

The Tarheel Libertarian

January/February, 2006

News for, by & about North Carolina Libertarians

{Check pp. 4 & 12 for registration and other info on our **State Convention** in Burlington, May 5-7!}

The Three Worlds of Ballot Access

From the Chair

by

Phil Jacobson

As most of you know, last Fall LPNC lost official recognition with the state as a political party. This included the voter registration of Libertarians, who were involuntarily re-registered as "Independent". What is being done to recover our official status? Several things, but before I describe them, let me mention a few details about how the current situation came to be.

NC has the third most difficult ballot access requirements of any state. Current state law requires "third" parties to collect almost 70,000 signatures on a petition to be put (or retained, in our case) on the ballot (this is 2% of the number of people who participated in the last vote for NC Governor), which we have not yet done. We are obliged to do this because neither our candidate for Governor nor for President received 10% of the votes cast in the last election. The petition signatures were due at the state Board of Elections last Fall. This is not the first time that the Party missed the official deadline, but in previous years a fairly significant number of signatures had been submitted by the deadline, and the BOE let us slide while the last ones were being gathered. The difference this time was that the National LP is not providing professional signature gatherers. In 1991, for the first time, paid petitioners were sent into NC in sufficient quantity to complete a drive to put LPNC on the ballot under current election law. In all subsequent years when we needed a petition drive to stay on the ballot, the National LP paid for enough professional petitioners to make that possible. It is important to note that no "third" party has ever achieved ballot access in NC under current election law without major funding from outside the state.

Perhaps that will change this year. There are three possibilities.

The first possibility is the lawsuit we have filed in state court. This is potentially the most powerful tool at our disposal. Our lawsuit asks, essentially, for current election laws to be completely thrown out and replaced by fair standards. If we win completely, a vast array of practices would be swept away, including the outrageous petitioning

requirement. Unfortunately this would not be an easy victory. First, it would be expensive, requiring perhaps as much as \$80,000, depending on how long the process takes, and how many appeals are required. Any initial decision is likely to be appealed, no matter who wins. The case might end up in the U. S. Supreme Court. Thus the second major drawback of this approach: it will take time. While it is theoretically possible for a victory to occur this year, no one expects that. More likely the process will take about two years. And it is not a done deal even after that. We could lose all or most of our key requests. Our liaison with the attorneys in this lawsuit is Sean Haugh, who welcomes input from party members. In addition to work on the actual lawsuit, Sean envisions a campaign to bring this issue to other interest groups and to the public, which you can help with. Financial contributions to the cost of the suit are also most welcome. If you wish additional information about the lawsuit, including a copy of the complaint and other court documents, there's an informational page at <http://www.ncliberty.net/LPNCvNCBoE.htm>, or you may contact Sean by phone at (919) 286-0152 or e-mail <seanhaugh@mindspring.com>.

The second possibility for regaining ballot access is in the NC Legislature. We have friends in the legislature, on this issue. A bill, originally called HB88, went from the NC House to the NC Senate. In its original form the HB88 would have reduced our petition requirements down to the point where we could complete the project even without paid petitioners. As it moved out of the

House, it got amended to a form which is not good for us. But our friends in the Senate are working on fixing that (such back and forth changes are common in the formation of legislation). A final form must get through a joint House/Senate committee and be given a final approval by both parts of the legislature. This is no done deal by any means. But it is a realistic possibility. We have a Legislative Agenda Committee, chaired by Eric Smith, which has been in contact with our legislative friends. Eric posted a status report of the committee to our LPNC Yahoo!Group, which you can view at <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/LPNC/message/26188>. If you would like to learn more about this process and how you can lobby yourself, contact Eric at <Esmith@lpnc.org>.

