentation)
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	we need to stress only supporting the immigration of those who do not produce an economic burden on our society by sucking upon social support systems such as welfare.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Government shall not regulate trade or migration.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"those not requiring public assistance" is ambiguous and needs clarification.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Though I like the new wording better than the old wording, I am still apposed to completely free trade with nations who do not share our labor laws. This allows multinational corporations to circumvent the law and exploit other people.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is better than the first. Not sure at the moment how to work it in...free trade is likely to improve the situation in other countries so that it is less likely people will come here for the basic life support and more likely for the general free trade possibilities.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	This is weaker than the original approach that gives individuals the same right as corporations to cross borders for commerce and employment.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do not want to make "not requiring public assistance" a prerequisite to immigration because penniless immigrants can become quite productive and because I want to simplify the process of legal immigration. I understand that free immigration does not work well in a welfare state, but eliminating the problems of state-provided benefits should be addressed separately.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Assumptive: no one "requires" public assistance; it is provided to those who the system determines are requiring of it.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The original is better. But some way should be found to integrate the closing sentence of the amendment into this plank...

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Prefer: "We are a country of immigrants and diversity has made us strong. Libertarians recognize the mutual benefit of accepting immigrants that will eventually be an asset to our country. The Constitution gives the Federal Government power to control immigration and we urge a policy of encouraging immigration of those individuals who would be good citizens of our country". Separate plank on Free Trade "We support the movement of goods and capital across national borders"
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Too much emphasis is placed on this change, though it is something that can be included. Immigrants use the welfare system for the same reason that Americans do, because it is there, and the government takes enough money from you that it is a way to get some back.
Support Support	Unlikely Likely	No No	Non-Member Non-Member	I like the new statement much better. Yes, it is an improvement. What about free trade with foreign countries that do not play on a level playing field, e.g., chinese slave labor, govt subsidized industries, tariffs, etc? in theory, Libertarianism would say no tariffs, but how do we deal with the reality that the ideal theoretical situation does not exist? This is a question that I myself still have about Libertarianism.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	If we fix the monetary system and are innovative, we could increase immigration 10 fold and prosper from it.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The last sentence of the revised version does not need to be included.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Too many weasel words and phrases. Don't justify the means by the ends. The right to act on your own judgement is not justified by improved standards of living.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The proposal reads more like a bulletin from a travel brochure than it does an official party stance.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Last sentence demands "Otherwise" at the beginning, since you just said you were going to bar free entry for undesirables. Also "credible threat" sounds very CNN. A threat exists or it doesn't. "...posing a significant threat"

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would change "credible" to "known". Because lately, anytime a government agency wants to do something unconstitutional, they say there was a credible threat. As if to say "It's plausible you could hurt me today, so without evidence to the contrary I consider you a credible threat."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"We welcome those not requiring public assistance..." This could be worded better. Maybe "seeking" instead of requiring.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	THEY MUST BECOME CITIZENS PROPERLY IF THERE HERE OTHER THEN A VACATION
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	As long as we keep it open for some of us that oppose illegal immigration, I'm for it.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again "the American dream"? Like so many of these. Too wordy Say it simply and without the flag waving of "the American dream" which means nothing since dreams vary widely.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is also a duplicate vote. (as was the last proposal)
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The original better conveys the sense of liberty that we as Libertarians cherish. There is a huge furor over people entering our country. Welfare should not be any part of our platform, as we generally oppose most governmental welfare programs.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Existing language reads much better, new language doesn't add very much.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Oh, come on! In a free society there would be no welfare and no one would come here just to get it. Does anyone truly believe that people leave their socialist homeland just so they can get American welfare? It just doesn't happen.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would remove "public assistance" and simply focus on the fact that "we welcome anyone".
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The "credible threat" sentence needs better constraints. Too many people seem to consider all immigrants to be "credible threats".
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	EXCELLENT!

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	STRONGLY support..."open borders" are a problem for this Libertarian, when the intent of the immigration is to receive govt. assistance.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I don't like either the existing or this proposal. How about something saying that ideally we want open borders and free trade, but recognize that slave labor of foreign nations, social welfare programs, and wartime require special consideration. Our goal is to end slave labor, social welfare programs, and war in order to create a society that allows individuals and their goods to move freely.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The original was clearer.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Proposed language is too negative. We support immigration; we only put caveats on it when it threatens health and security.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	well said
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It would turn the U. S. into a dumping ground and wreck our economy and our self sufficient state.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If other parts of the Platform imply an end to the Welfare State then explicitly mentioning the issue in awareness of immigration seems overly hostile.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We should also welcome the return of capital to this country from overseas subsidiary rather than tax it. As it is, multinationals keep overseas earnings overseas to avoid taxes, and pay dividends to shareholders out of earnings from the US. When it is time to expand, the expansion (and jobs) is overseas because that money has to be put to work there rather than here.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This would make it seem like libertarians oppose the movement of individuals who may be financially poor. Clarification here would be a good idea.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I simply do not agree with free trade, and immigration plank of the party. We cannot compete with labor arbitrage. We need to be open to refugees entering our country, as will as those willing to work.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The wording is alright, but I really like the previous emphasis on escaping from tyranny.

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The original version is far better as a statement of principle. The proposal is more "dog whistle" bigotry. Factually, legal immigrants contribute far more to the economy than they consume in benefits.
Support Support	Unlikely Unlikely	No No	Non-Member Non-Member	to come to our country if here LEGALY I would like to see this rewritten in a way that emphasizes a bit more emphatically that we welcome ANY immigrants who are not security threats, as long as they forswear any governmental assistance beyond those provided by police, fire departments, and other security agencies.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Governments only have the authority to control borders if they own the borders, and the only things that government legitimately owns are those things which people have donated to it. It's highly unlikely that the borders fall under that category.
Support Oppose	Unlikely Unlikely	No No	Non-Member Non-Member	VERY GOOD Immigrants should pass through a screening process to enter to ensure their identity and their intent. Illegal immigrants should be arrested, an assessment be made as to their identity and contributions while here, and a decision made on whether someone can sponsor them for citizenship through legal requirements.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I oppose this whole premise until the world is ready to embrace this of noble ideas. I believe that immigration should be controlled with only reasonable reasons for denial be a hindrance to entry. All people here illegally should not be rewarded for breaking our laws with citizenship.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It sounds insulting to immigrants. We all require public assistance in the protection of our rights. That's the point of government. We should welcome all who are committed to the liberty of themselves and others. we should use this to condemn sanctions.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Who defines what a "credible threat to security" is?

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The original message has a better, stronger feel. I think adding the first sentence of the proposed change just before the last sentence of the existing statement would be better than a complete change.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	But, (I know, I know) this comes back to taxes on corporations. Americans need good paying jobs. And letting corporations ship jobs overseas while receiving tax breaks is wrong. Even in the name of "Free Trade."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We pay them to come, and then lament the fact that they do come.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You have to be more specific like "I WILL GIVE TO EACH AMERICAN A \$75,000 LIVING CARD IF YOU ELECT ME FOR U.S. PRESIDENT"; "I WILL ISSUE \$50 TRILLION NEW FIAT MONEY ELIMINATING THE FEDERAL RESERVE"; "WE WILL MANUFACTURE ONE HUNDRED PERCENT IN AMERICA USING THE FEDERAL LANDS CREATING 100 JOBS". If you need help call me to 571-288-7383. My family could donate also \$100 million to your PAC. Thanks Alberto Lopez WWW.EBLM.US
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	MORE EMPHASIS ON LEGAL MIGRATION
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Change "those not requiring public assistance" to "those not demanding public assistance" or "those not expecting public assistance".

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Whether or not someone "requires" public assistance is, in practice, up to the government agencies themselves, and I think we can all agree they can hardly be trusted to make sane decisions. This new plank looks like "socialism for us but not for you", which seems kind of incoherent to me. The "credible threat to security, health or property" sentence irritates me because it is too long, over-emphasizes the point and makes us look xenophobic (I am personally extremely embarrassed by xenophobic libertarians), and does not use the Oxford comma. I want to see something that affirms that movement across borders is a fundamental human right, and does not mince words. A party platform of long ago phrased it in a way I liked a great deal, and I feel like it has just been getting less and less fundamentally libertarian over successive edits. I would support something like the current plank with the last sentence cut. I think the proposed plank is downright embarrassing.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While I approve of this in principle, the text just makes my skin crawl. Example: "public" assistance does not necessarily mean "government" or "taxpayer funded" assistance. You need to make that clear. Who determines which immigrants pose a "credible" threat to us, etc. (I have worked for the military; I think this a very serious issue). Why confuse the issues of free trade with immigration? That just seems wrong to me. While I agree that, overall, such things reduce the likelihood of war, our adversaries will quickly find examples to the contrary, so you need to write that in a less absolute way.

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I like parts of both. I would put the last sentence of the revision as the first sentence, replacing the original first sentence. I would keep the original second sentence. This would be paragraph 1, talking about free trade first. Then paragraph 2 would segue into free movement of humans as well as capital across borders. Then something like "Persons immigrating to our country are welcome as long as they understand there is no government assistance as that has been abolished. The government may retain the right to deny access to individuals deemed unable to accept or understand the rules of American society and the law of the land."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would remove the term General Welfare. It appears to be used here with the same meaning as the General Welfare clause that is abused in the constitution. use security or well being.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Should something be put in here about we accept all religion and cultures, but will not adjust our way of life to meet your needs.
Support Support	Unlikely Unlikely	No No	Non-Member Non-Member	Good wording. get rid of "not requiring public assistance", replace with "who wish". After "our own", "but believe that no public assistance should be used for non-citizens"
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	This statement is essential to include, "Political freedom and escape from tyranny demand that individuals not be unreasonably constrained by government in the crossing of political boundaries." I also oppose discrimination against people "requiring public assistance," which would be a step toward fascism, not liberty.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Both statements are unacceptably minarchist. The proposed statement seems be less effective wording.

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Since illegal aliens and a broken immigration system have grown to be such a large problem, one which both Republicans and Democrats barely give lip service to, can we break this into separate planks for free trade and migration? I think the proposed wording is fine, I'd just make the last sentence a separate plank for free trade.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This needs work. What is encompassed by the term "public assistance". Can those seeking political asylum find safe harbor despite the fact that they may not yet have gainful employment within our borders?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I wonder if we shouldn't have trade and immigration listed in different sections.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The phrase "credible threat" is far too vague.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Yes!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't think one government intervention (the welfare state) should be used as a justification for another government intervention (restrictions on immigration).
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would add something along the lines of "We do not support governmental interference aka GATT/Nafta." Trade agreements need to be established by respective business owners, not government bureaucrats.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Immigrants should be welcomed to this country, but only as allowed by law. We show have the right to limit who comes in and in what numbers. Existing citizens are expected to obey the law, why shouldn't those who want to live here illegally?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What standard do we propose using to "bar from entry those ... posing a credible threat to security, health, or property"? This is just too vague and open-ended for me.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	As ever, the sentiment is OK but find some way to say this that a 5th grader can follow.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What would be our position regarding current illegal persons ?

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The second and third sentences in the original language are indispensable. The rewrite fails to capture their meaning.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Strengthen the first sentence to explicitly oppose public assistance for immigrants.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think we need to control the borders. We need to keep people out who do not have permission to get in and if they do get in, we need to kick them out. Perhaps we can make it a little easier to get that permission but I don't want open borders and I don't want to say you can come as long as you work and don't get on welfare. Go through the proper channels and come legally or don't come.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We need to impede incoming foreign nationals. True-born American citizens (not born of illegals) should be considered first for work, promotion, pursuit of life & liberty. This aspect of American life is going away, thanks to rampant influx of foreigners.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Better. more-positive.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	State boundaries are arbitrary, and libertarians have no business endorsing them.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Both statements seem to express the idea clearly. The revision clarifies that those not in need of assistance are welcome (which should be expected of a party largely opposed to public assistance).
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	However, I think the first three sentences you would eliminate should be retained. They empathize free trade, political freedom and escape from tyranny, and economic freedom which the new wording doesn't mention.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I might want to include those persecuted such as Christians in Muslim nations and Jews like after the holocaust. All the rest is fine
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Immigration should be very severely restricted. Guest workers should be allowed.

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Unclear that borders would be secured (TRULY secured) or not. Without secure borders, how do you intend to bar those posing a credible threat to security? No argument with immigration (if, as you say, they're self-supporting). BIG problem with unrestricted free trade. Look no further than NAFTA to see how that kind of thing can get mucked up (and cause great economic harm).
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I thought the party platform supported an open border policy??? Has this changed???
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But how do you determine who poses a threat?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	My sole worry here is the manner in which governments can manipulate and define "credible"? Who has ultimate say? The people? The courts? A lot of our ancestors came here illegally, as debtors, as convicts, as conscripted labor. Those of use who were Irish were seen as "credible threats" to this country, so let's be clear that we don't need a government building a fence that denies the very labor freedom that most of us expect in this country.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Cut the aid
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	poor people aren't welcome?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Make it "we welcome "the authorized entry of" those..."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I love the concept, and the overall thought behind this proposal. However, I don't like the term "requiring public assistance". The intro indicates that the intent was to accomodate the view of those who like the concept of the original platform, but don't like the welfare state -- How about including text to that effect, and removing the public assistance line. Something to the effect of "We believe in the right of all individuals to travel freely, even across political border, to pursue... So, we welcome.... However, we also recognize that certain government policies may entice people who don't support these ideals, by the use of taxpayer-funded welfare programs.

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The agreements, such as NAFTA, have caused this country to lose jobs and industries that move their businesses across borders in order to pay lower wages and then import these goods into this country. This has severely hurt this great nation.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This does not go far enough. Illegal entry into this country should be dealt with severely.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	free trade would kill american business
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is to close to "open borders" policies. Immigration is fine, but it can only work with tightly controlled quotas.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I support free trade only with those other entities who bring their goods and services to market without the initiation of force and or fraud. Unilateral disarmament is not so wise a policy.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I oppose both the old and new language.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Start again.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I especially like adding the phrase "not requiring public assistance"
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	scratch "American dream".
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There's that American dream again
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I neither oppose nor support this
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But how to ascertain if an immigrant will need public assistance? That criteria would be used? Seems to go against the grain of Libertarian thinking to set salary/income/asset quotas.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	However, I do not support illegal immigration, amnesty for those who are here illegally and I believe that legal immigration should be tied to the level of unemployment. It makes no sense to allow one million legal immigrants per year and give away 50,000 green cards in the state department diversity lottery when we have real unemployment close to 14%
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	How would you test the "public assistance requiring" bit? Someone might require public assistance based on their income in country of origin, but in the USA they could earn enough to not need assistance. This case probably encompasses the majority of immigrants to the USA today.

14.0 - Free Trade and Migration

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%
Commenters	44.9%	55.1%	9.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	My support of the Libertarian Party is largely due to this plank before the amendment. The term "public assistance" is too prominently placed and also too undefined a term to merit inclusion in the plank.

15.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	90.6%	9.4%	100.0%
Commenters	67.8%	32.2%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But you left out "gender orientation" does the party not support the transgender community?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	why were "race" and "color" left out of the re-write?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Parents, or other guardians, have the right to raise their children according to their own standards and beliefs, as long as they violate no laws which would limit their right to initiate the use of force against another person.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I like the old first sentence. It says more about Libertarians' motivations than the proposed new first sentence.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Outstanding re-write
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do believe the Party should leave the condemnation of racial bigotry in place.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Include.. "Parents , or other guardians, have the right and responsibility to raise their children.....so long as the inherent rights of those children are not infringed upon.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	First one is better phrased, I think. Also, just fyi children are reared. Barnyard animals are raised.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	despite my support, the unmodified sentence may need work in future time. Between the groups suffering discrimination, such a Mormon's, Amish, Nazi/communist and other home-schooler's, too much ammunition is provided to Do-gooders, and politicians, to interfere in the lifestyle choices, of parents or guardians.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What about the American Indians? Did they also make irresponsible choices? "Every mans death diminishes me for I am involved in mankind"
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Although I don't understand why we need the final sentence regarding parents right to raise their children in this particular section.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Considering that we are still getting fallout from the Rockwell/Paul newsletter fiasco, we might consider keeping the first sentence.

15.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	90.6%	9.4%	100.0%
Commenters	67.8%	32.2%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This needs to be reworked some more. I don't think it hurts to reiterate that we don't as a party endorse bigotry because our great tolerance of other people's freedom to say and do what they wish even when we disagree with them may easily be misunderstood as covert endorsement. Clearly though there are bigger issues that could be said here. For example, how about saying something like: A foundational and guiding philosophical principle greatly inspiring Libertarian thought is that we should grant the greatest amount of liberty we can to everyone we can in as much as that granted liberty does not infringe on another individual's equal right to the enjoyment of that same liberty. If infringement occurs than libertarians would consider the offender to have abused the liberty granted and would generally consider this to be a justifiable cause to have a government restrict such a person's freedom in the future after due process (or immediately if circumstances are a matter of personal defense or the defense of others against aggression). This unusual level of tolerance
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Pulled from the LPO (Ohio) Constitution (Article VIII, Section 6): race, gender, national origin, language(s) spoken, sexual preference, gender identification, religious preference(s), military background, physical capabilities or characteristics, mental capabilities or characteristics, age, prior political affiliation or any other individual trait.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Why won't "individuals human right to sovereignty" not be adequate instead of a long "based upon" list?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I am against genital mutilation, child marriages and a few other things parents og guardians might embrace,
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I OPPOSE same-sex "marriages".
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Sexual orientation is a myth, and therefore it cannot procure inalienable rights. I appreciate the added reference to natural law.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe that is already in the Constitution, no?

15.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	90.6%	9.4%	100.0%
Commenters	67.8%	32.2%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would suggest either deleting the last sentence (about parents' rights) or altering it significantly. The way it currently reads, it would seem to support a parent abusing their child, which would, of course infringe upon the rights of the child. It would also seem to support a parent's right to raise a sociopathic child who will infringe upon the rights (and perhaps safety) of others. Perhaps a phrase along the lines of "so long as they do not infringe upon the inherent rights of the child or others in society" could be added to the end of the sentence.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	The wording is confusing and somewhat contradictory. Perhaps say, "Libertarians embrace the concept that all people are born with certain inherent rights and that they are also the ones responsible for fulfilling them. We reject the idea that one person can ever impose an obligation on another to fulfill his or her rights." I'm wary of throwing the word "rights" around in the first place. The only rights we have are outlined in the Bill of Rights and everything else is a want or desire. People want health care. Health care is not a "right," for example.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	?? 'Your rights end when they impose on my rights' ??
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	No group should receive special consideration or status.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the addition, although I'm not convinced taking out the first sentence (condemnation of bigotry) is a good idea. Yes, it is condemning a specific personal opinion, but it's the opinion most consistent with libertarian principles. Libertarians can be accused of supporting racism because we believe (for example) that there should be no prohibition on employers discriminating based on race. Keeping the condemnation of bigotry statement in could help to counter that perception. A side note - I don't think any of the commas are needed in the last sentence.

15.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	90.6%	9.4%	100.0%
Commenters	67.8%	32.2%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	You need to proof this better. In your blue text, "...nor abridge any individual's human right" should be "rights" with an s; and you shouldn't have quotes around the word "rights" in the previous sentence.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	yes...
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, you need to emphasize that parents do not have the right to abuse their children. The use of force or fraud by parents against children is commonplace and should be discouraged except for medical reasons, e.g., making a child take his medicine.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Why is "right." in quotes?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support this, though I think the redacted line does clarify the general scope of the rest of the plank. Maybe include some of the language of the redacted line elsewhere in the plank, though not at the beginning?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	That last sentence is a very slippery slope and requires limitations, e.g.; to the extent that this does not encourage actions leading to harming or limiting the rights of others. This area needs time and thought.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I really like this!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Language should be included. I am now in Barcelona, and you could be fined for not conducting business in catalan, thanks to the local quasicatalans TALIBANS.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"personal habits, political preference or sexual orientation" should be "personal habits, political preference, sexual orientation, or other individual attributes".
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"human right" should be "human rights". I believe. The the phrase would read "any individual's human rights based upon"
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	In general better, still like to see more support for the rights of children
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I support this, but I would prefer the phrase, "Libertarians embrace the concept that all people have certain inherent rights."

15.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	90.6%	9.4%	100.0%
Commenters	67.8%	32.2%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do not care for listing out what should be protected (sex, wealth, ethnicity, creed, age, ect.) instead simple say. "....government should neither deny or abridge and individuals human rights." This shows that EVERYONE is protected.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I don't understand phrases like "to fulfill that 'right'" and doubt the voters will either.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	State the rights in the first sentence. "Libertarians embrace the concept that all people are born with the inherent rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Government should not be used as a means of "imposing an obligation". this needs to be clarified in the statement.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Unsure
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	sexual orientation is another "moral issue" that cannot be legislated. Government needs to ignore it and leave it alone.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Follow God not man on this one avoid debatable Christians Romans Chapter 14
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would consider a slight change to the last sentence. Parents, or other guardians, have the right, and the responsibility, to raise their children.... Not that personal responsibility is left unmentioned, it is the foundation of the platform, but that raising children is a special responsibility that should be emphasized.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It would seem appropriate to add a caveat to the final sentence in order to prevent abuse. To keep it positive, we could add the following to the beginning of the final sentence: "Responsible..."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The original wording is more clear.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	marriage is a right from god. between a man and woman.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Adults should be responsible as to cause and effect. Government must be limited by its people as herein stated.