The third possibility for regaining ballot access is the old fashioned way – get the petition signatures turned in. A renewed effort is being undertaken under the leadership of our Ballot Access Director Bob Ritchie. There are few funds for hiring professional petitioners. But Bob has started a fund for local LPNC members, whereby they are paid at half the rate as the professionals are paid. In addition there is some local organizing going on to revive the fully volunteer efforts. In the Triad especially, but also in the Triangle, some tangible results are coming in. We can use more. If you would like to contribute to one of the dedicated petitioning funds, or get involved in organizing or doing volunteer petitioning, please contact Bob Ritchie at <Ballotaccess@lpnc.org> (You can find printable petition forms at <http://lpnc.org/>).

It is tempting to think about each of these three arenas for ballot access as distinct, and then to try to decide which one is "best". But as a practical matter, it is better to view each strategy as a contribution to a wider effort. The likelihood of any one of them, by itself, being able to wipe out the problem is much smaller. A lawsuit could easily lower the petition requirement without eliminating it, as we would ideally like. A legislative reform could end up with significant improvement, but still a major burden. Petition gathering might not provide all that our current law requires, but still provide enough to satisfy a lesser burden.

The Tarheel Libertarian

Acting Editor: Max Longley

The Tarheel Libertarian is published bimonthly by the Libertarian Party of North Carolina, PMB 253, 1851 Hillandale Rd., Suite 1B, Durham, NC 28805. *Subscriptions:* Free with LPNC membership.

If you wish to buy advertising, suggest a story idea, write a story yourself, send me hate mail, etc., you can email me at TLEditor@lpnc.org, or phone me at 919-477-1961.

Nor is it realistic to presume that LPNC can put all its eggs in one basket, even if some of us tried to arrange that. Our membership has diverse opinions on this issue. There are members devoted to each of the strategies, though I suspect that the largest group is composed of those who see value in more than one approach.

Officially, the LPNC Executive Committee decided that, with our normal budget, we cannot afford to fund both a regular paid petitioning force and the lawsuit (even with the cost of the lawsuit spread over time). So the choice was made to make the lawsuit the top priority. Do you agree? If you feel that your resources would be best put to one of the other strategies, then you are in luck, because you can participate in any (or all three) of our ballot access initiatives. At this point the most important thing, that anyone who has strong feelings on this issue can do, is to join with those who are actually working on one of the strategies.

I challenge you to do more than join a debate on which strategy is best. I challenge you to vote with your personal resources, in the ballot access marketplace inside our own LPNC community.

Phil Jacobson (chair@lpnc.org) is the State Chair of the LPNC.

Libertarians at UNC-Greensboro win a Free-Speech Victory

by
Allison Jaynes
and Robert Sinnott

“The University Permits individuals assemblies of groups without prior approval in two ‘free speech and assembly’ areas... Although prior approval is not required, notification of the intent to hold an assembly in these areas must be given... at least 48 hours in advance of the assembly.”

Section X, UNCG Facility Use Policy

In the wake of the student movements of the 60s and 70s, universities around the county started enacting policies that restrict free assembly and speech. These policies often involved the designation of small areas of land as so called “Free Speech Zones.” By default, the right to freely speak and assemble is thereby restricted on all remaining areas of the campus. These policies are at best disturbing and at worst a gross injustice. The Declaration of Rights in the North Carolina Constitution, not to mention the First Amendment of the federal Constitution, protects us against such outrageous restrictions.

Despite this clear message sent by our founding fathers, universities today desperately try to defend these practices by claiming that they protect a student’s right to study. The rights of all students to study and learn absolutely should be defended, but not at the expense of the fundamental rights granted to each and every citizen of the United States. As long as a demonstration or gathering is peaceful and doesn't interfere with the primary function of a university, free speech should never be confined to specific areas or require prior notification.

(Continued on Page 5)

2006 LPNC Annual Convention Registration Form

Yes! I want to celebrate *Independence Day: Every Day* with the Libertarian Party of NC. Here's my registration information. (You may also register at <www.lpnc.org>.) Register by 4/25/2006.

	Number	Total costs
Gold package (\$90) (Includes Friday reception, Saturday luncheon, Saturday Gala Awards Banquet, and convention floor pass)	_____	_____
Silver package (\$60) (Includes Friday reception, Saturday luncheon, and convention floor pass)	_____	_____
Bronze package (\$30) (Includes Friday reception, and convention floor pass)	_____	_____
Additional banquet tickets (\$30 each)	_____	_____
	TOTAL	_____

(Please specify meal choice: _____Chicken _____Vegetarian)

Name _____ E-mail _____

Address _____

City/State/Zip _____ Phone _____

_____ My check is enclosed.. _____ Bill my credit card

Name on card _____

Credit Card # _____ Expiration Date _____

Signature _____

Preregistration prices are good through April 25, 2006. Only bronze package is available after 4/25. Price increases by \$10.00 at the door.

Please complete and mail to: Barbara Howe, LPNC Convention Registrar
5046 Tar Hill Drive
Oxford, NC 27565

For more information call 919-690-1423 or register on the web at <www.lpnc.org>.

Free-Speech Victory (Continued from Page 3)

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro claims time and time again that it has “consistently valued and protected the rights to free speech and open dialogue.” It even claims, in its mission statement, that the UNCG community is “founded on open dialogue.” Yet, it maintains and enforces rules that do just the opposite.

As the leaders of the UNCG College Libertarians, we decided to oppose the University's oppressive and unconstitutional policies. Two months ago, the College Libertarians hosted a free-speech demonstration on the front lawn of the Jackson Library, the most central and accessible area of UNCG, making it the obvious ideal location for any kind of demonstration. It is the only arena easily viewed by every student strolling through the heart of campus. Accompanied by an enthusiastic group of about 40 students and supporters, we protested the attempt to confine free expression within bureaucratically-designated “Free Speech Zones.”

We stood on a piece of lawn holding painted signs. We never blocked a walkway, disturbed a class or prevented any student from learning or studying. Our goal: to make the UNCG community, and the public at large, aware of a very serious infringement on the rights of students at UNCG.

While our demonstration was peaceful and quiet, we weren't in a designated “Free Speech Zone.” An administrator asked us to take the demonstration to a specified “Free Speech Zone” down the road. Although the “Zone” in which the administrator wanted to confine us is bordered by a fairly busy sidewalk, it is not nearly as visible as the library lawn and only about 1/3 the size. Obeying the demand to relocate our demonstration would, of course, have gone against the whole point of our protest. We held our ground, knowing that we were doing nothing illegal or disruptive.

We were subsequently notified that disciplinary action would be taken against us for violating UNCG's Facility Use Policy (printed above) and for failure to comply with the directive of a University official. The other students demonstrating with us weren't charged, just us two ringleaders.

When our case was reported in the media, UNCG attempted to justify its speech-suppressing policy by using arguments irrelevant to our case. Checkna Leinwall, the Associate Director for Student Life, told the press that UNCG has to “balance the students' right to free speech with a student's right to study.” If this means preventing classroom disturbances, keeping pathways clear, and maintaining a suitable work environment in dormitories, then we agree the University should do these things to protect the students' right to study. There is nothing wrong with punishing people who interfere with the purpose of the University's mission. But that is *not* what our group was doing, and the enforcement of arbitrary free speech policies is *not* the way to ensure a peaceful and respectful campus environment.

UNCG is only one example from the hundreds of universities that have speech codes. Students across the nation are being censored. From coast to coast, the ideas and opinions of our nation's brightest students and professors are being silenced. But there is hope on the horizon. With the help of an organization called the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (FIRE), students are challenging these policies-and winning. When students challenged the speech code at West Virginia University, the school changed the policies without litigation. Then, at Texas Tech, a federal judge struck down restrictions on speech.

Now, after the student demonstration and ensuing public support (thank you, local media), UNCG has dropped all charges against us, and has formed a committee to rewrite its policy. In fact, at a recent meeting, UNCG's counsel, Lucien “Skip” Capone III, finally admitted that the rules regarding free speech at UNCG were clearly unconstitutional.

Institutions of higher education have always been heralded as being a sanctuary for the “marketplace of ideas.” The free exchange of knowledge is the cornerstone of our future. The ability to express and share views with students and the community is just as important outside the classroom as it is inside the classroom. The spread of information, the development of new and exciting ideas, and the defense of our nation's strongest values are all threatened when free speech and assembly are prohibited. There is simply no excuse good enough to warrant violating our constitutional right of free expression at any public university.