15.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	90.6%	9.4%	100.0%
Commenters	67.8%	32.2%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Apparently we believe that children are OWNED by their parents. I do not! Children are entitled to the same right of self-determination as adults. When parents fail to protect their children OTHER adults have a right, and obligation, to step in and guarantee them their basic rights. CHILDREN ARE NOT CHATTEL.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Excellent!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Only because children also have rights that trump any parent's wishes, to some extent. Yes, very fine line. This is where the 14th amendment comes in.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	As long as those standards and beliefs don't endanger their children.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would remove "certain" from the first sentence. I would remove the quotation marks around rights in the second sentence because the first of that sentence refers to authentic natural rights but the quotes around "rights" at the end of the same sentence implies those rights are only perceived rights.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Add "As all individuals share the same level of rights there shall be no distinctions of "protected classes" of individuals."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I really like the second sentence of the proposal.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Better wording
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But I don't like the last sentence. It seems to open-ended.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The difference between prejudice and bias is delicate; a prejudiced man condemns another while a biased man only prefers other associations and does nothing against the subject. Bigotry and prejudice have no place among us, though biases are the natural result of our learning in life.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Strongly agree
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the previous one better because it states and acknowledges we are not bigots. and it should be 'any individuals human right(s)'

15.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	90.6%	9.4%	100.0%
Commenters	67.8%	32.2%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would suggest removing the laundry list of attributes upon which there should not be a basis for abridging rights as it implies something not listed would be ok as a basis for abridging rights. Government should not abridge rights of any human, Period. There should be no qualification of that obligation.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Oppose emphatically! Keep the first sentence, loose the second (the person who wrote it understood what they were talking about, but I don't). Keep the next sentence, and delete the last. Do you support the right of a parent to not educate their children? What if their idea of raising children involves beating them? What if their idea of education is a madrasa (religious education to the exclusion of practical education)? Delete the last sentence entirely. Suggestion: "Libertarians embrace the concept that all people are born with certain inherent rights. Government should neither deny nor abridge any individual's human right based upon sex, wealth, ethnicity, creed, age, national origin, personal habits, political preference or sexual orientation. "
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Only if the second sentence starting with "We reject. . ." is deleted. "Your rights stop at the end of my nose." I have a right to be secure in my person. For that right to have any meaning, the government or society or my friends have an obligation to help me secure or be secure in that right.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Not all of us believe in the concept of natural rights.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	All children have rights to both parents and both parents have equal rights to shared legal and physical custody of their children.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would leave in the language that states "we condemn bigotry as irrational and repugnant" somewhere...because it is.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I would keep the first part of this plank: "We condemn bigotry as irrational and repugnant."

15.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	90.6%	9.4%	100.0%
Commenters	67.8%	32.2%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	One thing you forgot is - POLITICAL PARTY. Any government priveledge extended to one party should be extended to any other party. Also, you could add here that we are opposed to voter discrimination and prefer laws favoring instant runoff voting. (just a thought)
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Much improved and far less inflamatory.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But what about governments' obligation to protect those rights. This reads that you are against the Civil rights acts of the 60s
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	lets consider using the concept of "party" rather than" libertarian" to promote the idea that we are becoming a major party!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Would add "and responsibilities" to the first statement.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Disagree that we "are born with inherent rights". How do we make this determination? Who has the right meter in the closet? Can I borrow it please? I need to scan myself and see which set of rights I was born with. Maybe it's not the same as yours? Really? Also, why are listing all of these "inalienable rights"? What if government banned employment based on an individual's BMI? Can I be fat and still have rights? Can I be bald and still have rights? What if my name is Goofy?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree with all of it except that children have a right to an education in order to have an equal chance at success either from their family or from society.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The second setence should end at "human right".
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i support the constitution as it was written???
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Bad English. "all persons" or "all peoples", would be correct, but not "all people". Voting rights are abridged for minor based on age, and this is reasonable. Do we need to make this distinction?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Fully support.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I notice that religious belief is not listed... Is this a deliberate omission?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	old text is better

15.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	90.6%	9.4%	100.0%
Commenters	67.8%	32.2%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While this directly addresses government discrimination, it does not directly address the creation of protected or favored classes in government policy, such as affirmative action or anti-discrimination laws, which (by my understanding) would also be opposed.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"We reject the idea that a natural right can ever impose an obligation upon others to fulfill that 'right.'" < this sentence feels unclear. How can a natural right impose an obligation on others to fulfill it? Can't think of a practical example of this. Might just be me.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If a person is here, in this country illegally, they should NOT be given the same rights as those who are legally in this country. Otherwise, it would lead to the dissolution of the meaning of what being an "American," "Kentuckian," or "Canadian" means.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Add back in the first sentence.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Longer but more positively stated. OK.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The last sentence doesn't make sense because there are definitely standards and beliefs that are evil. We wouldn't, for example, give parents the "right" to raise suicide bombers.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The audience may not have a good idea of what "natural rights" are. A more explicit definition may be good, particularly because the word "right" tends to evoke many emotions.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Rights are given to us by our creator and NOT by the Federal government. Again, please reference the United States Constitution.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer the brevity of the original wording, though I like the bit about a right not imposing a duty on others. Rather than enumerate the reasons for which government should not abridge rights, should we perhaps enumerate the reasons for which they can? Like "having been convicted of a crime against another's person or property"?

15.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	90.6%	9.4%	100.0%
Commenters	67.8%	32.2%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I will still put in something about the fairness of treating all people equality and blindly that must be maintained within the government.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The new second sentence isn't entirely clear, but I'm not sure I know a better way to express the idea. Consider these possibilities: (1) all natural obligations are negative: they prohibit action that violates the rights of others; (2) no natural right entails a claim on the life, liberty, or property of another person; or (3) there can be no natural right to violate the rights of another person. I prefer the original second sentence to the new third sentence that replaces it. But make these changes: replace "based on" with "because of his or her" and insert "ethnicity" after "color" ("ethnicity" can't replace "race" and "color", since the former is cultural and the latter two are genetic).
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	If you feel the first sentence is irrational or repugnant we can discuss striking it from the plank. I do believe the second sentence should end after the word 'rights'.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Suggest "human rights" plural in third sentence. The second sentence is a tough one. It is correct, and it addresses some really bad, oppressive government policies. However, if this sentence is put in the platform, that should be done with the clear understanding that this correction of a "mistaken notion" will likely be insufficient to actually clarify the matter for those who do not understand the point. For example, someone could read the sentence and then ask, "So then I don't have an obligation to not initiate force against someone else?" A reasonable question like this demands further clarification of the point. To really explain what is meant, an essay—not one sentence in a platform—is required.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	what about parents raising thier kids in a way that others find to be harmful to that kid? extreme religious views for instance? Let the kid be harmed for life????

15.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	90.6%	9.4%	100.0%
Commenters	67.8%	32.2%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	too wordy.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't like either because it never defines what these inherent rights are.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Support, except for the last sentence. Children are individuals first, and shall be treated as such. Parental "beliefs" have no place in how an individual lives their own life!!!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Omitting references to "bigotry" is an improvement. The LP should not condemn "bigotry", since this implies government acting to prohibit or control bigotry. The problem with including "sexual orientation" is that currently there is a powerful faction trying to get the government to grant SPECIAL protection for their "right" to impose their lifestyle on the community, such as when laws prohibit a person from refusing to hire, rent to, or marry two people of the same gender, for example. I don't have the answer, but this needs to be addressed. Sex, ethnicity, age, and national origin are all inherent. Wealth, creed, personal habits, political preference, and sexual orientation (read here, sexual behavioral choices) are personal preferences. The plank fails to recognize that "sexual orientation" is NOT inherent, but sexual BEHAVIOR is a choice that has an impact on others.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	As long as the parental standards and beliefs do not conflict with the rights of the children or accepted Law. May need to be clearer on the language on this one.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Do individuals have the right to prejudice?
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Forgot comma. Fix grammar.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support conditionally. Do trial by jury and legal representation for the poor qualify as natural rights? If so, they are the only two obligatory impositions, as they are the only two mandated by the Constitution. As for those parental or guardian rights, that should only go as far as those standards and beliefs being harmful or detrimental to the child, as in some religions' rejection of medical care.

15.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	90.6%	9.4%	100.0%
Commenters	67.8%	32.2%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is not clear: We reject the idea that a natural right can ever impose an obligation upon others to fulfill that "right."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	not sure. Why inherent rights rather than inalienable?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	My initial reaction would support an addition to the final sentence that qualifies "standards and beliefs" that pose no harm to children, but that would open a Pandoras Box of government intervention (indeed it already has), so it's probably best to accept the proposal as-is.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i would also support wording to inform that government has not right to AFFIRM any particular viewpoint but that society is maintained by the natural maturation of its people.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	As long as it does not do harm to the children (abuse/neglect).
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Suggest we change "all people are born with certain inherent rights" to "all people are created with certain inherent rights" to capture those who believe unborn individuals have rights too.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Right, but "wrong." Find me a "manifesto" in which core beliefs are "articulated" in the patois of the "wink-wink." "Define" "right" for me, please.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't understand what the second new sentence is advocating or limiting.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Last sentence; Parents, or other guardians, have the right (and responsibility) to raise their children according to their own standards and beliefs.

15.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	90.6%	9.4%	100.0%
Commenters	67.8%	32.2%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I oppose this proposed change solely on the grounds like I do not want to see the elimination of the first sentence, which reads, "We condemn bigotry as irrational and repugnant." It is true that the Personal Liberty plank states that individuals have rights to make choices we don't agree with. But just because libertarians would never, ever condone a law that prevents someone from being bigoted does not mean that we don't condemn bigotry as irrational and repugnant. We can condemn something without prohibiting it, and thus, I would like to see the first sentence stay.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Libertarians are often accused of being racist, bigoted, anti-poor. Here we've made an official statement saying we're not and condemning, in a moral sense, those who are. I don't think we should change that for a much weaker statement.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The first sentence of the current text needs to stay: it is poignant, important, and still valid in many different forms in today's culture. The sentence "libertarians embrace the concept..." is badly worded. This is our platform, not some pedagogical tool. We're not writing a book here, and therefore book prose is not called for.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Better, but the whole paragraph is probably superfluous.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Common sense again. A good solid statement.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I feel very strongly we should straight out condemn bigotry. How about: We condemn bigotry as irrational and repugnant while acknowledging an individual's right to their own opinion. Government has no such right and should not deny or abridge...' 'Libertarians embrace the concept that all people are born with certain inherent rights. We reject the idea that a natural right can ever impose an obligation upon others to fulfill that "right." ' is an important plank for the platform which I believe should be included, but I think the above statement should be rewritten.

15.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	90.6%	9.4%	100.0%
Commenters	67.8%	32.2%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Instead of deleting the first sentence, just substitute "aggression" for "bigotry", and then it will be condemning un-libertarian actions instead of personal opinions. There is no need to delete the second sentence, which is perfectly correct and appropriate to include in a plank about rights and discrimination -- government should *not* deny or abridge any individual's rights based on sex, wealth, race, color, creed, age, national origin, personal habits, political preference or sexual orientation! Adding the term "human" before "rights" would appear to exclude other types of rights such as civil rights, legal or contractual rights, etc., so this is a mistake. Moving "wealth" further down the list would be a good idea though -- putting it right at the beginning after "sex" and before the more familiar listings of race, color, and creed, could easily give the impression that we are unduly concerned with protecting the wealthy.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Tentative support. I don't have a problem with the platform condemning bigotry.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Seems to be some confusion over the meaning of "natural rights" and "positive rights".
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Nor should the government grant special rights based upon sex, wealth, ethnicity, creed, age, national origin, personal habits, political preference or sexual orientation.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	[ref to founding documents by:] with certain inherent rights --> with certain unalienable rights
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	good positive tone
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	The quotation mark after the word "right" should be before the period.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	This one can be toned down a bit. There is a lot of animosity toward the recent Citizens United ruling that liberalizes campaign spending by corporations. Better to avoid the issue and focus expanding choices to the voters.

15.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	90.6%	9.4%	100.0%
Commenters	67.8%	32.2%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Bavo on the wording to whoever wrote it, especially the part about a natural right not being the obligation of others to fulfil. When government moves beyond guaranteeing equal freedom to pursue something to guaranteeing a right to have the thing pursued, we go too far.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Amen
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Excellent re-write which I guess addresses positive vs negative rights?
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Ahem! You need a comma after "political preference".
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Libertarians embrace sentence just redundant to platform; second sentence probably confusing to most people. First sentence should be "govt should neither." And what about children's rights to divorce abusive parents? That belongs back in there. Needs major rewrite.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Change inherent to inalienable
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Yes, and as follows: creed noun 1 people of many creeds and cultures: faith, religion, religious belief, religious persuasion, church, denomination, sect. 2 his political creed: system of belief, set of beliefs, beliefs, principles, articles of faith, ideology, credo, doctrine, teaching, dogma, tenets, canons. Therefore, would suggest that "political preference" be changed to "political affiliation"; as the preference factor is covered by "creed" while the actuation and living demonstration of the preference would be covered by "affiliation". "personal habits", yeah, well, ok, yet would much prefer "personal culture" and i am much more than my habits, and so are you!!! Also, why not also have "unalienable", to read thus "...are born with certain unalienable, inherent rights." I just believe this particular point of unalienability is crucially fundamental in importance to the stance of individualism or sovereign autonomous personhood and in this plank, would be further augmented or strengthened by "inherent".
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	OK, but what about "age" with respect to minors: the right to vote, drink alcohol, smoke, etc.

15.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	90.6%	9.4%	100.0%
Commenters	67.8%	32.2%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What "certain" inherent rights"? May be right of the strong to enslave the weak? What is the role of government? It is in the Constitution already
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"Race" needs added to the blue
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Would modify to read: Libertarians embrace the concept that all people are equal under the law and born with certain inherent rights. We reject the idea that a natural right can ever impose an obligation upon others to fulfill that "right." Government should neither deny nor abridge any individual's human right based upon sex, wealth, ethnicity, creed, age, national origin, personal habits, political preference or sexual orientation. Parents, or other guardians, have the right to raise their children according to their own standards and beliefs.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Yes, excellent rewrite.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the more positive nature of this one :3
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Like the use of word embrace.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I have reservations about the last sentence -- if parents are gardiens are palpably harming their children (for example, severe beatings, ritual clitoridectomy), I believe others have a right and moral duty to intervene.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	mostly better
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"individual's human rights" - we have more than one human right, so it should be plural
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Although I support the re-write here proposed, I feel that the word "inherent" in the first sentence above should be replaced with "God given inalienable".
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The first sentence of the original does need to be deleted but I don't see anything wrong with the second sentence. You do need to create a third sentence that says "private entities, either for profit or not for profit, have the right to discriminate as they see fit".
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Strong support.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	As long as this does not remove discrimination-related civil rights legislation.

15.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	90.6%	9.4%	100.0%
Commenters	67.8%	32.2%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Replace "upon others" with "upon another". Replace "Government" with "The state".
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	here again, the fix is not much better than the current plank. Both accomplish the same objective so I really don't care. There really should be a "it doesn't matter" button so that you don't get the impression that I feel strongly either way, but that is not a choice that I have, and I have to choose one in order to move to the next page.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Again, too wordy. Just delete the first sentence of the old version.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Excellent! Very well written!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The first version was fine as well.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The old one was okay too.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This also infers that the above groups do not receive preferential treatment under the law.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Should call out NYPD and other organizations for spying on Americans.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Are they inherent rights, natural rights, or human rights? Pick one and stick with it.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I oppose the last sentence - "Parents,to raise their children..." What if their "standards and beliefs" are to physically, sexually, or mentally abuse their children?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	race and color needs to be in the list.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	General comment: It would be clearer if we only had one "type" of rights: "inherent", "natural" or "human". Third sentence: reword to make clear that the denial or abridgement is not to be based on sex, etc., along the lines of "Individual rights--the rights to life, to liberty and freedom of action and to property--should not be denied or abridged by government on the basis of an individual's sex, wealth, ethnicity, creed, age, national origin, personal habits, political preference or sexual orientation."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Very good!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	. . .concept that each person is bornabridge any individuals natural right to freedom of peaceful action for any reason.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	2nd statement is unclear as to what you're really saying.

15.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	90.6%	9.4%	100.0%
Commenters	67.8%	32.2%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	My preference: Keep the original plank with the exception of the first sentence. Add nothing new.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	So much better than the original! I heartily agree.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Although, I would remove the word "human" from the last sentence. "Human rights" is the term the UN use to indicate the right to a house, free medical care, etc.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Both the existing and the proposed planks are untrue--there are many legitimate personal habits for which government should discriminate. Do you want your nuclear launch officer to be a drunk? Both do not clearly assert free association. A better version of this plank: Libertarians recognize the equal and inalienable rights of all persons, regardless of gender, race, or other factors. Governments should not mandate or allow discrimination in their own policies, as happened when states required racial segregation. Government should not regulate the free associations of private individuals, businesses, or groups. Nor should government interfere with peaceful collective action, such as secondary boycotts, against those who discriminate.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support this re-wording because I think the crossed out version, in red, is a little too general and philisophical
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The second sentence should have "or other characteristic" added. We do not know on what next year's discriminatory bias will be based.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Rather than ..."certain inherent rights." I would prefer ..."certain inalienable rights."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Is there a place where we enumerate "certain inherent rights?"
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Do we not condemn bigotry?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Should it be emphasized that "raising their children according to their own standards and beliefs" does not infringe on anothers right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness?

15.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	90.6%	9.4%	100.0%
Commenters	67.8%	32.2%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You need to add "gender identity" to your list. I personally would prefer that you simply state "Government does not have the authority to deny or abridge any individual rights for any reason whatsoever." Also, you need to clarify that parents/guardians do NOT have the liberty to abuse, mislead, or otherwise violate the individual rights of their children. Children should expect honest dealings from their parents at all times.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Why is government even considered?! OF COURSE a government defines and determines what "rights" and "laws" are -- that's what states/governments ARE! Rather: "Any government's only roll is to protect all individual humans' rights; no discrimination based on any criteria other than against initiation of violence, theft, or fraud, is proper. Any government may only prosecute violators of others' rights to non-aggression, non-theft, and non-fraud, if these criteria even require an external government. These issues are much better addressed through private individual insurance and arbitration."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't care for the quotation marks. If you mean right, say right. If you mean something else, say what you mean. Using quotation marks implies (to me) that you mean something else but you aren't saying what, and vagueness is hardly appropriate for a party platform.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Should add: illegal immigrants who do not pay into the system of American Government will be deported and denied certain rights.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Bigotry and prejudice are forms of ignorance, and as such, carry within themselves their own penalties.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Please consider reordering the second and third sentences.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	One cannot legislate morality or equality. Best the government can do is support our inherent human rights. This is good.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Americans first libertarian party second immigrants should stay and fight for their rights and freedom not run away as we did

15.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	90.6%	9.4%	100.0%
Commenters	67.8%	32.2%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't like the existing first sentence, but the use of the term "fulfill" sounds like there is not obligation to "protect" a right, which IS government's obligation.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What if a bunch of people decided that other people shouldn't have as much liberty as they enjoy. Is it an "imposition" to allow everyone the same degree of liberty? That is a big weakness in the libertarian philosophy because market forces have not been historically reliable in ensuring civil rights.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Might be good to have a plank defining what we mean by a "right". I would propose that we define it as a authority retained by the individual which government may not ignore, limit, impede, or make the exercise thereof into a crime.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe this section would be better served if we started from the 3rd sentence of the proposed replacement text ("Government should neither...") and eliminated the first 2 sentences proposed. I find them confusing (Inherent rights? Natural rights?) and unnecessary.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"We reject the idea that a natural right can ever impose an obligation upon others to fulfill that "right". I think there needs to be clarification to this line or I am not sure what this item is trying to convey. Natural rights are obligatory in that our government and the individual have an obligation to make sure our natural rights are secured. Other so-called "rights" (which are not rights), such as "right to healthcare, a job, a house, etc" are not rights and goverment, groups, individuals can never impose these upon others to fulfill that "right".
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	"inalienable"
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	2nd sentence rewrite
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Parents have the right to raise their children in a manner that will contribute to the pursuit of life, liberty and happiness of all. Parent do not have a right to abuse thier children as the children should have rights too.

15.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	90.6%	9.4%	100.0%
Commenters	67.8%	32.2%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I oppose the sentence about "We reject the idea that a natural right can ever impose obligations upon others to fulfill that "right." I don't think the term "natural" right is appropriate. This is an awkward effort, I guess, to reject "positive" rights. In reality, the right to property imposes an obligation on people not to steal. A right to life imposes an obligation not to kill. I don't favor (and can imagine some language in the platform that rejects) rights to food, health care, a job, and so on. But this language is wrong, I think. Just leave out that sentence.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	With prejudice, read the Declaration of Independence, "We hold these truths to be self evident, THAT ALL MEN ARE CREATED EQUAL, THEY ARE ENDOWED BY THEIR CREATOR WITH CERTAIN UNALIENABLE RIGHTS, THAT AMONG THESE ARE LIFE, LIBERTY, AND THE PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS." Anything more is pure vanity!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Libertarians embrace the concept of free will and that all people are born with certain inherent rights. ...
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	more positive, well done
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I see some resistance to the word inherent; the constitution does not use that word. It may be more inline with 2012 but wanders away from the meaning the forefathers were trying to convey. I would recommend some spirited debate before adopting that word.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This seems to clash with the proposed immigration plank on page 12.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	... as long as such teachings/beliefs do not advocate theft, chaos, etc. which undermines accepted civil law.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	better word than "inherent" is "unalienable," since it will remind people of the Declaration of Independence. last sentence should include parental responsibilities as well. would be nice to have "sexual orientation" sooner in the list than "personal habits," more damage done with discriminating against GLBT than people that decide not to shower.

15.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	90.6%	9.4%	100.0%
Commenters	67.8%	32.2%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	the government should intervene when someone's inherent rights are being infringed on, however.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	An improvement, but not great. Is it necessary? Can't we just say we support the Constitution?
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I'll support this, but it needs more. It's not just that "Government should neither deny nor abridge any individual's human right based on..." the various criteria, they should not provide special treatment in FAVOR of people based upon their sex, ethnicity or national origin. Best example, "Native Americans" get special benefits. Who is a "Native American" -- anyone who is AS LITTLE AS 1/16TH Indian. So our government DISCRIMINATES AGAINST WHITES by saying someone who is 15/16th white is, in fact, a "Native American".
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Sounds unnecessary to add in and makes it sound ridiculous
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Keep the repugnant part: see below - Libertarians embrace the concept that all people are born with certain inherent rights. We condemn bigotry as irrational and repugnant. We reject the idea that a natural right can ever impose an obligation upon others to fulfill that "right." Government should neither deny nor abridge any individual's human right based upon sex, wealth, ethnicity, creed, age, national origin, personal habits, political preference or sexual orientation. Parents, or other guardians, have the right to raise their children according to their own standards and beliefs.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, Libertarian.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Just us the language of the Declaration and Constitution, these are Natural rights, endowed by the Creator, and may not be abridged by humans.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Interesting take on a difficult topic-- well done.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The second sentence needs some clarification.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	original is clearer

15.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	90.6%	9.4%	100.0%
Commenters	67.8%	32.2%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Just a small, but I think important, change -- completely capitalize "all" in the first sentence, i.e., "ALL".
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't think the last sentence is needed.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"inalienable rights" instead?
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Is there a difference between "inherent" right and "natural" right?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	1. Rather than "inherent", let's say, "inalienable". 2. In the second sentence, suggest that "can ever impose" with, "ever grants license to impose".
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do love the first sentence of the existing plank.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would like to see some acknowledgement that parents do not have unlimited power over their children; the state has the same interest in protecting the safety of children as it does in protecting the safety of adults.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	How about coming right out and saying Affirmative Action must go?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I oppose the last sentence about parents. If parents prove not to be good mentors, then they should be "fired".
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, with certain unalienable rights. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. Only individuals, not groups, have rights
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I'm not sure I know what you are trying to get at iwth the new first sentence. I can guess, but I think it would be very confusing to the general public.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Although I support this, I feel we should guard very carefully against the tendency to throw into the bucket of "human rights" all sorts of things which people would wish protected from the objections of others, but which are not rights at all.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	New wording is OK, but in real-world terms, I'm not sure what the point of it is...
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If you are going to make statements about inherent rights, than you need to state what those rights are What is a natural right. How can you have rights with no obligation that it be fulfilled.

15.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	90.6%	9.4%	100.0%
Commenters	67.8%	32.2%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A simple declaration that opposes government discrimination is clearer and avoids the concept of protected classes, which implies unprotected ones.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	eliminate the EEOC, do not give reason or purpose to support it.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This long string of listed things that a person might BE grows every year and can never be complete for its intended purpose. How can we get to wording that makes it clear that we don't want to discriminate based on what people ARE and discriminate (make judgements) based instead on what they DO? Let's work toward losing this ridiculous list that can never be complete nor completely accurate.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the idea, but the second sentence is confusing.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You'll lose people with the second sentence - it lacks clarity.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Yuk. For the most part it's okay I suppose, but that last sentence is really bad. Just leave it out. You could also just say "based upon anything". Once you start making lists, you leave stuff out.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The last sentence needs removed. It doesn't flow with the proposal.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The govt. should NOT be able to force anyone to violate their religious rights. This whole issue is mainline news right now. However, why the media zeros in on Christians fighting for their rights NOT to provide health benefits for abortion, etc., or rent their facilities to same sex "couples", do they really think that Muslims and Orthodox Jews will? Why are the Christians made to look like the big bad bigots?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Parents do need to feed and care for children.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Government must be blind as to race, sex, ethnicity etc. Individual has the right to pursue, not the right to demand...
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The second statement is very unclear and I'll be honest in saying that I've no idea what it means, so I can't help but feel that maybe I should hit 'oppose' without that being cleared up.

15.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	90.6%	9.4%	100.0%
Commenters	67.8%	32.2%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	That "right" sounds odd. More clarity would be nice. Still sounds like we'd let parents abuse their children.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	instead of the big laundry list, it seems better merely to state "based upon any social classification such as..." and keep the list small
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The 2nd sentence is awkward. I'd lose the last two words and leave at this: "We reject the idea that a natural right can ever impose an obligation upon others to fulfill". The last sentence seems like it was an afterthought...like it's a sentence or an idea that just needed a place to go in the platform.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The first sentence should remain intact.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Typically I would only protect that which a person cannot change (reasonably) such as race, sex, age, etc. There are others which are a choice and as long as their choices do not interfere with my daily life I am all for protecting their rights.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Conditional support; add "unalienable" (not inalienable) after inherent.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	you must find a way to allow discrimination against B.O. offenders.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would add in the term 'legally appointed' guardian.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This would be a good place to again state the the government's only role is protecting rights, not limiting them.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The government is not a living being able of recognizing sex, wealth, ethnicity, creed, age, national origin, personal habits, political preference or sexual orientation. The government only recognizes a citizen or not a citizen.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The ammendments to the constitution spell out our inaliabile rights which cannot be abridged or ammended in any way or form.

15.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	90.6%	9.4%	100.0%
Commenters	67.8%	32.2%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There is not a grain of sand of evidence on the veritable Everest of information in 2012 to suggest natural rights, divine intervention, or any other similar rubbish. Freedom to hire and fire who one pleases, for instance, simply works. Interference in such matters does not. The only sentence in this plank should be the last one. Ideally, it should be amended to include "responsibility" to mirror the "right."
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Rewrite the whole thing.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Somewhere in the platform there should be a statement about the concept of marriage. I believe that there should be no government sanction required of people who wish to marry. Before government intervention marriage was a simple matter between two people and was a commitment requiring no sanction of any kind by any governmental body. All of the present rancor concerning marriage issues is the result of government involvement on all levels and involves a variety of issues - taxes, inheritance, etc.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Terrific change -- major improvement!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Might also mention the libertarian position that all rights are inherent in individuals, not groups; thus, a true libertarian does not engage in prejudice, which requires seeing persons not as individuals but as members of a group.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Just not right to life, right?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	God's laws, and the U.S. Constitution state the definitions of freedoms, liberties, and rights. Govt. has no authority to restrict, control, or intrude on any of them. Govt. is the enemy of freedoms and rights. Start there.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What about religion?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	w/caveats: Replace "We reject the idea..." with Inherent (I still prefer unalienable) rights can never impose and obligation upon others to fulfill those rights. We reject the notion that any "right" can impose an obligation upon others...."

15.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	90.6%	9.4%	100.0%
Commenters	67.8%	32.2%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But it's getting ridiculously long a list of what conditions will not be a basis for discrimination. Why not add in things like wardrobe, sports played, musical talent, verbal facility, etc., etc., etc.? Government shall not deny or abridge any law-abiding individual's human rights for any reason whatsoever.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Good proposal, but rewrite in a more aggressive tone than the passive tone in the proposal. Leave out the lame clause: "embrace the concept." Libertarians "know!"
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Should keep the sentence "We condemn bigotry as irrational and repugnant."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Government shall respect privacy without exception.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Very weakly support this. It sounds like nature red in tooth and claw. Is this an opposition to the Lockean proviso of leaving as good as in the commons for the next person. A species that "eats" its own is much less likely to survive at all. I feel that there is, once we are here, a right to continue existing at some basic level that does not amount to some sort of punishment. There is a case for government as an organizing principle to optimize our existence as a society. Which is the individual the ant or the ant hill.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Raising children should be subject to the proviso that they have the same right to life and security of their person from birth onwards.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Except when it can be shown that the treatment of a child is abusive or keeps him from achieving potential. People are born w/equal rights but no power on earth can assure that they remain, in fact, equal.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Take away the first two sentences and I would support it. I would add that ending racism requires that government not consider race when granting or denying benefits.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Bravo.

15.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	90.6%	9.4%	100.0%
Commenters	67.8%	32.2%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I wasn't going to vote, since I find both versions unsatisfactory. Apparently I can't move on without hitting one or the other, however. Thus...
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Prefer: "Libertarians believe that all people are born with certain inherent natural rights that cannot be abridged by any government or institution. Each human being is endowed with the right to be equal under the law and respected as an individual".
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Add that the Libertarian Party does not view people based upon sex, wealth, ethnicity,... , but as individuals and that the government should do the same.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Yes, it's better, but I personally dislike this notion that some crimes are in a different category because they are "hate" crimes, or that the right of free speech should be abridged by other people's choice to feel "offended" by that speech.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I love the removal of "We condemn bigotry.." and the insertion of "Libertarians embrace the concept that all people are born with certain inherent rights." I don't like the wording of "We reject the idea that a natural right can ever impose an obligation upon others to fulfill that "right." It just doesn't sound right.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Change "inherent" rights to "unalienable" rights. Why not use the founder's language?
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I partially support both versions, but again where do we draw a line between an adult's (parent) "rights" and a child's "rights" when the adult's rights impose themselves on the children. The future of the nation and of humanity depend on the children growing up healthy, smart, and able to think and reason critically. There ARE environments that prevent that.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You "rear" children. You "raise" cattle. Please get this right. "Rights" should be plural (after human). Need a caveat after beliefs -- are we condoning abuse?

15.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	90.6%	9.4%	100.0%
Commenters	67.8%	32.2%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't like the new or old plank. The whole bit about natural rights is a bit aloof-sounding to most people. "personal habits" is a bit vague. Are we supporting pedophiles?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Glad to see you attacking the "positive rights" concept!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again convoluted. Say it straight up. What does "impose an obligation upon others to fulfill that "right"" mean?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The original form is more succinct and powerful
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	In the second line, the phrase should read, "...any individual's human rights..." (i.e., "rights" should be plural here). Also, proper, traditional American English usage is that we "rear" children and "raise" animals, although in recent years "rear" as applied to children has been losing ground to "raise" in common usage.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	but can not do them harm
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would remove "human" and simply leave it at "rights" (plural). Also, something should be included to make clear that rights belong to the INDIVIDUAL and not to any group or because anyone is part of any group. This is NOT a duplicate vote.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The first says it better. The second is too wordy in conveying the same message.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	1. Where did "human right" come from? 2. Where did "race" go??? "Ethnicity" is not a synonym.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Better would be, "Government should not deny, abridge or enhance...."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	EXCELLENT
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Much better!
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Replace "embrace the concept" with "understand". Remove "certain". Replace "others to fulfill that right." with "other individuals". Replace "neither deny nor abridge any individual's human right based upon" with "be blind to" and replace "or" with "and" in the same sentence.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I am fine with us condemning bigotry. We should just add that we oppose government action against bigots.

15.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	90.6%	9.4%	100.0%
Commenters	67.8%	32.2%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Though the following sentence: We reject the idea that a natural right can ever impose an obligation upon others to fulfill that "right." should be deleted. What does it mean?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Very well worded!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Marital status should also be included, in this plank and also in 1.3; one of the more egregious marital status discriminations is the income tax laws. Plank 1.3 should also include that the government should recognize contracts between consenting adults.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I'm OK with us condemning bigotry, even if that's not strictly a public policy statement.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Still think Inherent rights should be unalienable rights.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I thought Jefferson-adams-franklin already said that???mgm
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Second proposed sentence is meaningless- every existing government program violates it. It adds no value to the platform and creates unnecessary conflict.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This was definitely necessary.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Retain the original as a preamble sentence to the new remainder in this plank.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	by sex do you mean gender... if so , say gender or gender orientation. wealth? I beleive the point is equal rights require equal justice...not social justice
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The second added sentence does not belong and is hard to understand. Maybe we should just embrace the wording in the Declaration of Independence regarding inalienable rights, life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness and leave it at that.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Awesome change.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	worthwhile improvement

15.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	90.6%	9.4%	100.0%
Commenters	67.8%	32.2%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	In general I support this change. Although I recognize that I am a religious person by nature and not everyone will share that, I feel it is important to point out the Founders often said that "rights" came from God. This is important to distinguish them from privileges granted by the State. I would like to see language indicating that our inherent rights come from a higher authority than any government. I am more than happy to consider language that is approved by different faiths including atheists.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	In my thoughts, the parent line at the end is not needed. If the government follows the first part then the second part is inherent. Its inclusion would raise more questions than answers. For example, what if the parents standard denies the child life, liberty, or the pursuit of happiness? Drop the line.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the new sentence. I do not think we should no longer dislike (condemn) bigotry, stupidity, or any other attitude that should be offensive. Yes, as in the new sentence we should embrace good. We can also condemn bad.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Substitute "subsidize" for "fulfill". Both proposals are wildly overbroad; they would allow 3-year-olds to drive cars and Kenyans to become President . . . and suppose someone's "personal habit" is having sex with children?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe a natural right CAN impose an obligation upon others to fulfill that "right." While government "should neither deny" an individual CAN. And parent's, or other guardians have the right to raise their children ... to their own standards and beliefs ONLY to a certain degree
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Support in principle; however, you use the varying terms "inherent", "natural", and "human"...are you sure you have a firm grasp on the whole concept? What about disability? Is there a "right" for, say, disabled veterans to pursue a full and unrestricted life?

15.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	90.6%	9.4%	100.0%
Commenters	67.8%	32.2%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The last sentence here doesn't entirely belong and perhaps should be reviewed further.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The last sentence is not restrictive enough. Parents do NOT have the right to physically or psychologically abuse a child. Other than that, child rearing decisions should be entirely up to the parents.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Marriage is defined and should remain as defined. Whatever relationship exists between those of the same sex should be named something else entirely. They have no right to redefine and marginalize the defined condition of marriage.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	You are rejecting the concept of positive rights. I happen to agree with that view.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Why not just use the words of the constitution and Declaration of Independence to enunciate the concept of natural rights.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would also add religion or lack there of: this would give the same rights to everyone regardless if they believed in a god or not.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Parents are held to a higher standard. With respect to children, I think parents are required to treat them as they would like to be treated.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Excellent change. This focuses the the party's opposition on government discrimination, while keeping it clear that the LP supports the right to choice of beliefs.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I agree 110%!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would add as long as it does not involve physical harm or mental cruelty

15.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	90.6%	9.4%	100.0%
Commenters	67.8%	32.2%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You have to be more specific like "I WILL GIVE TO EACH AMERICAN A \$75,000 LIVING CARD IF YOU ELECT ME FOR U.S. PRESIDENT"; "I WILL ISSUE \$50 TRILLION NEW FIAT MONEY ELIMINATING THE FEDERAL RESERVE"; "WE WILL MANUFACTURE ONE HUNDRED PERCENT IN AMERICA USING THE FEDERAL LANDS CREATING 100 JOBS". If you need help call me to 571-288-7383. My family could donate also \$100 million to your PAC. Thanks Alberto Lopez WWW.EBLM.US
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Yes!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While I support this in principle, once again you write things such that you will cause endless problems. Example: in the first sentence you should change "are born with" to "have" to eliminate the issue of abortion, etc. You should eliminate the stuff about "natural rights" because it has too much baggage. Just use the term "right" instead. I'd change "sex" to "gender" (a minor nit). You also give our adversaries ammunition with the next-to-last sentence (they'll drag out pedophiles, etc.). The last sentence will, most certainly, cause problems that you could avoid by re-wording. Again, you need to, somehow, define "sanity" to eliminate situation where an insane (and bad) parent or guardian causes irrational and unnecessary harm to their children.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I agree with the rewriting.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would remove sentence 3 completely.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Best change on this survey.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I think this might cover my question on #12.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Keep first deleted sentence, delete second.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I don't understand the semantic switch from right to "right." That seems to suggest that the rights are illusory. Also, parents and guardians do not have the right to raise their children in ways that violate the rights of the children, no matter what their standards and beliefs may be.

15.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	90.6%	9.4%	100.0%
Commenters	67.8%	32.2%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I mostly like this new language, but I oppose the removal of the statement that "We condemn bigotry as irrational and repugnant." We do recognize the right to be bigoted (a choice that we don't agree with), but I think it's important to say that we as a party oppose bigotry, even as we would defend the right of people to be bigoted and live with the consequences. Also, actively removing the language (as opposed to, say, deciding not to add similar language) may be perceived, particularly by those outside the Party, as acquiescing to bigotry.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I would desire to keep some condemnation of bigotry. The proposed amendment, as it stands, could be interpreted as a dog-whistle to bigots.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	So long as those standards and beliefs do no violate the laws of the land.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Add gender identity
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"...raise their children..." What about parents committing what is now called child abuse?
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Actually, pretty good. First good thing I've had to say so far...
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Parents are obligated to raise their children, though some do not do it. that is why government is inserting itself into our wacked out education system.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I completely disagree about the right to raise children according to their own standards. These standards must be subject to universal norms, including the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Of course people have rights to make choices we don't agree with--this means we can't use force to interfere with them. That hardly means we can't condemn their irrational choices. We need to make clear our opposition to bigotry.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	How about "inalienable" rather than "inherent"?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The inclusion of the second sentence of the rewrite is, unfortunately, necessary, but clarifies our rational beliefs.

15.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	90.6%	9.4%	100.0%
Commenters	67.8%	32.2%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	For every right there is a duty of all others to accept and help enforce that right. Remember that the only "rights" in constitutional law are immunities from the actions of government. We should never recognize the use of the term to mean entitlements.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Please add religion and personal held beliefs to the list.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The third sentence is pure stupidity. There are reasons to discriminate: age (no beer for children), sex (separate gym classes for boys and girls), wealth (different tax rates), personal habits (parading nude), sexual orientation (child molesters).
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Very good, but it would be nice to fit in here or somewhere else: "Individual racism is bad; institutional racism is worse; and Governmental racism is the worst of all".
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The fact is, however, that unless government will guarantee it and protect it, we don't have any rights.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This again violates the rights of children.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Memberbeliefs, as long as children are not in harm of brainwashing or other forms of mind or physical control. I am not the expert but the children need protection.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What the heck is a natural or inherent right? Leave the original
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Wholeheartedly supported, but would move the "wealth" bit towards the end.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I cannot agree with this statement because said 'rights' are not defined here.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	All rights create corresponding duties. The second sentence is therefore problematic. I recommend making it clear that, while everyone has a duty not to abridge or deny someone's "natural right," that does not mean that everyone has a duty to affirmatively fulfill or effectuate that "natural right."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Those poor children of crazy parents.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	by replacing it we are welcoming bigots. no thanks.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I would still like a condemnation of bigotry.

15.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	90.6%	9.4%	100.0%
Commenters	67.8%	32.2%	11.2%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I would add a note of caution in that certain ethnic groups practice female circumcision on girls as young as 8. I could not support the right of anyone to practice genital mutilation for cultural or religious reasons.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The original is cleaner and more forceful, and thus more deserving of "the principled party."

16.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.6%	18.4%	100.0%
Commenters	54.4%	45.6%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This change could be used to have a jury find "neglect" by parents who, against gov't demands, refuse to vaccinate their children because they have valid family history or other medical concerns. Since judges instruct juries (improperly) this is opening a can of worms.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support adding this text to the previous revision, but not to the existing plank.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Some juries might argue a lack of a cell phone for a child is reckless endangerment (as an example)
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What I said in the previous answer!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Too little compared to the first option. I prefer the elimination of the "We condemn..."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	jury or court?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Thought personal opinion was going to be left out? The first sentence is a personal opinion. Keep it simple.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Not quite a complete enough statement. As written, this requires suit, and jury action. Who will define abuse, neglect and reckless endangerment? Those actions may be fine by the parents, but not fine by "societal" standards. Need to better define, and remove "jury".
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This comes out of left field, considering what the rest of the plank is about.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I understand the sentiment, but it would be better worded as it was above: 'Breaking the parent/child bond is a serious decision that belongs in the realm of a jury, rather than a bureaucracy.' Generally, I don't find it all that necessary.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Amend prior article, to include the added wordage after a comma.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I still think that the portion regarding children should be in a separate line item. In addition I personally think that we should allow for certain safeguards regarding the safety of children that would include reporting by teachers, doctors etc. By saying it's only after a jury finds abuse would be far too late for many abused children.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'm not sure the added phrase is needed.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I OPPOSE same-sex "marriages"!

16.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.6%	18.4%	100.0%
Commenters	54.4%	45.6%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Debate on final version of that sentence; I'll leave that to parents.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Highly agree with this statement!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Why are you restating the obvious, which has already been stated, and is a central belief of libertarians, the inviolate nature of contracts and laws to protect our liberties. KISS!!!
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	If we want to stress that this is a jury decision and not a bureaucratic one then it should say "unless a jury and only a jury".
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Children, Parents, Guardians Rights and Obligations should Thoroughly Be Defined. I personally have reservations about Giving Juries a vote on What Abuse, Neglect or Reckless Endangerment is,,, As in some Communities Pedophilia is NOT considered Abuse, Like San Francisco. Where as Those same San Franciscans may Consider A teen operating Farm Equipment such as a Combine, Shoeing a horse, Cutting down a tree, Using pesticides to be Reckless Endangerment. I have No solution to this issue... However I have reservations in allowing Elected Prosecutors, Social Workers, Public Opinion or Juries that reflect Local public opinion in determining the Fate a Child, Parent relationship..... Theory is fine, but it is often useless in the real world.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The added phrase is redundant because it would be assumed.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	who's to say what's abuse?
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Given the old saw about "that prosecutor can get a jury to convict a ham sandwich", I would NOT vote for this as long as it specifies only a jury. A better alternative than a government court action would be a private arbitrator or mediation service.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Tack this onto the other proposal.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	... standards and beliefs and children have the right to protection from abuse, neglect or endangerment. The courts have the responsibility to insure the rights of all people.

16.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.6%	18.4%	100.0%
Commenters	54.4%	45.6%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Goes without saying. And saying makes the plank weaker.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What if this judge and jury override the constitution?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Barely...
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Is a start but requiring a jury should not be a first step; need a stream lined process which can be appealed if necessary and who pays is clearly defined as are the consequences of unloading threats to society onto us as a result of the parenting choices made.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	oppose social justice,cultural diversity,political correctness,affirmative action,wealth re-distribution.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	this tag should be put on every spot where parent determined authority is suggested
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Nice addition!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Jury and not appointed-bureaucrats is the operative word here.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"personal habits, political preference or sexual orientation" should be "personal habits, political preference, sexual orientation, or other personal attributes"
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Add something to the effect that children may not be taken from parents unless & until such a jury determination is made.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"abuse, neglect, or reckless endangerment" are relative judgements by a bureaucracy or a jury. And a bureaucracy would have to be involved to bring it to a jury in the first place. The larger question of "individual personhood" is left unaddressed. When is the person a child and when are they adults with rights separate from those of the parents jurisdiction. Address that question. Then you can speak about abuse and neglect. Leave off the proposed change.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The other was better. Moreover tje Libertarian platform is not the place to even hint at government legitimacy.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I would add religion
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	see argument in previous comment box
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	phrasing could be better by avoiding the establishments buzz words

16.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.6%	18.4%	100.0%
Commenters	54.4%	45.6%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Abuse, neglect and reckless endangerment are concepts that are too vague to protect individual parents from interference by government bureaucrats. Some attempt should be made to define these concepts and limit their reach.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"- unless a jury determines said standards and beliefs constitute abuse, neglect or endangerment."
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Unsure
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I am not entirely opposed, but this seems redundant and only something you would add to keep a nut job from saying that the Libertarian party supports child abuse.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Not needed it goes without saying. Maybe you need a platform for when rights may be taken away like with a jury of 12 only.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like this added to the previous option as it was the one area I felt was lacking.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I would support this if it included an explanation similar to the one included under "Purpose": "...a jury, rather than a bureaucracy".
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A 'Jury' - not a judge. Piers are to mean those who are similar in most aspects not dissimilar.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	OR A JUDGE. The judicial system has a right to intervene when the basic defacto contract between parents and children is violated.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Definitely the first proposal is better.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	In a full Libertarian society, this would be acceptable. However, in our current society, the rulings of courts and juries as well as charges by law enforcement of what constitutes abuse, neglect and especially reckless endangerment is out of control. Until such a time as common sense finally prevails, I cannot support this change.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Individuals have the right to be bigots; government does not.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Although I don't want to see any child abused, etc. I know that the person with the deepest pockets most often receives the "justice" (in this case a gov't. agency) and the DHS is a deeply flawed department. I would rather err on the side of freedom.