Allison Jaynes (allisonjaynes@gmail.com) is an at-large member of the LPNC Executive Committee. She is also a UNCG student and the founder and President of the UNCG College Libertarians. Robert Sinnott (robgob@blazemail.com) is Vice President of the UNCG College Libertarians.

***Kelo* resolution:
Executive
Committee backs
state constitutional
amendment**

The Executive Committee of the Libertarian Party of North Carolina adopted the following resolution on January 14:

Resolution by the Libertarian Party of North Carolina in Support of an Amendment to the North Carolina Constitution Limiting the Power of Eminent Domain

WHEREAS, the protection of private property rights against government seizures and other unreasonable government interference is a fundamental principle and core commitment of our Nation's Founders; and

WHEREAS, On June 23, 2005, the United States Supreme Court issued its decision in Kelo v. City of New London, which held that government may seize the private property of one owner, and transfer that same property to another private owner, simply by concluding that such a transfer would benefit the community through increased economic development; and

WHEREAS, the Court's decision in Kelo is alarming because, as Justice Sandra Day O'Connor accurately noted in her dissenting opinion, the Court has “effectively . . . delete[d] the words ‘for public use’ from the Takings Clause of the Fifth Amendment’ and thereby ‘refus[ed] to enforce properly the Federal Constitution;” and

WHEREAS, the Court in Kelo noted, “nothing in our opinion precludes any State from placing further restrictions on its exercise of the takings power,” and

WHEREAS, the North Carolina Constitution contains inadequate restrictions on the State’s exercise of the power of eminent domain, in that it does not specifically address the power, merely stating in Article I, Section 19 that “No person shall be . . . deprived of his life, liberty, or property, but by the law of the land;” and

WHEREAS, the Libertarian Party of North Carolina opposes the taking or seizure of private property by government or by agencies acting upon governmental authority and supports compensation for owners whose property is devalued or made inaccessible by government regulations;

WE THEREFORE, THE LIBERTARIAN PARTY OF NORTH CAROLINA, support an amendment to the North Carolina Constitution affirming the government's role in the protection of private property rights. As seizure of private property for the benefit of private interests is in direct conflict with the government's role in protecting private property, we call upon the legislature and citizens to amend the constitution to prohibit in particular this form of taking.

It didn't start with *Kelo*

Insight from
the Bible

by
Max Longley

The LPNC is joining the chorus of protest against the U. S. Supreme Court's *Kelo* decision. That decision, in practical effect, means that in certain cases, the government can take your property for private use, rather than for a public use as specified in the federal Constitution.

This is not the first time that greedy government officials have tried to steal private property for non-public uses. An early example of this sort of thing is found in the Holy Scriptures, in the first book of Kings, Chapter 21, verses 1-19. I don't want to spoil the plot: read it for yourself! Suffice to say that God didn't approve of this early attempt at Kelo-ism.

Max Longley (TLEditor@lpnc.org) is the Acting Editor of *The Tarheel Libertarian*.

Leadership Changes

by
Max Longley

There have been a few changes recently in the higher ranks of the LPNC. Thomas Hill has resigned as State Chair. Richard Norman has resigned as Membership Secretary. Sean Haugh has resigned his paid position with the LPNC.

Tom, Richard and Sean have been fighting valiantly for liberty for a long time. The LPNC owes them a debt of gratitude for all their hard work. Hopefully, they'll keep fighting for freedom for many, many years into the future!

The Executive Committee has appointed Phil Jacobson as the new State Chair and Susan Hogarth as the new Membership Director. Susan's former position as Newsletter Editor remains vacant, but I have been appointed Acting Editor.

Max Longley (TLEditor@lpnc.org) is the Acting Editor of *The Tarheel Libertarian*.

How I Became Pro-Life

Guest editorial

by
Doris Gordon

[The following speech was delivered by Doris Gordon to the Maryland Right to Life Convention in the 1970s.]