16.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.6%	18.4%	100.0%
Commenters	54.4%	45.6%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Guardianship applies not to just those responsible for children but also to those caring for individuals of diminished capacity, the aged, and the infirm. How do we apply those rights to these individuals, too?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Good add
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Now this last sentence repeats the point made in the previous plank, but adds an important qualifier. Remove the sentence from the previous plank that omits this qualifier.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	When worded this way the whole last sentence should be taken out of this section and put into a more relevant one.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	with the previous changes, and some sort of provision for emergency removal of children from abusive or neglectful homes while awaiting a jury determination.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Either raise your kids or have them adopted by someone who can!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think this is unnecessary. By the time a situation got before a jury, the damage would have been done. This is a tough nut - but children need protection at a lower-than-jury level.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Parents or other guardians, have the right to raise their children according to their own standards and beliefs. Parents who are convicted by a jury of their peers of neglect and/or abuse to their child or any child in their care are relieved of legal rights by society.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Use: However, parents have the right ... I also think that this is redundant - perhaps it should be eliminated.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	unnecessary, delete the last sentence entirely. Refer to previous point.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But I like the last Plank 3.5 better than this one. I assume the change you are making applies to that one as well?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would not even trust a jury of my peers to judge my standards for raising my child.

16.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.6%	18.4%	100.0%
Commenters	54.4%	45.6%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The stated exception is not strong enough. If there is abuse, a community process must allow for immediate intervention with certain safeguards and rights of appeal. Ultimately a jury might determine just cause; for long term protection of abused children; but a lot of damage can be done while waiting for a jury to determine that necessity. Better to not say anything additional if we cannot find a way to clarify the issue properly.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Add this new addition to the re-write. :)
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	suggest: unless a jury finds the parents guilty of neglect, abuse, or reckless endangerment.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Doesn't it go without saying that crimes are to be prosecuted?
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Well, okay!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Stick with the first new proposal on this.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A good fix
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I like the addition.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	good sentiment with poor wording choices. also, was anyone confused about the sentiment to need the disclaimer?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't mind the addition of "unless a jury finds abuse, neglect, or reckless endangerment", but I definitely do not want to keep the existing opening sentence condemning "bigotry".
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support this change, in addition to the previous one (on p.13 of 17).
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again not sure. A jury of mainly Jehovahs Witnesses would find it perfectly acceptable to let a parent deny a needed blood transfusion or a Christian Science follower to deny medical care at all. You are treading in dangerous waters here.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	That means more laws on how we raise our kids, a jury will have to determine if a law is broken..
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Remove the jury sentence. Jurors are too manipulated by the press, which is manipulated by the general government. Possibly add, unless these standards and beliefs bear a substantial credible threat to the health and well-being of the child.

16.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.6%	18.4%	100.0%
Commenters	54.4%	45.6%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support this version even more as stipulations are made for the safety of the child.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	unnecessary as so well established
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	NO! This presupposes juries are infallible! Granted we have problems with our system of jurisprudence, but we should at least let it work (until such time as we can fix it--don't hold your breath) to correct criminal behavior. I recommend we find broader wording that captures our intent to safeguard personal freedoms while still protect those who have none (or less, and in this case children). Maybe something like "Parents, or other guardians, have the right to raise their children according to their own standards and beliefs so long as these beliefs do not cause harm to the child; whether it be physical or psychological."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A jury today would possibly find a lot of the stuff my parents let me do as negligent. It is my own experience and learning from mistakes that lead me to be who I am today.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The addition should end with abuse. What IS neglect, or reckless endangerment? It's basically the camel's nose in the tent that precedes the entry of the entire camel.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The second sentence should end at "rights".
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I have long struggled with the aspects of when someone steps in to protect a child from their parent. This helps clarify the Libertarian platform on the subject. Thank you.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I will support it if it refers to a jury need for a permanent break of the bond. In some cases law enforcement (or other agencies) need to step in to protect a child while length legal process unfold. There a many cases where delayed intervention has allows for more harm or death to take place.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, some rights such as voting may be limited to adult persons.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I feel the last statement leaves it open to government influence and control.

16.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.6%	18.4%	100.0%
Commenters	54.4%	45.6%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	How do we address cults, religious neglects?
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	sometimes actions are required before a jury can meet.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	remove the "unless a jury" text
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	seems reasonable.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree with the addition, but I would more tightly define "personal habits", as this can be read as someone doing vulgar things in public places and claiming that it is their "right" that can't be denied...
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Not perfect, but there is no Utopia.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Proposal adds minutia that should go w/o saying.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Better wording than the other option.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Why not end it, "unless the they are abusive or neglectful."?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I oppose jurisprudence in any case.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support this only because I believe that the jury system would in fact be more fair than the bureaucracy. However, I think this needs to be expanded upon in the plank, it's a tad too vague.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Thanks for this clarification.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	there is a wide berth for defining neglect and reckless endangerment in the court system today. Neglect has been charged against adults who choose not to inoculate their children.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Combine this with the last one. Make the changes in page 13 and this one.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Remove neglect. This has broad interpretation. It could be redefined as physical neglect. However, some would say home schooling is neglect.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	And implicitly the assumption is that some complaint has been filed and pursued by a prosecutor, an indictment, and a trial. I suppose protection of the child must have some advocacy, but I wonder if it is the agent advocate who might become the pesty problem in the first place.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	CPS needs to a massive over haul and serious oversight before I would grant them ANY further powers.

16.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.6%	18.4%	100.0%
Commenters	54.4%	45.6%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Add the new last phrase to the previous Plank 3.5 rewrite - that would be sound and much better than keeping the previous plank language.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree with the idea but the open ended nature of this clause seems dangerous. A jury won't see the case even unless some bureaucracy tries to bring it. I just think this needs more clarification.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support this additional change to the previous proposed version of 3.5.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Slight addendum: "... unless a jury finds compelling evidence of..."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I disagree with this on the ground that it implies that parents have dominion over the children's own personal rights and that those rights can be transferred to "someone else" upon conviction.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Abuse is a pretty vague term, and different people will define many different things as abuse.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Could this proposal be added to the previous proposed change on Plank 3.5? The previous one is a more important change, but this should be added as well in my opinion.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	This phrase might as well be added to all rights we support: People should be free to enter into contracts, unless a jury finds abuse, neglect or reckless endangerment. If a candidate can't handle that question without reference to this language, the candidate needs to get into another line of work.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	no way. what jury?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would like to see this in local government, not on the federal level.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It's better than it was, but why start this off with a condemnation of a personal view? And this doesn't define what rights should not be abridged.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Support, although please refer to my previous comment regarding parental rights. Children are people, too!!!

16.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.6%	18.4%	100.0%
Commenters	54.4%	45.6%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This plank should ONLY say, "Parents, or other guardians, have the right to raise their children according to their own standards and beliefs -- Unless a jury finds abuse, neglect, or reckless endangerment." The problem again is that "bigotry" is a BELIEF, and the LP should recognize that a person is ENTITLED TO BE BIGOTED! Government has no right to try to control bigotry, and the LP should focus on what GOVERNMENT does or does not do. Also, be careful, because there can be a false finding of abuse, neglect, or reckless endangerment, even by a jury. No court can determine what REALLY happens in the home. All it can do is take the word of government officials who decided to intervene. Even though some children may be harmed by government's failure to intrude into the home and the family, far more are being harmed as things stand. In reality, the government should only act whenever there is evidence of concrete medical harm, and if the question is before a jury, government has acted, by making the accusation in the first place.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	support this and other 3.5 proposal.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Should it take until a jury finds abuse, neglect, or reckless endangerment to sever parenting rights?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Well, that's close to what I was saying in the previos comment box.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think there needs to be a stronger connection to the premise that treating people as individuals eliminates descrimination and stops the kowtowing to specific demographics that is so much a part of today's politically correctness
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Difficult issue, but at least it's left to a jury, rather than a social worker or judge.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	or Fully informed jury assoc. outlook that juries have the right to decide the validity of laws as well as guilt of accused .
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But don't you mean "unless a jury finds compelling evidence of"?"

16.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.6%	18.4%	100.0%
Commenters	54.4%	45.6%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	By specifying jury, you are limiting the ability to have mediators or judges involved. Also, this clause can be twisted if you find a jury that would convict someone of abuse by forcing them to go to church, for example. Leave this last sentence as is it. If a child is found to be abused, their guardian can be changed by the court.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree-but still with the addition I indicated in the previous proposal added to this one.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"abuse" and "neglect" are too vague. Abuse could be spanking, and neglect could be forgetting to pick up a child. I'm okay with reckless endangerment. We have more to fear from abusive government than abusive parents.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Change "abuse" to "physical abuse." Some nuts might claim that raising a child to be tolerant of homosexuals somehow constitutes "abuse," but nobody could claim that constitutes physical abuse.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is a good amendment, but instead of simply adding it to the original plank, this amendment should be added to the proposed revision of plank 3.5.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Combined with the previous change, this could work.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"Abuse" is too vague and could be interpreted to be almost anything. Same for "neglect" and "reckless endangerment". Absolutely oppose.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Fine, but probably doesn't belong in a Federal platform. State or local, certainly.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Good add.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	This added language would be a positive change, *if* it included the additional clause, "or a child becomes legally independent." Without that clause, children are denied the possibility of legal emancipation.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Is religious brainwashing of very young children considered to be "abuse" as it is a serious problem that many fail to recognize in American.

16.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.6%	18.4%	100.0%
Commenters	54.4%	45.6%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Support this along with the rewrite of the balance of 3.5 as outlined in the prior recommendation (page)
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'm hesitant about this one due to the sometimes broad definition of "neglect". A parent eschewing "modern medicine" for natural or alternative treatments for their children have that right and should not be charged with neglect (this has happened). This includes vaccinations.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, the federal government should only be involved in protection of our freedoms! Many of these issues are mute when looked at this way.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This also is an improvement.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I like this one better than the other.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	It is hard to imagine this plank turning anyone off.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I wholeheartedly agree but some, like myself, consider forced religious education to be tantamount to child abuse. Do we define, somewhere, what would constitute "abuse, neglect, or reckless endangerment" or do we just assume that the laws on these crimes are already defined?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Jury is key.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Who would determine abuse, neglect, or reckless endangerment prior to a jury determination?
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Very clumsily worded.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A jury could find the addition to negate the first half. I prefer the wording on the question before.

16.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.6%	18.4%	100.0%
Commenters	54.4%	45.6%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Based on my understanding of the objective of the principle, I would agree with it, however I think further detail can be provided. Perhaps my beliefs do not align with the Libertarian Party, but I do feel that the government should protect the well-being of children by removing them from situations deemed to be an immediate risk to physical and/or mental health. This would, of course, have to be extremely well defined, as risk to health can be a variety of very minor issues, such as feeding children unhealthy food. Certainly, we do not want to leave this open to interpretation. Ultimately, the responsibility in determining the placement of the child and charges brought against parents should be left up to a jury. Government though, needs the ability to take immediate action by removing a child in a very limited number of situations. I might be looking at this under a microscope when it is more of a broad outline, so I'm sorry if I'm bringing too much detail to the issue.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Not wrong, just too much.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	New addition should be added to the previous proposal to eliminate duplication.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	This is ok. OK to take out first sentence.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Adding stronger language clarifying the role of a jury here might be better.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If the "personal culture" or/and "political affiliation" suggestions in the previous recommendation are accepted, then please include here as well.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Same comment regarding "age," what about minors? Personal habits can be a problem. There was a problem (I believe it was in Morristown, N.J.) with a library "customer" who refused to bathe and keep to personal hygiene. They had a problem keeping him out.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Who will bring the problem to the jury? Than should be the lawsuit?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	terrific

16.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.6%	18.4%	100.0%
Commenters	54.4%	45.6%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't believe it should be before a jury. Family Court may need revamping as well (the laws that govern). Non-jury "trials" (for lack of a better word) are more appropriate.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Libertarians embrace the concept that all people are equal under the law and born with certain inherent rights. We reject the idea that a natural right can ever impose an obligation upon others to fulfill that "right." Government should neither deny nor abridge any individual's human right based upon sex, wealth, ethnicity, creed, age, national origin, personal habits, political preference or sexual orientation. Parents, or other guardians, have the right to raise their children according to their own standards and beliefs.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I begrudging support...I think it might be better to clarify "abuse", people tend to bandy the word about anytime a parent makes a choice different then them (a short trip to a "mom's board" is evidence of that), but I support the intent of the addition.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I totally agree that the last sentence needs to be added.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the first one more, though~
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	That sounds as if throwing governmental control right back into it. "Government makes the laws juries enforce.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Use the first half of the previous proposal with this added sentence. I just about made a comment on that on the last page, but then you fixed it!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What type of "abuse" do you mean? Who decides what constitutes "neglect"? What is "reckless endangerment"?

16.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.6%	18.4%	100.0%
Commenters	54.4%	45.6%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Thinking of possible exceptions to parts of planks may lead to a slippery slope: there are probably specific circumstance exceptions for many parts of our platform, both existing and proposed. My understanding is that the platform is supposed to stay tightly focused on over-arching general principles, where possible being specific for clarity and ease of understanding. If this "asterisk clause" is added for this plank, i'd want to go read all the others and think about exceptions to be raised—and enumerated—for those.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	unless a jury finds evidence of abuse,.....
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Use of a jury may be an improvement over current child welfare practices, but I oppose championing the use of juries as an exclusive improvement.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	abuse or neglect can be a very subjective idea. juries can be as tyrannical as any other entity If a parent feels it is in the best intests of the child to deny medical care (in protection of their soul) why should a jury who don't have that belief say it is endangerment.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Too specific and not necessary
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the proposed change, however I think the current language is a bit stilted/awkward. I would recommend a minor rewording.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the idea of what is being added, but don't like the language being used. Something along the lines of "....provided it does not violate the rights or well being of the child through abuse, neglect or reckless endangerment." seems to flow better to me.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Muddies the water. Not needed in the Platform. I think it is better explained elsewhere, or better understood in part within the fraud and non-agression principles.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Yes, but let's not be naive about the sticky wicket involved in detecting child abuse by parents or other adults. Again I am a Libertarian, but not an Anarchist.

16.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.6%	18.4%	100.0%
Commenters	54.4%	45.6%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Sometimes children must be protected from adults, if we eliminate the government as a protector who will bring this abuse to trial?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would prefer the term "absent evidence of abuse, neglect or endangerment, which are examples of violations of another person's Constitutional rights.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, this presents a more reasonable side to the Libertarian position.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'm confused about how these two proposals go together. I support the blue sentence from the first proposal appended with the blue sentence here.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	As in a previous comment, I would instead be in favor of developing a separate section related to the issues of children.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i'd add the background to it too ('breaking the parent/child bond is a serious decision that belongs in the realm of a jury, rather than a bureaucracy')
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	In addition, parents should have the right to face their accusers (just as in any other court system) and defend themselves against false and untrue claims. In the present system, parents (guardians) are guilty until proven innocent. That's backwards.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	reckless endangerment is too vague. is smoking around your child, letting them ride their bike without a helmet, letting them sit in the front seat of the car reckless endangerment. This is somewhat protected because of the phrase "unless a jury finds", but there is a history of evidence that the majority will use their view to impose their beliefs on the minority, however in the context I don't think that it deviates from the overall message.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Also.... What about favoritism?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But, please, drop the dash. And make it clear that it is the parents the jury is to find abusive, neglectful, etc. "standards and beliefs, unless a jury finds one or both parents guilty of abuse, neglect or reckless endangerment."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'm glad to see "a jury", and not "a judge."

16.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.6%	18.4%	100.0%
Commenters	54.4%	45.6%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Gov't can sway juries. As reported some gov't employees participate in illegal activities with children "abducted" from their parents !
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	How about parents who want to educate children to destroy or harm others or to harm or oppress those who the parents dislike.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would say, "— unless a jury finds undeniable evidence of abuse, neglect, or reckless endangerment."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the new language in this proposal, and the new language from the last one, combined.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We condemn face-to-face bigotry . . . Governments. . . .abridge any individual's right to the peaceful exercise of his liberty for any reason.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	not necessarily important
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, do we want to say that the right to vote should be limited only to people not ruled incompetent? Statements of principle can make some assumptions!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think the added wording should be added to the first proposed changes to 3.5. This would make it strongest.

16.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.6%	18.4%	100.0%
Commenters	54.4%	45.6%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't like the wording, what is to define abuse, neglect, or reckless endangerment? does spanking a child leaving no marks and causing no damage to eh child constitute abuse? I have spoken to some parents who consider any physical contact "abusive" and they believe that the only proper way is to confine the child to their room or to take away the TV. Does lack of the internet to do research for school or the refusal to provide a 5 year old with a cell phone so they can call the parent if they get lost or something constitute neglect if it is provided by everyone else on the jury? Does allowing a 5 year old to ride in the front seat of a car reckless endangerment? My mom was raised in a generation where cars didn't have seat belts or airbags, if a 10 year old road in the front seat of a Studebaker, Model T or '57 Chevy does this constitute reckless endangerment because modern safety devices are not found on these vehicles? My confidence in modern juries is not very high.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	And if the jury happens to be 12 people too politically biased?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think this addition adds important protection for children.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I would eliminate "neglect," which can be very subjective. Also, I would like to see the jury be drawn from members of the local community.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I doubt that anyone finds a right to child abuse in the old language. Have suggested substitute language that eliminates that sentence entirely.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support this one over the last one. It would be nice if I could see both proposals and choose the one I liked best. I would like to see both proposals for this plank combined. However, if I can have only one, I want this one due to the protection of children.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	delete this section entirely until a better proposal is put forth
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think this is even clearer than the first proposal

16.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.6%	18.4%	100.0%
Commenters	54.4%	45.6%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Criminal laws already deal sufficiently with abuse -- assault, battery, theft, or murder. Neglect and reckless endangerment are too nebulous and subject to misinterpretation to be part of a political platform.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	In an earlier plank you removed the phrase "We condem...". This plank may need to be revised to meet the same standard while not weakening the purpose of this plank.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think it should be rewritten - it is an awkward addition to the proposal.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This change should be tacked onto the first proposed change.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We need a better, separate plank related to children. It would be better to move the second sentence there.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	maybe this point can be integrated better but now it sounds too technical and just tagged on to the end.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	oh yeah
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	reiterate jury of peers, not a board of judges or bureaucrats.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'm not sure about the wording. I think there should more about due process; to make it clear that the state must go through a process and that the rights of the parents' and/or guardians' as well as the child's are being respected and protected.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	However - who is going to determine/define what constitutes abuse or reckless endangerment. Does spanking a child constitute abuse - In Kalifornia it does!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Excellent!!!!!!!!!!!!

16.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.6%	18.4%	100.0%
Commenters	54.4%	45.6%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Rewrite: "We abhor bigotry as irrational and unjust. However, we support any individual's right to be bigoted as long as that individual does not initiate or threaten violence against anyone else, or steal from them, or defraud them. We support every individual's right to think their own thoughts, and express them, without endorsing them. The libertarian principle of non-aggression of course extends to parents; no one has the right to violate anyone else's rights to be safe in their persons. Any accusations of parental violence or abuse of their children must be proved and appropriate measures taken to correct the situation through witness testimony and evidence to a local community arbitration judge/magistrate and jury of peers of local community neighbors of the parents. Their findings, based on witness testimony and evidence, will be legal and binding on the parents found to be abusing, sexually molesting, and/or neglecting their children." After all, without a nanny government, who is to say what is "reckless endangerment"? Suppose a child wants to rid
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	or here illegally
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	It is an unnecessary expansion of our language that opens more questions than it answers.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The wording is too vague and elastic. Juries might believe a kid should be forced to take Ritalin, for example, and they might say the parents are negligent if they don't make the kid take it. I'm all for making sure children are properly treated, but the wording of the last sentence leaves too much room for mischief and the abridgement of liberty.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This new section should be obvious as in a litigious society as ours.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I liked the first version better.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Children should NEVER EVER be subjected to abuse of any kind. I think a jury is more fair- a trial hearing beats a social worker coming to the house to see the parents on their best behavior- they will never see the abuse like they will hear about it on the stand.

16.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.6%	18.4%	100.0%
Commenters	54.4%	45.6%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Glad you said "jury" instead of social worker.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I disagree that a bureaucracy might not do better.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This should be addressed under the section(s) addressing criminality. Child abuse is not any individual's right, so no qualification needs to be made.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	unless a jury finds a parent or guardian GUILTY of abuse, neglect, or reckless endangerment.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I appreciate and fully support the protection of children clause, but does this current form conflict or complicate the sentence in the previous recommendation about obligation to fulfill a natural right?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Agree some thing should be said as some parental standards and beliefs may be harmful to children. A jury seems the logical place to make this distinction.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Rewrite. The new part seems like an afterthought. I would recommend a rewrite to incorporate it more into the proposal.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the original proposal as is.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Jurys seem to act on LAWS, Laws made by people whom have been stuck in a paradigm or republican/Democrat. As the constitution reads of a three tier system, we need 3 parties (in office) to have a real 2 tier system. that when you can find the true center.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	unless those beliefs involve the abuse, neglect, endangerment, or violation of the childs own human rights as found by a jury.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Corn is raised; children are reared.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would strike the word a jury finds and add are found at the e4nd. Children should not be raised in such a matter as to violate their basic rights.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But.....what is to be done with the children while a jury decides.....??
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What is abuse? What is neglect? What is reckless endangerment? Does a jury decide? How does one know beforehand that the conduct will be abusive, negligent or reckless?

16.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.6%	18.4%	100.0%
Commenters	54.4%	45.6%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	too micro-management to declare that it's only a problem when decided by a jury. "Parents or other guardians have the right to raise their children according to their own standards and beliefs, and the responsibility to foster an environment without abuse, neglect, or reckless endangerment."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would put that part in parentheses.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	i would also add that whoever brought the "charges" up would have to fully compensate the parent should these charges be found baseless.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Unnecessary.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Why didn't you have these two on the same page like the first plank? I generally like this one better than the last, with the exception noted on the previous page -- about government discrimination FOR people on the basis of their race, et cetera.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Add this line to my last copy suggestion and it would sum up everything tightly.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support this change but do not feel the added language is clear, specific, or comprehensive enough.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the previous plank with this addendum.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Isn't that always the case in crime, though? By stating it, specifically, are we limiting or (worse) exacerbating responses to perceived acts?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Define bigotry?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i think children would need to be removed from the household LONG before it goes to a jury trial..
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	but when do kid's right begin?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Merge this with the first one.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Needs to be expanded a bit: a jury will rule on established law for the most part. Children should be raised to be not bullies, bigoted or racist themselves. A tall order.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I guess that's better, but I still think it's extraneous.

16.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.6%	18.4%	100.0%
Commenters	54.4%	45.6%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	This is a limitation on parental rights and an unnecessary statement. There are already laws against murdering, mutilating, torturing or otherwise endangering your children.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Not relevant to rights and discrimination topic.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Getting too deep into the weeds.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support with caution. A jury that leans too far to the left might find it emotionally abusive to homeschool based on a christian foundation.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Jury over bureaucracy is crucial in all areas, but i like it being the wording in this proposal.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	courts and government agencies must not have any rights above those of the parents, save for physical endangerment, and no court or government agency should ever be allowed to break up a family, save for physical endangerment; this government meddling is the number 1 reason American society has deteriorated to the level it now stands
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Juries aren't allowed to judge the law anymore. The law too often makes crimes up and the juries too often just base their decisions on facts and the existing laws without recognizing their ability to judge the law in question.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Suggested alternative change: "; the government should intervene only in provable cases of abuse, gross neglect, or reckless endangerment." Since the standard of proof in legal matters is the opinion of a jury, the ultimate test of whether or not an intervention is legitimate remains a jury trial, but this wording does not give the appearance of precluding emergency action before a trial.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Only concern with the added language is that government definitions of abuse or neglect could be expanded beyond what those terms are commonly understood to mean.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Juries find a lot of things that aren't there.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This addition I could agree with.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	This is clear an unambiguous.

16.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.6%	18.4%	100.0%
Commenters	54.4%	45.6%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I like this one even better since it addresses child abuse and pedophilia.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Suggest combining both proposals. Difficulty here is that the bureaucracy defines what constitutes abuse, neglect or endangerment.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Parents often waive a jury in these kinds of cases. Instead of "unless a jury finds" insert "unless there is an adjudication of".
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would substitute "court" for "jury"
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	This statement is implied already, and advocating for it adds a new layer: That government should investigate how each of us raise our children. This reminds me of the recent story from NC where the government decided a child's lunch was unfit to eat because it didn't have any vegetables in it. A jury could end up agreeing with the government on this. Raising a child in an Amish household could be considered torture by San Francisco jury standards.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Note the word "JURY". This does NOT apply for only a judge, it MUST be a jury
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Government raising kids is worse than neglectful parents. 1 in 10 children in the "system" are being sexually abused by their foster parents. The additional wording here leaves open speculation as to what is being advocated here.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think this sentence should be included in the previous proposal.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	jury is the key
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	As "abuse, neglect or reckless endangerment" are not defined here, they could be interpreted very broadly. Is it neglect to not feed a child meat? Is it abuse to spank a child? I would say "no," in both cases, but these are reasonable interpretations. Far more extreme positions could be seen as supported by the amended sentence, and such interpretations erode the personal liberties and rights of parents for circumstances which are not truly abuse, neglect, or endangerment.

16.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.6%	18.4%	100.0%
Commenters	54.4%	45.6%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I understand what you are getting at here, but "jury" implies a trial, and the LP opens itself to extreme ridicule by suggesting that a child should have to wait on the slow and deliberated proceedings of the trial courts before he or she can be protected from abuse, neglect or reckless endangerment. Certainly a police officer who discovers that a child is endangered should be able to interfere with a parents rights, albeit temporarily, on the spot without waiting for a jury trial.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	you are mixing two different topics. all individuals, including children are protected from harm and the rights and rights and discrimination was covered in the previous proposal
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Have seen too many instances of neglect when a jury is going to be too slow to prevent a tragedy.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Support ONLY in addition to the previous proposed change.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would change the word "Unless" to "entill"
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You can harass someone endlessly dragging them through a legal procedures.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Eliminate entirely. See previous comments.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	That is a tough one. I understand the language added and why it was added but I have seen cases where a jury still ruled against a family when it was really just a different culture that was being viewed as abusive...don't know if that makes sense but I guess I support this language.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The problem with this is that "abuse, neglect, or reckless endangerment" need to be defined.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I agree with the intent, but this looks like what it is, an afterthought, an add-on. How about something like "Parents can forfeit this right if found by a jury to be guilty of abuse ..."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would think that other laws concerning abuse, neglect or endangerment would cover this aspect without having to add it to a "plank."

16.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.6%	18.4%	100.0%
Commenters	54.4%	45.6%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	A jury suggests a criminal trial, as you only have a right to a jury in civil trials in cases involving monetary damages. There are civil and administrative proceedings proceedings in which children are taken from their parents, for example, so "jury" should probably be changed to "court."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	excellent!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	See previous comment.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I feel the statement is unnecessary.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	remove the "jury" part. Doesn't sound right.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Kind of support... Unless their peers (not government) find the parent or guardian guilty of abuse, neglect, etc.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Define abuse, neglect, or reckless endangerment. The CPS and law makers tend to exaggerate these terms beyond the realm of actual abuse, making it difficult for parents to successfully discipline their children.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	abuse and neglect are subjective
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Why the hell would you want to add that? Why would you think that a jury chosen - for the most part - randomly would have the right to make a permanent decision that the individual? Am I missing something here?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Drop the added conditions.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The clause is just very out of place in this area.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	abuse and neglect are to subjective and ambiguous and a jury finding doesn't protect from that. Standards for abuse & neglect are necessary
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	add to second sentence: ...deny, abridge OR FAVOR...
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	This one is MUCH better with addition of last sentence.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Never mind, this fixed that.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think the explanation of the purpose for this change provides better clarity. Instead of the proposed addition, add a final sentence: "Breaking the parent/child bond is a serious decision that belongs in the realm of a jury, rather than a bureaucracy."

16.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.6%	18.4%	100.0%
Commenters	54.4%	45.6%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	this proposal seems to endorse jury judgments over others without really stating the obligation parents have to their children,,, much better to add "so long as the parents respect the rights of their children" ... or something similar
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	still don't see why it's here
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"Neglect" being illegal implies a positive right on the part of the "victim." We Libertarians only believe in negative liberties, remember?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, the separation of church and state implications here need to be made more clearly. This statement allows a "religious jury" to say that abortion is "reckless endangerment" or something equally ridiculous. The jury must be held to the letter of the non-religious LAW, not their own beliefs... then I agree.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Could be better to define the subset of adult rights that convey to children.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I like the requirement for a jury in cases where children are being harmed but this needs to be re-worded. I have no suggestions at the moment but can not support it as written.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	See the previous question comment with regards to choices versus things that a person cannot change. You might want to define what you think the definition of abuse is. Spanking vs. waterboarding for example.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It does beg the question, "What happens until the jury speaks?"
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It would be great to see something in here about 50/50 parenting being the presumptive norm in cases of divorce.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Oh yes, I like this addition very much.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Uneasy about this one.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	sure, .

16.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.6%	18.4%	100.0%
Commenters	54.4%	45.6%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Juries don't just magically arise in every situation. It is only when a crime is committed, or there is a civil dispute covered by civil law, that a jury is sometimes permitted. Therefore, the change should read: "unless after a fair hearing, a judge and/or a jury finds..." "Juries are required to be optional to the parents whenever parental rights are being adjudicated"
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	this is a tough one - what if i have a jury that believes every kid should be vaccinated regardless of what the parent thinks - or if i believe that cancer should not be treated with chemicals and radiation and choose an alternate route for a quality of life no matter how short - that could be construed as reckless endangerment by a jury.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The government is not a living being able of recognizing sex, wealth, ethnicity, creed, age, national origin, personal habits, political preference or sexual orientation. The government only recognizes a citizen or not a citizen. Recognizing this about government makes this statement unnecessary.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A jury may find spanking "abusive" and even religion as abusive. A jury could be the worst tyrant!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support this with a small reservation. No definition of what constitutes a jury is given.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the sentiment of the proposal, but it seems a bit vague.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	protection of an individual from harm, no matter their age or by whom covers everyone. No specific comment is needed. Example: The murder of a gay person is murder. No additional law is needed.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A child should have some say in whether to break the parent/child bond. The choice of guardianship should not be made by government. Think grandparents or godparents.

16.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.6%	18.4%	100.0%
Commenters	54.4%	45.6%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I suggest this as the last sentence: Parents, or other guardians, have the right to raise their children according to their own standards and beliefs with regard to the rights of those children.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I understand the thought, but this doesn't address the evils perpetrated by 'protective service' bureaucracies, which are overall much more detrimental than the relatively rare true instances of child abuse.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Yes!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, what about religion? Presently Juries are a bureaucracy. Look at LCDR Walt Fitzpatrick's case in Monroe County TN. Judge hand-picked stacked juries selected for a particular pre-determined outcome. This is happening all over the USA.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is very good
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is a sticky matter as who deems it neglect or reckless endangerment. As a former LEO, I do not condone these acts, I believe the statement could be made clearer.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Allows for to broad an interpretation. The jury component does not do enough to ensure a narrow and well defined scope on what constitutes abuse, neglect, or endangerment.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Isn't this redundant? We have a plank that discusses due process.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"unless found guilty by a jury of ones peers of..."
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	This one is better than the first one.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Consider specifically stating that a jury, not a bureaucratic agency finds due cause.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think that this is a very important and much-needed addition, as some parents' 'standards and beliefs' support forms of abuse.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Title 14 Jury?
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I was tempted to agree with this, but I worry about a jury finding those things when they don't exist, especially in the name of political correctness.

16.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.6%	18.4%	100.0%
Commenters	54.4%	45.6%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There's that ridiculous enumeration of discriminatory bases again. And how is a jury going to find abuse, unless people spy on each other and decide that those who instill in their children ideas opposed to the snoopers' are somehow abusive. Richard Dawkins has defined religious indoctrination as child abuse. Some parents may also believe in teaching bigotry and intolerance of others. Yet the protection of free choice requires us to accept even ideas repugnant to us, as long as they do not abrogate others' equal rights. In any dispute, one person's rights may not trammel someone else's.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Isn't this simply the consequence of any trial? Why do we need this?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Change; "We condemn bigotry as irrational and repugnant." to "Bigotry is irrational and repugnant!" Again the pervasive use of the lame word: "should" ought to be replaced with "must!"
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	again - I kind of question having a parent/child discussion as elements of some planks. Maybe a plank all it's own - if at all. I think this is an area that is a bit complex, and do not see it as being that necessary for a plank. but if we do have it as part of a plank, then I would probably leave the qualifiers off.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	the last sentence needs work. When is a spank on the bottom considered abuse or discipline? Parents need to be able to discipline their children where, when and how it is needed. My fear is that the 'jury' will interpret good ol discipline as abuse.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	the previous seems contrary to this???
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I said this on another page.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A finding by a jury should not be required before a child is taken from an abusive situation.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Better.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	See above
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would start 2nd sentence with "Responsible parents...."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The basic idea is good, but the wording should be different.

16.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.6%	18.4%	100.0%
Commenters	54.4%	45.6%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I like the idea. However, the hyphen seems a little too powerful and sudden in the sentence, and takes away from the "Parents, or other guardians, have the right to raise their children according to their own standards and beliefs" section.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Should be included with change number one.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This proposal leaves too much out and too much undetermined. The terms in which a jury would be arranged pursuant to a claim of abuse and the inherent investigations need to be specifically clarified. Also, the risk of future government figures utilizing the idea that teaching dissent to federal rule or other such mandates constitutes abuse of a child is blatant and horrifying.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Ah, there you go. But why are we talking about juries? That's the trial. The <u>_right_</u> ends at the violent act. "...as long as they avoid abuse, neglect or reckless endangerment of any child."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This fact-finding could be done by a judge as well, which the parent has the freedom to choose over a jury trial if they think it will benefit them.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support this statement if it is added to the previous proposal. I do not support this proposal as written.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What constitutes "abuse, neglect, or reckless endangerment?"
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I feel like a broken record. Who wrote these things? What does the last sentence have to do with the first two? I do agree that taking a child from a parent is very serious but not sure we could have a jury trial for each instance. I tend to think Family Court judges are equipped to handle this. Our courts are crowded already. This would become overwhelming to the system.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the idea, but implementation of the jury trial would have to be prompt in order to avoid permanent damage to the child. The procedural aspects of implementing this well-intentioned proposal would be difficult.

16.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.6%	18.4%	100.0%
Commenters	54.4%	45.6%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think the wording is cumbersome, but the idea conveyed is sound.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	children have rights just like everyone else (i.e. anyone found guilty of abuse of another human being would be convicted and sanctioned as per the laws of their state). I can't see how this is a platform.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I grudgingly support this. I think it could be improved by simply including "abuse", rather than "abuse, neglect, or reckless endangerment". Things that would have been considered perfectly reasonable a generation ago are often considered neglect or endangerment today. Any truly abusive neglect or endangerment would be covered by the word "abuse".
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'm not totally sure this needs to be spelled out.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	need to restrict that a bit more. I don't want a jury of nitwits telling me how to raise my kids. The only time intervention makes sense is in a true abusive situation. Not because someone got their feelings hurt (and no, I'm not anywhere close to that with my kids)
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It might be wise to call in the appropriate amendment of the Bill of Rights here to clearly found the trial by jury aspect.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	What gives the jury the power of omniscience or omnipotence? Who is the omnipotent legislator who will craft the law to be used by the jurors? I understand the desire/necessity to protect the kids, but this is pretty sloppy writing for a platform.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	That is not in the domain of the "state"
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	it should be changed to - unless, abuse, neglect or reckless endangerment is proven.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I like the sentiment here, but the proposed wording seems oddly specific.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This might be better if worked into the first proposal.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	the statement of Parental Rights does not need to be qualified, particularly because the terms "abuse," "neglect" and "reckless endangerment" would then need to be defined. You're getting into the weeds. Stick with the principles.

16.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.6%	18.4%	100.0%
Commenters	54.4%	45.6%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	By thee time the jury system is completted, the "child in danger" will be 60 years old. To late to help him.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Support the Concept, however, it could be incorporated into the plank more gracefully.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support this clariication, assuming it will be meregd with eth preceding proposed change.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Hard to imagine an argument against this one other than the need for police to intervene in a case of imminent danger.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Juries can be and are often terribly wrong. An individuals rights can be stripped from them by a jury just as much as they can be by any judge.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	better
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	again...use gender vs. sex.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Alright.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Definitely support this addition, along with the previous change.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the addition here but not the original language of the plank. I voted to support the overall new wording of the plank in recommendation 13.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'd support both of these proposals. Bigots do have the right to their repugnant views.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would also add your purpose sentence from above, "Breaking the parent/child bond is a serious decision that belongs in the realm of a jury, rather than a bureaucracy."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I still think the last line about raising children is not needed, but if we have to have it then this addition is more beneficial.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	#NAME?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would remove the word neglect as "neglect" could mean something unintended by the writers and Reckless endangerment covers true neglect as well.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I would change "jury" to "court". Also, should include, "we respect the rights of an individual or private business to operate with freedom and not held to the same standards as government."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Good amendment.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	duh!

16.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.6%	18.4%	100.0%
Commenters	54.4%	45.6%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is a very slippery slope. Note that these decisions are usually made by bureaucrats and judges (many of whom think it's "abuse" not to vaccinate your children) rather than juries. No no no no no no no no no no no.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	but there should be some suggested guidelines, that if considered, would reduce the amount of taxes, an individual pays. (an incentive to do the well-understood, best thing)
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Amen. That's exactly what I proposed in answer to the previous question.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Thoughtful libertarians can disagree on the rights of children. Vagueness might be better than the proposed change.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Should be better defined so that "community standards" or other arbitrary standards are unfairly applied against parents in actual abuse and endangerment cases.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	for jury substitute court.... it matters.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Individuals have the right to be irrational and repugnant and should not be persecuted for such beliefs. Government should be indifferent to individuals beliefs so long as those belief do not rise to the level of denying others of their rights.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Protects rights of children
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I may agree, but the word, "abuse" is a slippery slope of future problems.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There needs to be a separate section for children's rights. This should state clearly that the government has an obligation to protect the rights of children, and that the Judicial branch is the only way to do it.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	protects the rights of minors
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The word "jury" needs to be expanded to " or other judicial authority." A jury seems awfully slow and cumbersome for many of these cases where children's lives might be at risk.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Protecting the rights of children is a separate matter in and of itself. Rather than adding to existing statements, these ideas should be made clear on their own.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Unnecessary.

16.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.6%	18.4%	100.0%
Commenters	54.4%	45.6%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer, "... unless convicted by a jury of abuse, neglect or reckless endangerment."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You have to be more specific like "I WILL GIVE TO EACH AMERICAN A \$75,000 LIVING CARD IF YOU ELECT ME FOR U.S. PRESIDENT"; "I WILL ISSUE \$50 TRILLION NEW FIAT MONEY ELIMINATING THE FEDERAL RESERVE"; "WE WILL MANUFACTURE ONE HUNDRED PERCENT IN AMERICA USING THE FEDERAL LANDS CREATING 100 JOBS". If you need help call me to 571-288-7383. My family could donate also \$100 million to your PAC. Thanks Alberto Lopez WWW.EBLM.US
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	NEEDS TO BE MORE SPECIFIC-IN SOME CASES, GOVT. MAY FIND SPANKING, FOR INSTANCE, TO BE CHILD ABUSE EVEN THOUGH MANY FAMILIES MAY REGARD IT AS LEGITIMATE FORM OF DISCIPLINE
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The em dash preceding the final clause is unnecessary.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I find this better than the previous one. But a jury works as a type of slavery, at least in the current system (if they call me for jury duty, I have no choice but to serve, whether I want to or not, even though they (sometimes) pay me a token amount). You need to reword this to eliminate that entire issue. Again, you need to define "sane" or "adult" in some way, such that you can leave the determination of things like child abuse as, legitimately, ambiguous (for the purposes of this platform).
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I like the previous choice. I don't like keeping that first sentence here. Also, I think it is not necessary to spell out the fact that parents can lose the right to raise their children. I think that is something everyone realizes and agrees with.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Drop sentence 2. You forgot religion and trans gendered and whatever else. This is a whole can of worms that shouldn't be opened.

16.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.6%	18.4%	100.0%
Commenters	54.4%	45.6%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Emphasis on "jury". A single government employee isn't always the best judge of abuse or neglect.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I was trying to add to the previous plank's ending such a concept. Agreed.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Somehow, we need to see how private justice can perform all tasks better than "public" justice monopolies.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Parents do not have the right to abuse and neglect the rights of their children, no matter what a jury finds. Are you saying child abuse is OK if it is kept secret and law enforcement never finds out about it? That would be ridiculous and a total violation of the rights and liberties of children.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	This is a minarchist alteration, that finds that a jury, presumably one run by the government, with voir dire rules that can be used to exclude libertarians, can make findings on the fitness of a parent and take away a parent's children. A slippery slope that is better not addressed, at least not with the current wording.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I would add this to the previous proposed change. It only makes sense if one of the earlier proposals on personal rights keeps the current wording "individuals" rather than "adults." The above fits our philosophy if one considers that children have rights to not be abused, neglected, or endangered--beyond those legally specified boundaries a parent has full freedom to raise a child as desired.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would support this change on the first proposal, not with the original text.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Big step forward for the Libertarians!
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Jeeez. Rodney King said it best.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Not a sufficiently significant issue to warrant space in the platform.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Combine with the previous plank.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I object to the amendment.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Yes, I couldn't work as a social worker because sending kids back to abusive parents is repugnant.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	This proposal still needs more work. However, I (sorry) don't have time to make suggestions until a later date--maybe by the next platform writing.

16.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.6%	18.4%	100.0%
Commenters	54.4%	45.6%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is the minimum but it does not go far enough. You need to define what it means to raise a child. This is totally inadequate.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is an improvement, but a rather poor one. Wording needs further work to better state the same idea. Also, the word "jury" makes it too narrow and specific. (I realize we don't want to have bureaucrats and czars dictating such things, but a "jury" is not the only option (and the list 'abuse, neglect, or reckless endangerment" is far too narrow and specific. this one also needs more work!
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Children aren't parents' property, so it's finally up to the children where they want to live. I think we need better language here.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Be careful. The gov't might redefine a "jury" as one bureaucrat. Better use our Founders wisdom and state "jury OF PEERS".
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	No comment
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	However, I am aware of several Wiccans who have lost custody of their children simply because they tried to raise them in their religion instead of christian. In at least two cases, they were ordered to not take their children to any Wiccan ceremony or even mention anything about Wicca and their children were forced to go to christian churches. So there should be some wording to the effect that simply wanting to raise their children in an unpopular religion is not abuse.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	this should be combined with the proposal for plank 3.5 on page 13
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	See previous comments regarding first two sentences.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Support the addition provided it's made to the rewritten version of this plank, and not the sole change made to the existing plank.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I'm neutral on this one. I agree with the sentiment, but real cases of such malfeasance are comparatively rare, while juries have sometimes been led astray by emotion or prejudice.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Don't believe in juries.

16.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.6%	18.4%	100.0%
Commenters	54.4%	45.6%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Maybe this is the place to include: "Individual racism is bad; institutional racism is worse; and governmental racism is the worst of all".
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	delete the blue statement
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Conditionally Support. Denying access to information should be considered abuse.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Understand - I don't disagree with the new line in principal, however, it implies oversight by society. I do not consider my fellow man my final arbiter in advance. It hangs as a threat over parents.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Yes some thing like that a bout the kids - but maybe even more detailed.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	give this one to the lawyers
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Unnecessary nit-picking. Nothing in the platform alludes to the thought that we don't believe that bad behavior should be punished, or that people always act in the best of ways.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would insert "...provided that the exercise of those rights do not harm or injure their children which can only be determined by a jury."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We should give some consideration to amending the word "jury" to "trial court," thereby allowing the possibility of trial-level judges making that determination. Alternatively, we could reject that entirely and mandate that the right to raise children is so fundamental that its abridgement should exclusively be a matter for a jury of one's peers, and never a judge sitting alone.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Implied.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is better. Lots of nutcase parents out there.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Substitute "court" for "jury."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What jury where?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	neither support nor oppose
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	the addition seems to legitimize government interfering in raising children, even if via court cases

16.0 - Rights and Discrimination - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	81.6%	18.4%	100.0%
Commenters	54.4%	45.6%	11.4%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I like the general idea, but I don't like the express mention of a jury here. Abuse, neglect and reckless endangerment are functions of responsibility. I would say instead "Parents, or other guardians, have the right to raise their children _responsibly_ according to their own standards and beliefs."

17.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	93.3%	6.7%	100.0%
Commenters	64.4%	35.6%	6.7%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would, however, like to see us include literacy as a prerequisite to voting. An uneducated populace is anathema.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Financial support of a candidate should be made public to allow voters to be aware of influence peddling, although reducing the power of government would reduce the incentive for people to try to buy influence.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Flawed, argument: Subject to 50 state interpretation, and an historical reading, too much of the above, was standard practice, prior to 1890. Then came the ONE Party fear of 3rd parties/individuals, seeing them elected to office, and displacing the ONE Candidate/Party individuals, and the cumshaw that the ONE party politicians acquire. You might also want to Subscribe to Ballot Access News, as his historical knowledge may exceed mine, on this issue.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The only reason I oppose this is this part- "We call for an end to any tax-financed subsidies to candidates or parties and the repeal of all laws which restrict voluntary financing of election campaigns." I think the cause of the corruption in government is campaign financing. I believe too much money is spent. I knew something was going very wrong with this country when campaigns began to cost a million dollars. This is more than some people make in a lifetime. It seems odd to me that one would spend so much money for the position of servant to the public. I think there should be a tax that the people pay to cover our elections. Let the elections belong to the people and not to only those who buy the votes. I think the corporations do not belong in this area, nor do I consider them to be a person. Abraham Lincoln spoke of this. "I see in the near future a crisis approaching that unnerves me and causes me to tremble for the safety of my country. ... corporations have been enthroned and an era of corruption in high places will follow, and the money power of the country will endeavour to

17.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	93.3%	6.7%	100.0%
Commenters	64.4%	35.6%	6.7%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't think that changing the word from "electoral" to "voting" clarifies what you are trying to say. I think you can just skip that first sentence completely and it would be clearer.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think the "electoral" system is important to prevent big city States from overriding local representation, so I'd recommend leaving that word in with the new word "voting", so I oppose the removed word, not the new one.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	When you say "more representative", did you mean "proportionally representative"? If we don't remove money from politics, the LP doesn't stand a chance. I think that we should push for any party to be allowed to run for any elected position and that the win/lose decision be made on percentage of votes including automatic re-ballot if more than 50% of votes are not obtained. By the way, there are many ways to implement such voting system cheaply.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	add: outsourcing of voting machines, materials, counting or methodology outside of the US will be opposed as a matter of national security.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The change is fine, and will clear up confusion, however, the actual current wording seems to eliminate the possibility for everyone to only have the same amount to spend on campaigns, not unlimited war chests. This would result in more fair competition and more fair elections and ensure they are open to all.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But please better define "effectively exclude alternative candidates" What does that mean?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The change is ok... but those who had electoral college concerns will still have them after this change.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Needs to be more positive. It's not "we oppose", it's "WE SUPPORT full & free elections without government funding, support, or interference".

17.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	93.3%	6.7%	100.0%
Commenters	64.4%	35.6%	6.7%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Political parties should only be allowed to establish their own rules for nomination procedures, primaries, etc. if they are also required to fund these matters. So long as the tax payers are footing the bill for the voting process, they should have a significant say in how it's done. Further, there is once again something to be said for uniformity. Having served for several years as an election judge, I can say that it would be much easier to combat electoral fraud if every precinct in every county in every state did things exactly the same way.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Because much of our population is often Nomadic by Choice or for Financial reasons. Voting Districts and Voter eligibility should be thoroughly Re thought. It Maybe Time to Move elections to Sundays. Maybe even expanding State and Federal elections to a Two day voting period, Saturday and Sundays. It may encourage indifferent Citizens to participate in the Electoral process or it could increase the sale of Fishing Licenses...
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	?? 'We oppose laws "AND ACTIVITIES" that effectively exclude ... ' ??
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I am unsure of the answer for financing candidates, if it is private finance without limits. With 99% of the wealth in a tiny number of hands, they can out-finance anyone as long as other laws are not addressed. I support this, but not without other changes in campaign financing and PACs.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Dumbing-down language caters to non-thinkers.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the change, but (and I don't know if this is addressed elsewhere) I wonder if it should be "voting systems and methods." I would consider a "voting system" to refer to either the physical device used for voting or to the entire process, while I'd consider a "voting method" the way that the winner is chosen (e.g. plurality, majority/runoff, Borda count, Condorcet methods, etc.).

17.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	93.3%	6.7%	100.0%
Commenters	64.4%	35.6%	6.7%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Money has corrupted the political system. Every elected official with very few exceptions, must sell his or her soul to the devil in order to win an election and then to fund their next campaign. I favor limiting each individual contribution to \$100.00 and \$1,000.00 per annum for an organization or group, This includes but is not limited to unions, corporations and business associations. Any organization that uses the public airways or right of way to distribute their product or service; such as broadcast TV and cable or satellite systems, printed media etc, must provide limited but equal access to all candidates with a place on the ballot. A strictly limited amount of taxpayer dollars should be equally distributed to each candidates campaign. A candidates position on the issues should determine which person and party wins the support of the voters. The current system is beyond redemption. We have the best leaders that big money can buy (but actually the worst for the nation as a whole).
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It should read" voluntary financing of election campaigns by individuals. We deny that a corporation or business has the same right of an individual in the election process"
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	No need to dumb it down.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	YES!!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	First sentence still seems to favor abolishing the electoral college, which is okay; just try to be clear. Leaving it okay for the rich to effectively buy elections is not good.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	corporations should be restricted from BUYING elected representatives as is the practice now. Not to much democracy here. They could compromise personal freedom for the sake of the profiteers who bought them

17.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	93.3%	6.7%	100.0%
Commenters	64.4%	35.6%	6.7%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is an issue where there is not correct answer. If elections are based on money, and they are, whoever gets the most money has an advantage. If we allow unlimited financing, it can be controlled by the powerful. If we restrict it, then only wealthy individuals can successfully run for office.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"federal, state and local levels" should be "federal, state, and local levels". "nomination procedures, primaries and conventions" should be "nomination procedures, primaries, and conventions".
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Think about the reading level of the typical voter when revising the platform. There must be many other points they will misunderstand.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	We should specifically oppose publicly paid for primary elections.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Imagine how I feel, every time I register as a Libertarian here in Maine and they try to call me an independent. No that's not right, they successfully call me an independent because the Libertarian party isn't allowed to exist.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If it comes about to be evident that 'The majority rule' applies there must be provisions for the minority positions when not a life and death concern
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Voluntary financing should be limited or reduced. industry and lobbys will buy the campaign.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The electorate is a throwback to slave owners. Yes!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	However, I would also support that only persons qualified to vote are permitted to monitarly support any candidate (or political party). [Corporations are not qualified to vote.]
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Also, establish that corporations and unions are NOT the same as individuals with respect to contributions.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	better wording, i can see how people could mistaken the meaning of electoral

17.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	93.3%	6.7%	100.0%
Commenters	64.4%	35.6%	6.7%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What about Citizen's United? This phrase-- "and the repeal of all laws which restrict voluntary financing of election campaigns"-- might be qualified so that elections don't just go to the group that collects the most money. Viz: Citizen's United.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Individual donations only should be allowed; corporate sponsorship of candidates should be prohibited.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	In addition to this, I would love to see proposals to make government at state and local levels made relevant again. Maybe it's time to return the election of US senators to state legislatures.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Oppose ! We should advocate the abolition of the "primaries" system. This would force all Republican candidates to run against each other, and likewise with Democrats. The result would be Libertarian candidates running against weaker R/D candidates, improving our odds. Best of all, less TV time and public resources wasted on political candidates. Unrestricted money helps other parties Dramatically more than the Libertarian party, so I would get rid of most of this plank, and focus on getting rid of primaries.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I'm not sure what this means: "We support voting systems that are more representative of the electorate at the federal, state and local levels." More representative than what?

17.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	93.3%	6.7%	100.0%
Commenters	64.4%	35.6%	6.7%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I have written a paper, the main point of which is the separation of political parties from state. Individuals run for office. Political parties should not own lines on a voting machine; but each candidate would get on the ballot adhering to same set of rules to qualify as anyone else; and that they would appear on the ballot only once. Should there be desire to allow limited space on the ballot for endorsements; fine - they can squeeze in as many names or symbols of groups supporting them as the space allows; but no longer would their access to the ballot be anyway limited to their obtaining endorsement from political bodies that are automatically on the ballot. No more would a candidate for office have to kiss the ring of a local or statewide party leader to get clearance to run. Additionally, the state would only register people to vote; the state would not take any part of enrolling voters in a particular party or keeping track of their party preferences.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	And Gary Johnson is looking for this subsidization.

17.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	93.3%	6.7%	100.0%
Commenters	64.4%	35.6%	6.7%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Clarity can be achieved using the correct language "electoral systems." "We support electoral systems which are [] representative of the electorate at the federal, state, and local levels." "Voting systems" and "electoral systems" are roughly interchangeable for our purposes. The problem is with the word "more" in the current language, not whether the word "electoral" suggests a reference to the electoral college alone. It should not, because the electoral college only exist on the federal level for Presidential elections, not for all federal, state, and local elections. Careful readers who understand overlapping jurisdictions should understand this. The Libertarian Party should not need to pander to their misunderstanding. In my view, "electoral systems" is the more proper term of art describing the system by which democracies structure themselves. By contrast, I associate "voting systems" with the actual process of voting: delivering voting booths to pollings places; carrying votes to a central office; tallying votes; etc. I may be in the minority in this view. I do not know.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We are a Republic, unfortunately it has been diluted. Democracies historically fail quickly.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I say we keep it. I don't agree with the establishment of the electoral college. That's not a true representative government. It's not by the people, for the people.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This sounds good, however the unintended consequence is that only a handful of people in the country determine who shall e elected to public office.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Should the fact that corporate personhood allows perversion of elections also be addressed?

17.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	93.3%	6.7%	100.0%
Commenters	64.4%	35.6%	6.7%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Not sure if this is the place to address it, but could mention the 24th ammendment here. I realize Libertarian party needs to raise money for its "operations", but poll taxes should never be tied to the voting process. I mention it because of voter fraud in the Republican party. We need to keep Libertarian party free of this kind of fraud.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	No view either way
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I've been talking to some of my state legislator aquantances about this here in Alabama.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	add "proportional" before "voting"
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the sentiment, but I doubt its effectiveness in producing change. The main 2 parties have a lock on the ballot not primarily due to laws that deny ballot access, but mostly due to the nature of lobbying vis-a-vis big government. There have been 'private' and 'voluntary' agreements between the 2 main parties and the major networks regarding debate broadcasts, for example. This plank will do little-to-nothing about the existing quid pro quo between the major parties and big media, and that is the key to change.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Does this mean you support Citizens United?? No restrictions now which means ..well just look at the super-pacs and the billionairres influence on the Republican primaries
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would like to see a movement away from the electoral college voting system to a popular voting system. This should be a view supported by our party.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Spot on.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	somewhat contrary to my Lib views, I would like my party to promote a CA covering this subject; for instance could we do better in "establishing districts
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Since Corporations are now legally "people" unlimited funding is out of the question. End corporate personhood. One person= One vote. Corporations are not people.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Who is to say what is "legitimate"? Remove that word.

17.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	93.3%	6.7%	100.0%
Commenters	64.4%	35.6%	6.7%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Just saying.... (If we could get rid of the electoral college third parties might win something.)
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Substituting a less stilted word--good.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What about tax payer funded primary elections. Candidate vetting should be a cost to a political party not the tax payers of a given state.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There should be no primaries, only direct voting for candidates.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Constitution is clear on this matter.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	As I think our Congress should be elected by lottery and not by voting, I oppose this change.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The substitution is an improvement. However, this entire plank is very poorly worded. It doesn't address fraudulent elections, and the requirement that government adopt measures to prevent fraud. Gerrymandering is a fact of life. Get used to it. When you change the districts, it happens. And how do you define "all legitimate alternatives"? And should foreigners be allowed to interfere with our elections by financing certain campaigns? I don't THINK so. Outsiders simply have no right to influence our elections by any means whatsoever.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would add protections in the voting process such as showing an ID at the voting booth.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I also suggest removing the word "legitimate" from the last sentence. Who determines what is legitimate and what is not?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would support the abolition of political parties. Read George Washington's remarks on the subject in his farewell address.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	All political voting shall be standardized nationwide. ONLY individuals shall be allowed to vote, upon presentation of valid ID, and allowed to support candidates with a set financial limit. NO corporations or other entities will be allowed to influence or support candidates in any way.

17.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	93.3%	6.7%	100.0%
Commenters	64.4%	35.6%	6.7%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We already have had very negative consequences of getting rid of the senate being elected by state legislatures (ie, diminishment of states rights). I would not advocate also tossing the electoral voting system. We already are marching too far from Republic to Democracy.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Agree but shouldn't financing be not allowed to come from big business?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I disagree with party established rules for primaries, and for state legislative control of primary dates for federal offices, as well as winner take all delegates. I believe in timing the start of a primary season according to the number of qualifying candidates. I believe in with open primaries with all the candidates of multiple parties on the same ballot. The primary season should continue until two candidates remain to stand for a general popular election to win the district of their electoral office. I do not support any major revisions to the process of appointing judges. I oppose any non-voluntary tax subsidies. I believe in unlimited contribution amount limits, but believe in restricting the source of support from individuals only, with no regard to the original source of the contributed funds, and individual free choice of which candidate to support. Any group may address any political issue at any time, including unredacted voting records, but the group should not be allowed to express recommendation or rejection of any declared candidate.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support a constitutional amendment that would ban unlimited contributions by corporations and unions. They are not "people".
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't think the statement is meant to merely include only methods of voting.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Proposed change is a no-op. The mistaken thought can be prevented better by changing "are more representative" to "are representative". The "more" suggests "more than the existing system", implying we have a better system ready to roll out - which is more than we're really saying.

17.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	93.3%	6.7%	100.0%
Commenters	64.4%	35.6%	6.7%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We still need to get rid of the electoral college. He or she that gets the most votes should win. Remember 2000?
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Electoral systems are electoral systems, and the Electoral College is the Electoral College. Electoral systems include more things than just methods of voting -- for instance, topics such as ballot access and gerrymandering which do not directly involve how voting is conducted. Instead of effectively dumbing down our platform for people who mistake electoral systems for the Electoral College by limiting the scope of our call for electoral reform to "voting systems", we should clarify what we mean by "electoral systems". We can do this by adding language following that sentence which specifically mentions proportional representation, a level playing field for all political parties via equal and reasonable rules for ballot access, and other reforms we seek.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Should include "no government funding of primary elections" as well.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'd also strongly support banning lobbying in politics and other undue influence of elected officials by powerful interests
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We need a completely different system that encourages politicians to do the right thing and discourages bad behavior. If you are truly interested in fixing America, I have a plan that would fix it all! No Kidding. just ask.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	fine... another word for the same thing, no problem
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	This one can be toned down a bit. There is a lot of animosity toward the recent Citizens United ruling that liberalizes campaign spending by corporations. Better to avoid the issue and focus expanding choices to the voters.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	& there should be an immediate cease of asking tax payers to 'contribute' 1 dollar on their federal income tax
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	one caveat... we are founded as a democratic republic with representative government. Popular vote by democracy is a prelude to the proletariat voting themselves continuous welfare

17.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	93.3%	6.7%	100.0%
Commenters	64.4%	35.6%	6.7%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Will this encourage "buying" the office?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would support just striking the entire first sentence. What does "more representative" mean?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i oppose this because it is an open door for super pacs
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	And a comment: Who is to define legitimate? Eliminating the word works well, and if there is concern about interpretations seeing allowance of violence/violent force within a consideration of all alternatives, then would suggest legitimate be replaced with "benevolent"; as follows "... or deny the voters their right to consider all benevolent alternatives."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	good clarification
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The wording needs improvement: what changes to the voting systems you propose?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If people mistakenly thought that the first sentence of the existing plank was specifically advocating a change to the electoral college, then changing the word to "voting" could confuse people into thinking that only the manner of voting should be changed, while keeping restrictive ballot access and other laws that hinder small parties.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Yes, this is a helpful clarification.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"repeal of all laws which restrict voluntary financing of election campaigns" - given the average intelligence of Americans in general and the ability to sway the populace with money (advertising), I think some restrictions should be in place to make a level playing field.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is terribly written. I can't support language that doesn't require single-term term limits on all political offices. We need to abolish professional politicians. I also can't support limitless spending on political campaigns, which should be limited in terms of TIME and in FUNDING. We also need to do something about the disgusting practice of gerrymandering districts in this country.

17.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	93.3%	6.7%	100.0%
Commenters	64.4%	35.6%	6.7%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Replace the first sentence by adding back a variation of the platform language adopted in 2002: "Electoral systems matter. The predominant practice of declaring plurality winners in single-member districts fosters political monopolies and creates a substantial state-imposed barrier to the election of non-incumbent political parties and candidates. We propose gerrymander- and spoiler-proof voting systems that are more representative of the electorate at the federal, state, and local levels, such as proportional voting systems with multi-member districts for legislative elections, and ranked-choice or approval voting for single winner elections." Strike the word "private" from the second sentence. Replace "alternative candidates" with "non-incumbent candidates".
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	electoral college should be continued
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	All fine, but to make this operative we really need to think more deeply about how to make elections fair and objective. Eliminating Gerrymandering is a good start, but I don't know how to do it.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	On principle I support this, obviously it is important to us (Libertarians) However, would we be looking at a five page ballot for three offices?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i oppose laws that require signature petitions for ballot access
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Make it part of platform for cutting taxes altogether. Land of the Free includes ballots too.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'm still very concerned about political parties getting financial support from big business. This supports makes it too easy for politicians to cater to their wishes.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	stronger if you use 'direct voting'...
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We should limit all contributions, be it personal, corporate, party or PAC to 10,000.00. Period. With total disclosure.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Sure, that's fine.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	simpler
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Yes. Electoral and electorate sounds too repetitive. Use vocabulary wisely!

17.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	93.3%	6.7%	100.0%
Commenters	64.4%	35.6%	6.7%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would to see the Congressional District system (which invites corruption) replaced by a system in which all Congressional seats are based on a mathematical dividing of a State's population making all Congressional seats "at large" within that state.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Not that important, though.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Would a challenge to the notion that "corporations are people" make sense here?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If given the option I would oppose the part of this Plank about campaign financing. I believe that some restrictions are necessary to prevent a captive state where only the rich and powerful have a say in selecting candidates.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Once again, some form of government/state is presumed. Why? "Representative government" is farce on its face. The only truly fair and effective voting method is direct hand-written paper ballots. Why shouldn't we get rid of the electoral college, in view of where we are politically now, and why? With SELF-government, there's no need for political parties, "representatives" of people, no outlandish contributions to candidates or parties needing oversight and regulation -- or abolishment -- no taxation even possible, hence no subsidies even possible. Why not: "We oppose majority laws imposed on all individuals in society; we oppose governments imposing external laws and giving and taking away what are inherent, innate, inalienable (meaning, they cannot be separated from an individual by any means or under any circumstances) rights, and will work to eventually eliminate all such entities and encumbrances, including our own political party. Everyone should have the exclusive right to consider what his choices shall be, considering also the consequences :

17.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	93.3%	6.7%	100.0%
Commenters	64.4%	35.6%	6.7%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I support the change, but do not think Libertarians should fully support a system of majority voting. There is no right 2 people have that one does not. The Electoral College recognizes this problem and imperfectly attempts to deal with the challenge. Let's not fall for "democracy" the way the majority of people have done.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I like the last part calling for a more HONEST political system...
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	And a person should be able to be a member of more than one group at the same time (unless forbidden by the group itself).
Support Oppose	Unlikely Likely	No No	Non-Member Non-Member	Why not get rid of the electoral college? The Electoral College is a protection of state's rights and the 10th amendment. I would not support direct election of the Pres. by popular vote as this would make big city (often orrupt) votes more important than small stae, rural votes.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'm still confused by what "voting systems that are more representative of the electorate". I would support this plank if the first sentence were eliminated.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	TERM LIMITS at EVERY level of government
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Wording could still be improved.

17.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	93.3%	6.7%	100.0%
Commenters	64.4%	35.6%	6.7%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	With this reminder: President George Washington's farewell speech 1796, excerpt;"I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the State, with particular reference to the founding of them on geographical discriminations. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally. This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind. It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but, in those of the popular form, it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy. The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge, natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result gradually incline the minds of men to se
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support in spirit.....but what of the debilitating role of big coporate money in the election process? How can an individual have a real choice when most candidates are already bought by special interests before the cycle begins ??
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	different word for same thing.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Aren't gerrymandered districts better represented?
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Again, why don't you have these two changes on ONE page? I'd like to see added about ending tax payer funding of primaries, that it is the responsibility of the political party to fund any primaries.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	HURRAY ... let's SUPPORT corporations as PEOPLE & Let corporations run for Office ... EXXON for President !
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We need to support the electoral college, and a return to the states selecting senators.

17.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	93.3%	6.7%	100.0%
Commenters	64.4%	35.6%	6.7%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Technology has reduced the necessity and the role of a representative government. Government decisions should be made by individuals voting directly (representatives should propose legislation – not decide it).
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Uncertain why I don't like that. So I probably should give it an okay?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support most of this statement. The part I am against is the part against restriction of financing. I am for the ending of ALL financing of ALL things political by businesses. Corporations have FULLY corrupted the federal government with their money. We NEED to get them out of our political system. Far too many foreigners gain more representation in this manner than we ourselves have. It is repugnant to continue the political humanizing of corporations, i.e. conferring rights on them.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Actually we should oppose ALL election funding. Elections are being bought and everyone knows it. Let the news media handle it (or not) with equal access for anyone on the ballot.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	On the national level I do support the electoral college for the presidency otherwise we would have NYC, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Chicago and Seattle doing all the electing of the president and the folks in fly over country would be left out of the system every four years.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I oppose this change because under the system put in place by the founders, the electoral process protects the minority of the majority. The proposed changed seems to endorse a democracy point of view, which is a point of view that supports the majority. If we, as Libertarians, support the individual and their rights, then this proposed change should not be accepted. I believe the proposed change reads as advocating a change from the electoral college, not the opposite as stated in the Purpose above.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	uncertain

17.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	93.3%	6.7%	100.0%
Commenters	64.4%	35.6%	6.7%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Then there are those who don't consider Libertarians as 'legitimate alternatives', but yes, I agree with the change.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	"Voting systems" sounds like we want the Australian preferential ballot or something...
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I also believe the Electoral College must be 1. eliminated or 2. restructured to ensure each Union State's votes are considered in the percentages the electorate cast. No more win the Union State by 1 vote & receive ALL electoral votes!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There is no such thing as voting system
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	do you support term limits for congress?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Missing from this proposal is a mention of electronic vote fraud - "voting systems must allow for public verification of the vote by people without special technical skill, via direct re-counting of THE ORIGINAL VOTES, as opposed to being limited to technically trained individuals, such as computer experts, or such re-counts occurring in seclusion.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Do we still need elected representatives? In this age of the computer, issues of all sorts may be decided by nation wide vote on any of them on a regular basis. The gang of 500 is not needed!
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I suppose if it eliminates confusion, then we should adopt it, but the fact that we have to dumb down the platform in order to be understood is a perfect example of why we need to drastically change the education system in this country.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	With a question, in light of recent events: do we have a written position on campaign finance as it relates to the "corporations are people" issue?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This provides absolutely no protection from the exploitation of international corporations trampling targets of opportunity by buying elections as the currently do in Washington DC.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the change as long as "the electorate" includes the current electoral college system for President/Vice President.

17.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	93.3%	6.7%	100.0%
Commenters	64.4%	35.6%	6.7%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Candidates should not be awarded a "block" of votes because they hold a majority in that electorate.....we should scrap that whole system in favor of restoring the idea of the popular vote is more critical.....we now have the technology to remove that ineffective archaic system for our government
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Totally support this!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't support the "repeal of all laws which restrict voluntary financing" unless these are also kept transparent to the public. I also don't support it if corporations can fund campaigns as "people"... as we have today. This detail is not clear in the above statement?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	the electoral college needs to be replaced by the popular vote.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Perhaps other proposals in this survey specifically address the ballot access laws. If not, I believe that we should more specifically address them.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	anything about financing?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A plank regarding early and/or absentee voting should be established, such as: "Early voting should be discouraged, as events occur which could change a voter's attitude on a candidate/issue. Absentee voting, which is conducive to much voting fraud, should only be allowed when the voter gives a sworn affidavit that he/she will be absent from the district, or otherwise unable to attend to the polling place in person."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support everything except repealing the restriction on voluntary financing - money will always buy influence and muddy the moral waters - i think these multi-million dollar campaigns are a disgrace and limits should be kept in place to stop the buying of influence
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If you are changing "electoral" to "voting," shouldn't you change "electorate" to "voters" in the same sentence?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Companies are not individuals.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Some control over wealth buying candidates is needed. One man one vote I believe . . .

17.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	93.3%	6.7%	100.0%
Commenters	64.4%	35.6%	6.7%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would be in favor of eliminating the secret ballot and replacing it with a two-part ballot: (1) a personally signed ballot for a specific candidate, and (2) a personally signed promissory note agreeing to pay the voter's personal share of the current national debt. Then we would see by the number of signed ballots how much support the American people actually have for their current government. I suspect the number would be zero.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The electoral college system should be specifically endorsed. Ballot access restrictions should be more specifically addressed ('effectively exclude' is too vague). How about support for photo ID requirement at the polls, and open, public counting of all ballots. Maybe even a condemnation of unproven machine counting.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We have to have campaign finance reform. Without it, the American people, at this stage of development/maturity, will generally elect the most well funded candidates.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The tenth amendment gives each State the authority to determine it's needs. No federal intervention is authorized, or needed. All election laws, and regulations should create and guarantee 100 % accountability, and eliminate possibility for fraud. Eliminate any and all attempts and possibilities for controls or influences to alter the conclusions and results.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We must support the Electoral College in order for States to have due representation.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do NOT support a direct popular vote that will place the elections firmly in the hands of the large population centers.

17.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	93.3%	6.7%	100.0%
Commenters	64.4%	35.6%	6.7%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This cannot happen without reapportionment. We cannot have Representation and Liberty with only 435 Representatives. Please add something about this. Congress has limited it's own membership to concentrate power and can add members but will not as it would dilute the individual Reps power and give a greater voice to the individual constituent as opposed to the special interests.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We oppose laws that effectively exclude alternative candidates and parties, deny ballot access, gerrymander districts, or deny the voters their right to consider all legitimate alternatives. Toward elections most fair, we support the "Instant Run-off Election System" form of voting to elect candidates.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Add a provision that the candidates must disclose who major supporters of a candidate are, so that voters can make an informed decision about a candidates attitudes
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I believe there needs to be regulation on the amount of money an individual or corporation can contribute to a party or election campaign. We see this today and in the past as buying favors from the candidates. More money leads to more advertising which is unfair to other candidates that don't have big oil or pharma on their side.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Democracy is tyranny.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Also be a good idea to add the opposing of state funded primaries, as in Maryland
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The amendment makes more sense. I don't entirely support the plank itself.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We support the Republican form of government as proscribed in the U.S. Constitution. Government at any level has no power to control the voluntary organization of individuals into political groups whose purpose is to elect representatives with whom they agree or to restrict their access to the ballot".
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Sounds like we are supporting a popular vote for president, which would be anti-states rights IMHO.

17.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	93.3%	6.7%	100.0%
Commenters	64.4%	35.6%	6.7%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Which should be that. "Effectively exclude" should be "restrict ballot access" ?? After all, if you do an online ballot, what's the big deal? And shouldn't we advocate for that since it would be less burdensome / more inclusive?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Don't agree with "the repeal of all laws which restrict voluntary financing of election campaigns." This would leave us with the "Golden Rule" which may work as a moral philosophy but not a political one.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It would be better to remove the first sentence completely.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Keep the word electoral as opposed to the new word Voting. The original wording using the word electoral means that the electoral college votes would have to be indicative of the popular vote as to the percentage won by each candidate in each state. That's the way it needs to be.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Good change. Suggest explicitly support a ranking system so that voters vote once and the results show who is preferred as the least favored candidates are, one by one, removed from consideration
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	If this has really been an issue then it could probably be changed. I liked the word 'electoral' better because it appears to be a more educated word to use in that sentence.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	However, if contributions to parties and candidates are unrestricted wouldn't the rich have unlimited power to control elections?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think the proposal generally tries to cover too much ground in one proposal.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It seems like it was fine before.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What about preventing "corporations" from donating. Why not limit donations to those made by actual people?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Large institutions should not be unrestricted in this matter.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Don't dumb down the platform. Tell the readers to crack a dictionary.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	add something about requiring positive, verifiable and traceable proof of eligibility to vote, at the least but not limited to citizenship and residency!

17.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	93.3%	6.7%	100.0%
Commenters	64.4%	35.6%	6.7%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	that will simply not erase any confusion.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't think that meets the goal of removing the confusion. I understand the word electoral and the word electorate. You are changing one of those two words to satisfy people who don't, but leave the rest just as confusing to those people.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	!!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	the word voting offers a little more clarity
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would like to see something added to this (and the next) proposal opposing the Citizens United decision, for one specific reason: Corporations are NOT "natural" persons; they are creations of the state, with laws varying from state to state. Since they are created by the state, the state can impose any restrictions on them that it wants.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would call for the protection of the Electoral College to protect the voting weight of smaller states in national elections.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	The plank should go further and call for Proportional Representation in larger bodies and Ranked Choice Voting in Single winner elections.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This still sounds like we want to change the electoral college.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Political parties are currently engaged in biased and unfair treatment of their own membership in selecting candidates. They should be banished from a free electoral process of, by, and for the people.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Nominations MUST be PROVEN correct and law abiding as per The Constitution for President and Vice President of the United States of America. Corporations, companies, businesses and etc, should not be able to provide funds. Funding Must be strictly received from individuals affected by potential legislators. No outside funds allowed. There must be an end to gerrymandering, replaced by a computer and straight edge ruler, only to be changed every 10 years with same system to reflect population changes.

17.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	93.3%	6.7%	100.0%
Commenters	64.4%	35.6%	6.7%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Good change. Although less elegant, the vernacular is more modern. It is rare to hear anyone use the word "electoral" to refer to voting unless they are a political science instructor, news caster, or an active politician.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I agree 100%...But, we see what "citizen united" has created & we can't have a few 100 people deciding who should represent the people. I have a lot of idea's to change the voting system, that I would love to bring to the table & debate.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You have to be more specific like "I WILL GIVE TO EACH AMERICAN A \$75,000 LIVING CARD IF YOU ELECT ME FOR U.S. PRESIDENT"; "I WILL ISSUE \$50 TRILLION NEW FIAT MONEY ELIMINATING THE FEDERAL RESERVE"; "WE WILL MANUFACTURE ONE HUNDRED PERCENT IN AMERICA USING THE FEDERAL LANDS CREATING 100 JOBS". If you need help call me to 571-288-7383. My family could donate also \$100 million to your PAC. Thanks Alberto Lopez WWW.EBLM.US
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I personally support the removal of the Electoral College from the procedure and advocate direct voting in all cases. I think this revision leaves that possibility open without making it a mandate in our platform.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would strengthen the last sentence to include some wording that elections for any and all public offices should be open to all persons who meet the criteria for the office even if they have no party affiliation.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I support changing the electoral college.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I believe that full public disclosure of who is financing a campaign is important and should continue to be enforced, even while there are no limits as to voluntary financing. Do we need to state this to avoid making it seem we favor allowing candidates to hide who is financing them? To me, part of evaluating a candidate's character and expected behavior once in office includes examining who his/her main contributors are.

17.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	93.3%	6.7%	100.0%
Commenters	64.4%	35.6%	6.7%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A big part of this problem is media king-making. Not sure how to approach this problem other than to return to the equal time provisions which used to apply to publicly-owned airwaves.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Why not just change "electoral" to "election?"
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We oppose any law which restricts the ability of anyone to vote for the single candidate of their choice for public office. If political parties want to restrict who you can vote for, let them pay for their own elections, elections which can not be held on public property.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	~~Kinda support. You have got to find ways to say simple things simply.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	No comment
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	There are other methods of selecting representatives than voting, such as sortition used for juries, which could also be used to select other kinds of officials.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Support in general, but support a ballot with write ins only because the government controlled by parties should not be promoting candidates and advertizing party affiliation. Any candidate supported by a voter should have ballot access through the voters who can enter anyone they wish.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Support, but not enthusiastically...
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	But NOT if the elections are paid for by the taxpayers. In that case, crystal clear laws should set the rules for all public elections. In Massachusetts in 1982, the Establishment with the concurrence of the courts, allowed the Democratic Party to make extra-legal rules (not provided for in the statutes) that illegally excluded legally qualified candidates (including myself) from the Primary Ballot in elections paid for by the taxpayers. A few years later, the anemic Massachusetts Republican Party followed suit, and to this day that transgression and injustice has not been corrected.

17.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 1

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	93.3%	6.7%	100.0%
Commenters	64.4%	35.6%	6.7%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Totally oppose. Look at what is happening with the Super PACs right now. Fewer than a dozen super wealthy individuals are funding the majority of campaign spending.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Get rid of Gerry mander - an old English traditiion - that we apparently love. But I am thinking Govt funding of electioneers may be more fair to all than private funding, which favors the rich. Qualify people, fund them, and come down on anyone using their own money. x \$ for ads, x \$ for travel etc. all on an equal footing.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The founder's created the electoral college as a means of insuring each state has an equal say in the system. I believe the original wording is more than appropriate.
Oppose Support	Unlikely Unlikely	No No	Non-Member Non-Member	need more information this is one topic i feel that regulation may be important. with candidates raising money for their personal candidacies. I feel there should be a limit to any persons donations to a particular candidate. i feel this will help show accuracy in the amount of support these candidates really have, and it could really be a good indication to voter fraud down the line when i comes time to vote on the ballot.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	we all condemn the McCain/Fingold campaign finance reform act.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Would like to add that if a party chooses to hold a primary nominate candidates then that party is required to bear the entire expense of the primary with no tax payer money expended.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What about repeal of Amendments XVI and XVII ?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Use 'election' instead of 'electoral' or 'voting.'
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	What about foreign campaign contributions?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I see nothing wrong with the original wording, although I'm not totally against a new wording.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We need to work toward an end to the Electoral College. People will feel like their vote counts more if we do this.

18.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	89.1%	10.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.7%	44.3%	6.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	ok, but not really necessary
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Yes, yes, yes !!
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Constitutions, not democratic referenda, are the proper checks on governments. Proposition 8 in California showed the danger of letting a simple majority of voters change a state's Constitution when they didn't like the Supreme Court's interpretation of that Constitution. Massachusetts, on the other hand, did not have that problem, because a simple majority of voters in that state cannot change the Constitution.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Voters must take this obligation seriously. The original primaries and elections must mean SOMETHING. Do-Over Recalls are costly and dampen the boldness of our legislators. YES, I live in Wisconsin.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think the proposed change needs to be more specific about which referenda are valid from a libertarian perspective... Prop 8 in California, for example is totally unlibertarian, and I believe we should not have systems in place that allow a majority to dictate a minority as easily as this system can be misused.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Recall is used all too willfully and has come to mean only a form of disagreement.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Finally!!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I really don't get what this plank is about, overall. What is the actionable step that it is advocating? That part is unclear to me.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I find this unnecessary; mostly because such initiatives (in practice) actually expand government.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This suffers the flaws as I highlighted on the prior plank. The addition of the blue input does not over-ride the flaws, although I approve of the input modifications.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support checks on government and do not like the fact that it is very hard to do at this time.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The change in this proposal is good, but again, I would just delete the first sentence.

18.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	89.1%	10.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.7%	44.3%	6.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't know enough about this to feel comfortable with it. My concern is that if it is too easy to make and undo laws, then this could be used as a vehicle to increase the size and scope of government power rather than to reduce it as intended. This may be something to consider later but I would not have this change at this time.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again "more representative" is vague. We need to say something measurably concrete, such as "proportionally representative" at all levels. I do like the last sentence to support "initiative, referendum, recall and repeal"
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	DEFINE YOUR TERMS! I am in favor the the spirit of this statement, but it is so poor stated I cannot sign on. Who writes this CRAP? "more representative," "effectively exclude," and "when used as popular checks" on government? What does that even MEAN? Poor language use makes bad law. I'm not kidding, you guys SUCK at putting a logical sentence together! I'm beginning to think the Libertarian Party is a new home for illiterates with a small dash of common sense. That is just not good enough.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A recall is an unnecessary tool employed by those unwilling to accept our constitutional system of govt. and honest results of elections. We have an impeachment process to rid ourselves of corrupt politicians. I oppose referendums as a mob-rule circumvention of representatative republicanism.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	See previous comment. If it wasn't for Ron Paul, people wouldn't even know about Libertarianism. This is the big chance to wake people up. I am a huge supporter, and you are putting me to sleep. This is the best set of ideas since 1787, and you people are making it sound like a big bag of whiney, undefined, it's not fair, lets all play nice, bullshit. Almost sound Soviet. You really can do better.

18.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	89.1%	10.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.7%	44.3%	6.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	As California repeatedly demonstrates, initiatives and referendums don't work. They take the responsibility away from the elected representatives who are paid to make decisions and give it to the people. While this sounds good in theory, in practice, it has two major flaws: 1) the average citizen has far too much on his plate to be as well versed on any given issue as his elected representative, and as such tends to make decisions based on the barrage of 30-second ads; it ends up being the side with the most ad money wins. 2) People inherently want everything immediately and free; when asked to approve raising taxes (with school levies the notable exception) they virtually always vote it down; yet when asked to spend money on somebody's pet project, more often than not, they approve. There's a disconnect between the project and the finances, and it is a major contributing factor to ballooning budget deficits. Eliminate the reference to "initiative" and "referendum," and you've got a winner. Let the elected officials do their jobs, and if they refuse, recall
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I also support a proposal to limit State and Federal Legislators to Part Time Sessions... States such as California, Began to expand Government interference into their Citizens lives and expand the cost of Government to unnecessary levels When a full time Legislature became Law. Part time Legislators would have fewer opportunities to enrich themselves at the expense of the Taxpayer or by introducing useless laws. Sessions would also be have to be condensed, more focused, More Transparent with a Time limit... It would be easier to keep track of their activities When in session...
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Do we only support these processes when they are used as "popular checks on government?" Who will make that determination?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think the word "advocate" is too strong.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think the wording is a bit awkward (but I have no alternative suggestion so I'd support it as written).

18.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	89.1%	10.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.7%	44.3%	6.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	with the previous amendment.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I don't like the wording.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Very redundant, of course, but, the additional sentence in this proposal is of benefit to the citizens. So, just add it on.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Add the word "power" to the end to make it clear these tools are to further place limits on the government.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The new sentence belongs in a separate section as it has nothing to do with electing people. Does have to do with defining the purposes of the government - and that is a good thing.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Why didn't you change "electoral" here?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Never minding the missing commas, initiative etc. are valuable in any case. How about "We advocate the use of initiative, referendum, recall, and repeal, especially as popular checks on government."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is still on the negative side.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The intent is appropriate.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We support a Constitutional Amendment that adds the last sentence to our governance.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The second proposal is better.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I am okay with this, but it seems like a waste of real estate relative to others. I am much more concerned with gerrymandering which makes "safe" districts that allow extremists on both sides to win elections.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Although I would delete "when used" from the statement.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	you can say when used to check power on the government withother there being a way to use it for giving power to government
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	In an earlier plank you changed "electoral" to voting." Why not do the same thing here. This plank repeats content from a previous plank.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	However, why would you deny a popular referendum to force government to do something constitutional that it refuses to do? Popular initiatives, etc should be supported for any constitutional purpose.

18.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	89.1%	10.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.7%	44.3%	6.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	In a representative government, the citizens should have a strong hand in government. 'Of, for, and by the people' should not be a shout in the wind but a primary guideline.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Needs something about not using initiatives to leverage government power to violate the rights of others.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Oppose only because I'm not sure of the meaning of this one.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support only the addition, not the entire proposal re my previous comment on abolishing primaries.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I ran for Indiana State Rep #49. I love Recall. Referendums are not used enough in Indiana.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	with amendment. The "purpose" is more clear than the ending sentence: We advocate initiative, referendum, and recall provided that they are used to reduce the size and scope of government power.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Perhaps the final line should note that these procedures are not available in many states (though ballot questions - especially for fiscal matters - may be). I live in NJ, for example. This statement can be revised to note that the Libertarian Party advocates that more states adopt such measures. If, indeed, it does to advocate.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Unless the the elected official actually did something illegal and other branches of the government do not perform their duties to prosecute that official the a recall should be in order. Being from wisconsin I am seeing a recall election happening because the governer did something that some people did not like. That is no reason to waste money on a recall.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There are problems in a "pure" democracy. One being that "the people" will support a referendum that provides the services they want from government and the oppose any referendum that would provide for a tax to support those services.

18.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	89.1%	10.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.7%	44.3%	6.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Popular checks on government are often "majority rule" initiatives and we all know that protecting the rights of the individual and legislating the majority will are often diametrically opposed.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The moment you allow for a exception, you don't have a rule, but only a recommendation.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Stick with the first new proposal on this.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I empathize with the intent here, but note that it implies that government has some right to exist. It doesn't
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	only in recall/repeal -- not creation of law
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The problem is, how does this ensure that referenda will be used to reduce the size and scope of government? It does not...California is full of examples of referenda that cause more problems than they solve.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Should also include language about repealing SuperPac laws this is clearly big business buying gov't
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Discriminatory Federal law regarding Southern voting should either be abolished or applied to all states.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Unfortunately I'm not entirely clear on what we mean by "we advocate initiative, referendum, recall and repeal", but okay.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The only restriction on campaign financing is: if you can't vote for the candidate, you can't finance their campaign.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This clears up my next question. Good change.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Same answer as 15 of 15
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Libertarians should not push for direct democracy because the majority can impose its will on the minority.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Initiative was used to raise the Michigan drinking age in 1978 from 18 to 21. You cannot advocate winning with a tool and avoid losing by the same tool.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	In a republic we need to protect the rights of the minority, this is to close to mob rule. It is well intended, just fraught with dangers.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Great addition!

18.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	89.1%	10.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.7%	44.3%	6.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We are a republic, not a democracy, for a reason. If we push "initiative, referendum, recall and repeal" then we could be lead down the path of "the tyranny of the majority" where at the whims of the times swaying policies in a government leviathonic way.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Plank is already long enough.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Good idea.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	The phrase "gerrymander districts" enshrines that the way to apportion representation has to be by geography? There are may other possible libertarian ways to achieve apportion.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I can't believe this wasn't already in the platform, actually. This is a rather important addition.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think it is more important to see that property and personal rights as well as economic freedom is defended than to have popular votes to determine political outcomes.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Initiatives that mandate spending and new taxes are not something any Libertarian should support. This is how California has ended up in as bad shape as Greece.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	PLEASE add this new last sentence to the first PLank 3.6 rewrite. It is important..!
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I am an expatriate Californian. I do not advocate initiative. Referenda, repeal, and recall are fine; but not initiatives.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support this additional change to plank 3.6
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I disagree with this on the grounds that it gives too much power to the mob. Given voter turnout in all levels of government, supporting such systems will result in minorities with greater power over majorities. On the other hand, I would support such systems if they required some form of majority tally on total registered voters (ex. 1/2+1 of all registered voters voted yes or in support)
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Was Paul Jacob behind this proposal?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Not sure what popular checks means??

18.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	89.1%	10.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.7%	44.3%	6.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Putting power in the hands of the mob rather than in a few elite representatives better expresses the will of the people, for better or worse. However, I think the LP should advocate election by lottery as a way to curb the influence of parties and money in politics.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	In the abstract, I agree with the added wording. Please see my remarks one question earlier about the plank in general. Please keep in mind that democracy in and of itself is ultimately going to result in the majority exercising tyranny over the minority. The fact is that initiative, referendum, recall and repeal often are mechanisms by which the majority exercises that tyranny. Look at the situation in Wisconsin. Recall is being FRAUDULENTLY used to dispose of a legitimately elected governor who tried to reduce government plunder and balance the budget. As long as there is so much rampant fraud, be very careful about changing this plank by adding this wording.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Is there also a plank supporting the state power of nullification? If not, there should be.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, I support the abolition of political parties. Again, read Washington's remarks on the subject in his farewell address.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	in keeping with Liberty as the general conception of the party. amendments should be made here that a return especially given the mature nature of the citizenry to the original constitutional election procedures eliminating power of parties in general and the allowance of all parties wishing to extend to the general election to do so . with the top two contenders being P & VP of the US

18.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	89.1%	10.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.7%	44.3%	6.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	So you support taking it to the people when the issue is one you agree with, but not when it isn't? What if a private, voluntary group jumps through all of your well-intentioned hoops to put a proposal on the ballot to, say, double the property tax? Freedom has to apply to everybody. This new line actually contradicts your own philosophy.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't care much either way about this change.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support this as an amendment to the preceding plank proposal, especially as an addition to my desired amendment.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Doesn't "referendum" include in its meaning the possibility of "repeal"?
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	They're usually used in opposite ways (e.g. the repeal of SB 5 in Ohio). Better to advocate representative government that is responsive and works without having to be overruled by direct democracy!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	So true.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	with the addendum that all funding must be accounted for before a candidate may be approved.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Referendums can be tricky, e.g. CA Prop 8. Public opinion does not make something right.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	This proposal should be reworded -- we don't advocate the initiative, referendum, recall and repeal when they are used to harm the cause of individual liberty rather than help it, whether such measures are "popular" or not. However, the basic thrust of the proposal is sound enough for me to support it. The problem I note could largely be fixed by adding the word "abuse" after "government" at the end of the proposed new sentence.

18.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	89.1%	10.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.7%	44.3%	6.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The federal government is a government of the States and not of the People as established by the social contract called the US Constitution. I cannot support initiative or referendums related to federal law if the US government was to limit itself based upon the enumerate powers in the Constitution. The last sentence creates a conflict with the Constitutional organization of government in the United States. The federal government was never intended to be the government of the People.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Support the concept; however, some form of structure should be in place, as California's initiative (propositions) process has resulted in many special interest proposals put on the ballot masked as the general good.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Judges throw it all out anyway. Fix the judicial process of legislating from the bench for a solution. Limiting governments authority is the only answer.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We advocate initiative, referendum, --> We advocate voters' initiatives, referenda,
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Note: This may suggest support for the notion "tyranny of the majority" which Libertarians often oppose.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Better
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	My guess is that this one would have almost universal appeal.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Populist power is destructive toward representative power.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I do not like the last sentence regarding referendum.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	repeal the popular election of the senate.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	You have missed another serial comma. Please fix that.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The proposed new sentence need elaboration. When advocating the rights to recall and repeal, it should be recognized that a strong set of rules may be necessary to prevent fraud and abuse that could cause a result that is counter to what the democracy would otherwise wish to enact.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	but would again substitute "electoral" with voting
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	ALSO ADD SUNSET LAWS

18.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	89.1%	10.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.7%	44.3%	6.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would support it if you added nullification to the list.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	NO!!! Will not accept the abridgment of we American peoples right to self-govern ourselves as we see fit through peaceful or benevolent means. Reduction of government, checks on government is especially important in these dangerous times, yet that which already exists also sometimes does not make for better our freedom or general welfare, and just what that may be should be decided by ourselves, not any so-called representatives nor bureaucrats nor too narrow of focus on what sort of changes should only be allowed. We are struggling towards greater wisdom in self governance, and changes in system and in policy may, from a greater whole systems viewpoint, require less or more of this or that at any particular matrix point. Limiting what should consist of our freedom to self-govern, to choose our way forward, especially out of the obscene quagmire of corruptions currently too prevalent, will not serve us well, will not serve us into the many possible "stepping stones" needed to enable further social survival and, hopefully, pervasive prosperity. Government needs
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Not well defined. May have undesirable consequences for a limited government.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Every state can develop their own system
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Good addition, although I think "when used as popular checks on government" could be worded better, maybe "when citizens believe such change is necessary" or "when citizens believe their representatives have overstepped boundaries"
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Unsure
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would support the proposal If you stick the words " state and local levels" The states and locals should be allowed to decide for themselves.

18.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	89.1%	10.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.7%	44.3%	6.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Not sure whether this may create more problems than it may solve, given the current abuse of some of these systems in my state of California. Popular sentiment amongst some of my non-Libertarian associates is that the California initiative and referendum processes are out of control, abused, and need to be repealed. Now may not be the time to add this sentence to our party's platform, especially because it does not (and, practically, probably cannot) address how to avoid/prevent abuse of these systems.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This can impose a majority rule on a minority.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the last sentence. See my preceding answer for the rest of the paragraph.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	In Washington state the recent referendums have been hijacked by special interest groups, who spend millions to advocate for their financial interests. I prefer that a representative legislature make the laws....
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I commend the Platform Committee for using the word "state" instead of "government" in the purpose statement.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Standard elections are the answer - not having one polarized group recalling another. Nonsense. If you lose, then you lose. Focus on the next election and grow up.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I oppose recall. It is another tool for denying representation.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The language feels a little too harsh to appeal to a larger audience.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	On a side note: We should be pushing for Instant Runoff Voting or similar, as those methods support "alternative" candidates better than current winner takes all voting.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Strongly support.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Also support FOIA's to obtain facts from government officials.. in order to initiate such actions.

18.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	89.1%	10.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.7%	44.3%	6.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The words "when used as popular checks on government" do not necessary mean "provided they are used to reduce the size and scope of government power". If the latter is what you want to say, then use those words.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Yes, very good, and certainly differentiates our Party from the Dems and Reps.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You either support such things or you don't-- how would you constrain their use to what the qualifying phrase "when used as popular checks" suggests? They are often used for partisan ends, as far as I've seen. I'm not saying that they're not useful, but just like anything are corrupted.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Are we selling our soul for popularity? What if the referendum favors reducing the power of the courts to settle disputes over property rights?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think this proposal needs to add the change of the first plank 3.6.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I strongly oppose this as it advocates a true democracy, which we are not. This country is founded on a constitutional republic for good reason. The idea that popular checks on government usually means special interests with money to buy commercial media advertisements and convince the fickle public to their end, flies in the face of a representative form of government. There exists the impeachment rules in almost all forms of government for the accountability of our representatives. If you voted for the politician then you should live with the decision until you can throw him/her out of office through our already tried and true system. Why have representatives if we are going to go through the referendum, initiatives, and propositions. Athens, Greece tried this in the square and it was a dismal failure. This is not the Libertarian way!
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Add a serial comma. Drop "when used" as obviously these policies cut both ways. "We support initiative, referendum, and recal as popular checks on government."

18.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	89.1%	10.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.7%	44.3%	6.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	As an aside, I would like to see all convicted felons ineligible for holding any elected office.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Very mild support.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	In regard to Natural Rights. You may also want to add into the platform that our current legal system has many laws that violate natural rights. These laws need to re-evaluated, and removed, or rewritten into a better format. Our legal wold is so dense that it is paralyzing to citizens. We are unable to sometimes "do the right thing" because law won't allow it.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would delete "when used", though.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Good catch. Please reiterate with strong language.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Referendums are often used to deny individual rights. No majority may vote away the rights of anyone for any reason whatsoever; for this reason, referendums are often inappropriate.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	By definition, libertarians oppose electoral systems at any but the local level, where they can maintain oversight and control what affects their individual right to SELF-government. In a libertarian society, there is no "federal," "state," or "county" levels of government; only the local community. Hence there is no need for national or state primaries, conventions, or even political parties! And so there can be no tax-financed subsidies or laws restricting election financing; no national or state or county campaigns to need financing. There are no alternative candidates and parties to exclude, because there are no national candidates and parties to begin with; there is no necessity for national, state, or county elections. Problem solved. Why not state the fraud that is "representative government" and the libertarian goal of eliminating this fraud? Sheesh. I think the people of the party are wolves in sheep's clothing. I think you also like the idea of ruling others, and want to maintain a facade to facilitate that goal. To what end? Why should anyone vote

18.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	89.1%	10.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.7%	44.3%	6.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'm confused by what "we" would be "advocating." I support reforms in voting and re-drawing more representative, "fair" districts, but I don't support it to favor just one party which is what I feel like the last part is saying.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Recall can work both ways. Voters will take more chances initially if they know recall is so easy.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Absolutely
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Perhaps a statement naming more representative electoral systems like proportional representation in multi-representative districts, instant run-offs, Condorcet, etc.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Like the previous platform, I would support this one if the first sentence were eliminated.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i don't know enough about that last sentence. I need a reference book...
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Consider changing "electoral" to "voting" here, too.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This should be left to the states to decide. Such a blanket philosophy may not and probably should not be here, as many methods (most being good) are used to govern. There is no need to add the last line as it is confrontational and appears bullying states to a certain philosophy of governing.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	With prejudice, do Libertarians also support judicial overturning of legislation passed by the electorate opposing the contemporary will of the judiciary and of the executive or deliberative / legislative branches of government? Just where the limits legally on initiative, referendum, recall, repeal, and judicial overturnment? How can anyone predict the limits of government except by enactment of the Constitutional limits on big government?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We should also Tax each candidate on campaign contributions and that money goes to the state...win or lose.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Civil liberties shouldn't be up for a vote.

18.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	89.1%	10.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.7%	44.3%	6.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This implies a shift from the republican form of government required by the constitution to a simple majority rule or pure democracy. Initiative and referendum has been a disaster in my home state of AZ. It leads to the inevitable voting of 'largess' for themselves without providing funding. Recall and repeal do serve as checks on government and would be useful.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Ditch the entire ELECTORAL COLLEGE ... we have the COMMUNICATION systems in place that each individual VOTE should be counted --- NATIONALLY = One PERSON = ONE Vote ... and everything should be VOTED on by REFERENDUM
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There needs to be some type of qualifier on this last sentence. I believe the recall process is being abused and is deligitimizing the electoral process. These types of checks on government should required more than a majority decision to be enacted.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't know about the referendum and initiative part...those are destroying California because of people voting themselves benefits.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Local governments are the only way to operate. I understand your purpose (I think) but oppose any regulation beyond the neighborhood.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	This is an awful addition! California has been run by these referenda for years and it has been an abject disaster. We live in a Republic (if we can keep it) not a Democracy.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again except for the financing part. We NEED to end ALL political financing by businesses.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Unfortunately, initiatives and referendums are usually used to increase the scope of government, rather than check its growth. SO, this is a very tentative "support" vote.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Include rewording as given in prior proposal.

18.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	89.1%	10.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.7%	44.3%	6.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Just don't abuse it. We should not say no just to say no all the time. This seems to be a large failure on the part of the party. We oppose for the sake of opposition effectively achieving nothing.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I would add language saying that we don't support the use of these tools to limit the rights of others (e.g. the right to marry, have an abortion, or to help an illegal immigrant).
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Our constitution is "non majoritarian" in its nature. Adoption of initiative, referendum and recall would have the effect of making basic rights subject to a simple majority vote. A necessary trade off in the election of officials is the obligation for the voters to live with the consequences of their actions for the term of office. Recalls might cause voters to be less careful in their initial choices.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Add "citizen" before "initiative.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I prefer the language in the purpose section "reduce the sizee and scope of government power" to the language actually used ("used as popular checks on government").
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	this is redunt
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I do not believe in recall. If an elected official has committed an impeachable act then he can be removed from office, otherwise there is the ballot box.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I see the need for Recalls and repeal but I feel the statement is more defined and not so general to limit the amount of recalls and wasteful spending of recall elections
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	There is nothing here that prevents the undue influence of international cartels.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again, I support this change only to the extent that it does not oppose the current electoral college.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Normal voter wont know these terms.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	sounds too conditional ... what if such actions are not seen as a "popular check on government"
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	How about instant run off, also?

18.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	89.1%	10.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.7%	44.3%	6.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	all monies should be divided equally between the candidates so no candidate has a financial advantage, this way we can get the cream of the crop , not the wealthiest candidates
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Recall should never be allowed when used as a tool to remove one party simply to replace another. Especially when it is being used such as in Wisconsin. These people are elected to a term and as you say everyone should live with their choices.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	good
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	however i still have the same comment as the previous.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This is really needed. Think back to McCain being saved by the AQ attacks on 9/11. Because there was no recall system in place, he was still in office when we had to shift focus. If he had been replaced, there was the chance that AZ would have a better Senator now and there would have been an actual candidate running back in 2008 for the Presidency. Very good addition.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	See previous comment
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	With the provisionn of individual declared responsibility of the voter.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	- but it should be made clear that we do not support abolishment of the "Electoral" system as described in the Constitution. A brief statement to that effect should be included. The first sentence leaves some doubt on that matter.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't think "popular checks" sufficiently identifies these as voter actions (as opposed to actions by governmental entities). If the language were tweaked to make it clearer, I would support the change.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I support the last sentence. However, we must have campaign finance reform. PAC contributions are nothing more than legal bribery.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	not recall, read the constitution about what it say about removal from office.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	by a hair, since I think the national LP platform should address national issues only

18.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	89.1%	10.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.7%	44.3%	6.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'm opposed to initiatives and referenda. They both have the same problem with checks and balances.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This cannot happen without reapportionment. We cannot have Representation and Liberty with only 435 Representatives. Please add something about this. Congress has limited its own membership to concentrate power and can add members but will not as it would dilute the individual Reps power and give a greater voice to the individual constituent as opposed to the special interests.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	With the addition of the last sentence, I like this one better than the first one.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Toward elections most fair, we support the "Instant Run-off Election System" form of voting to elect candidates.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	As it should be.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	same comments as page 15. The portion that doesn't work is the repeal of laws which restrict voluntary campaign financing. I support the last sentence.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I also think the party should consider taking a negative stance on the validity of the Supreme Court's decision on corporate campaign financing. The government is overly influenced by corporate money as it is and all campaign financing should come from individuals only, as an exercise of their free will.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Could the idea of term limits wherein after the term is completed a candidate can be elected to office if receiving 50% plus one of all the registered voters (not just the voters that come to the pole)
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Only to the extent that the people are protected from the tyranny of the majority.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	And "(w)e" oppose them when not "used as popular checks on government"? The world doesn't work that way.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	To wordy.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	We should emphasize this.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I agree with the concept, but I don't like how the sentence is worded.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I'd like to see the Supreme Court be subjected to the will of the people.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	".....include gerrymandering of districts,....."

18.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	89.1%	10.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.7%	44.3%	6.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	but the devil is in the details.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This last sentence has no semantic meaning. How can we advocate these mechanisms only when "used as popular checks," whatever that means? Under what circumstances wouldn't we advocate them? "We advocate the continued availability of ballot initiatives, referenda, recall and repeal mechanisms to ensure a balance of power between government and its constituents."
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Voter initiatives are generally bad laws that couldn't make it past the scrutiny of the legislative process. They are harder to repeal because legislators fear repealing something directly voted on by the people. They are rarely a check on government; more often than not, they expand it.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	See previous. Do agree with the addition.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Great! Strengthens political freedom.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But I would reword this to read, "We support the right of people to use initiative, referendum, recall and repeal to reduce the structure, scope and power of government entities."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	EXCELLENT!! We included similar language in our State platform 3 years ago. Glad to see something on this subject make it to this level. (this is also NOT a duplicate vote)
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Of the two proposals, I prefer this one.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	And when they encourage govt. rather than checking it?
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Never election recalls as they do nothing but promote government instability and make for unhealthy alliances. Single (one) Term limits for all politicians and judges - eliminate re-election campaigns and thus political favors.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I strongly agree. This is much more democratic.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I don't understand the last line very well.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	The principle is good...so..why doesn't guarded sentence more clearly follow the language in the "purpose" description?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Also include requirement for majority vote (50+%) to win elections through the use of instant run-off voting.

18.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	89.1%	10.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.7%	44.3%	6.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Our republican system of government is intended to oppose the "tyranny of the majority." Too often, initiative, referendum, and repeal measures are tools of that very tyranny.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This should be combined with the first proposal.
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	I have a problem with this. The problem is that it is democracy. It allows mob rule. This only should be allowed if it forbids the use of referendum for reducing unalienable rights. Marriage contracts should be private, and the fact that the People could obviate those rights is anathema to freedom and liberty.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	But this proposal has nothing to do with the last phrase of the Purpose statement.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Once an official is elected, he needs a few years to demonstrate the worth (low or high) of his abilities and ideas. Recalls of elected officials shorten the already woefully short political attention span of Americans. In any event, if the power of government were reduced, politicians would matter less, and there would be less need to recall them. Note: in cases of criminal wrongdoing, governments at all levels already have mechanisms for the removal of elected officials. E.g. Nixon, Blagojevich... Referendums and initiatives regarding laws are fine.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Agreed.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I realize we are all fed the idea that democracy is a god, but like Hoppe says, it's a god that failed. Madison might have had the right idea when distancing the process from the common man. I am not sure we need to increase the power of the electorate much. We just need to restrain government.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	California is a mess because of this misapplication of democratic principles. We are a republic, NOT a democracy. We just happen to elect our leaders.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Term limits? Anyone? Hello? cricket, cricket
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Like this better than the last one.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I'm concerned that this would introduce an element of instability.

18.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	89.1%	10.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.7%	44.3%	6.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think this is good, but states have rights as well.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Yes of course, but what does "when used as . . ." mean? If people use initiative and referendum to make government bigger and more expensive, how are you going to stop them? Do they lose their right to vote?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	See comments to previous item.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Government has an obligation to ensure that groups operate in a fair and equal treatment manner for their members. Groups are things that have no Rights and therefore no protection from government interference. Individuals have rights so long as their actions do not interfere with the rights of others.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	the main problem is bribes. And the thing is, that lobbyists effectively bribe the congress with campaign contributions.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	As I said about one of the other proposed changes, this doesn't seem to be something that needs to be spelled out to anyone reading it. Basic deductive reasoning could draw this conclusion even if only basic ideas of the platform are understood.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	I support, but believe we need to move to a popular vote.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	You have to be more specific like "I WILL GIVE TO EACH AMERICAN A \$75,000 LIVING CARD IF YOU ELECT ME FOR U.S. PRESIDENT"; "I WILL ISSUE \$50 TRILLION NEW FIAT MONEY ELIMINATING THE FEDERAL RESERVE"; "WE WILL MANUFACTURE ONE HUNDRED PERCENT IN AMERICA USING THE FEDERAL LANDS CREATING 100 JOBS". If you need help call me to 571-288-7383. My family could donate also \$100 million to your PAC. Thanks Alberto Lopez WWW.EBLM.US
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Have these tools helped or hurt the State of California? I would say no, so I don't think we should advocate for other states to have to deal with them.

18.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	89.1%	10.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.7%	44.3%	6.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I can't tell if this is a sort of ethical statement or one of policy. It should at the very least distinguish clearly between "we advocate use of and voting for of initiatives, etc. only when they would check the power of government", and "initiatives etc. are good because they provide a popular check on government". I probably agree with the spirit of this sentence, but I can't tell for sure!
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	While I support this, what, exactly, does the "right" of voters to consider all legitimate alternative mean? I haven't a clue.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Although the added sentence is not totally necessary, I have no objection to it. I would combine these 2 proposals, changing "electoral" systems to "voting" systems and including this new sentence.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	This one is better
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I personally don't think you the party should "advocate" these things. I would like it better to see something like, "We believe the people have the choice, if they so desire, to use popular checks on government such as..."
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	A bit confusing, as I agreed with the removal of "electoral" in the previous question. But I like the additional sentence.
Support	Likely	No	Non-Member	Living in a state (New Mexico) that does not allow recall and has very limited and restrictive processes for referendum, I strongly support this addition.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Can we add nullification.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Again see previous comment about need to bring back equal time rules.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Prefer the first option
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	What does that mean, "when used as popular checks on government?"
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Actually, this is the only area of the platform that I think is wrong on philosophical grounds. We have a republic and not a direct democracy for a reason. That is, a republic is best at protecting the natural rights of all of its citizens. Pure democracy is the old adage, two wolves and a sheep going out for lunch.

18.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	89.1%	10.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.7%	44.3%	6.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Eliminate any contributions from corporations or Pacs. Limit the campaign periods to 60 days prior to election date.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	No comment
Oppose	Likely	No	Non-Member	Good idea in some situations and not in others.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I think popular initiatives and referendums cause budget havoc as they do in California. They are special interests budget items that manipulate the budget in ways which make it difficult for legislators to reconcile when they have to draw up the general budget.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	The only access a candidate should have to the ballot is through a voter or voters who place their name in a blank next to the office to be filled. The government should not advertise candidates or party affiliations by suggesting them on the ballot. No single lever voting, write in only.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Like the addition; still not hot on the rest.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Why not include the change from electoral to voting here as well?
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Blah blah
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Why not just opposed the government recognition of parties? They would of course still be allowed to exist, but if they do not exist in the eyes of the government, no law can be established to help or hurt a party.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	I am stupid so I barely understand this.
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Do we only support the power of initiatives, etc., when it supports our beliefs and goals? Who is to determine whether the initiative, etc., "is used as a popular check on government." I would delete the language of "when used as ..." And just go with we support initiatives, etc, BECAUSE THEY ARE POPULAR CHECKS ON GOV'T.
Support	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	i would like to add if a member of a labor union. the union fees shall not be allowed to support any particular candidate, because it takes away from the people of the union liberty to choose who they would like to vote for
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	Clunky wording.

18.0 - Representative Government - Proposal 2

	Support	Oppose	All
All Respondents	89.1%	10.9%	100.0%
Commenters	55.7%	44.3%	6.8%

Support?	Attending 2012 Convention	Past Delegate	Membership Status	Recommendations
Oppose	Unlikely	No	Non-Member	It is an important part of our constitutional Republic to avoid allowing knee-jerk public over-reactions to result in "mob" government. If an elected official exercises any criminal behavior then they should be prosecuted, otherwise they should serve their term.