In 1959 I read a book that changed my life and thoughts profoundly. Its name was "Atlas Shrugged"; its author, Ayn Rand. It was her ideas together with those of Nathaniel Branden, a famous psychologist who was once closely associated with her, that made me eventually pro-life. Ironically, both strongly support abortion.

Rand and Branden taught me aggression is wrong; that human relationships should be based upon persuasion and voluntarism instead of coercion and fraud; that the moral and the practical are one and the same, in the long run at least; that first of all we must do no harm; and that each of us is personally responsible for our own actions, but not the actions of others.

I also learned that the chief source of coercion and fraud is the state; that instead of being helped and protected by the state, we are harmed in countless ways; that in order to create a more humane and healthy society, we should turn away from the state and strengthen those voluntary institutions in society which do in fact promote the good – such as the family, private charities, the free enterprise system, and even the churches. I say "even", for, as some of you may know, I am an atheist. I point this out just to make it clear my pro-life position is derived entirely from philosophical and scientific ideas and is not influenced by religious beliefs.

I don't know when I first thought about abortion, but I had always accepted the idea in some vague sort of way. But twelve years ago, I attended a lecture given by some disciples of Rand. Someone in the audience challenged their proabortion position and then a debate ensued about when the human being comes into existence. This struck me as odd, for Ayn Rand's philosophy, which she calls Objectivism, starts from the premise that existence exists, "existence" meaning something physical exists. Why were they disagreeing about when something as physical and as easily observable as the human body comes into existence?

This shocked me into thought. It was easy to figure out that the human being begins to exist at conception. It took just one more step to decide that the human being at conception is capable of having rights; for if all human beings have rights, so do the unborn.

But I couldn't go further, for there seemed to be a conflict of rights between the mother and her child in the womb. In 1973, the Washington Post printed my letter about this. It said in part, "The abortion issue will remain insoluble. The reason is that there are two basic rights in conflict...the right to life in the child and the right to liberty in the mother... The implementation of one right requires the violation of the other... Some may argue that life is a higher value than liberty. But then there was Patrick Henry who said, 'Give me liberty or give me death.' Life without liberty can be meaningless and of no value." It seemed to me that if someone was enslaving me, I would have the right to kill that person if that was the only way I could free myself.

The belief that there is a conflict of rights between mother and child still persists, not only among proabortionists, but among proliferers. I no longer believe such a conflict exists, but it took me three more years to figure out why. I am going to give you some of the reasoning I went through. It may sound complicated and confusing in part, especially if you are hearing it for the first time, but the bottom line is very simple and everyone knows it: There is no conflict of

rights between mother (or father) and child because parents have an obligation to care for their children and, therefore, children have a right to that care. Most of us, even pro-abortionists accept this idea about children after they're born. Even the state acknowledges this is true, for the state compels parents to support their children. If children are children before as well as after birth, then parents have the obligation to care for them, also.

This means women have no right to choose to kill their unborn or to evict them from their bodies. Mothers have the obligation, instead, to house and feed them and protect them in the womb. Perhaps when the pro-abortionists wear their buttons saying "Choice," we should wear one saying "Responsibility."

Now I will go more into the ideas that changed my mind about abortion. To do this I have to talk about my views on the military draft. The draft and having an unwanted pregnancy have something in common: They are both involuntary servitude in the sense of having to do something against one's will rather than by choice. I may say some things that some of you will strongly disagree with, but right or wrong, it was my work on the draft and amnesty issues that gave me the idea and courage to form Libertarians for Life. Libertarians agree that the draft is immoral and I hope to use this common understanding to help explain why abortion is immoral, too. Perhaps my comments will be useful in talking to non-libertarians, too.

In the case of the draft, I believe involuntary servitude is aggression. In the case of the usual pregnancy, it is not. The distinction hinges on whether or not we owe something to someone else. Involuntary servitude is justified only in order to compel someone to give what he or she owes to another. None of us can point to another person and say you owe me X number of years of service in the military. But children can point to their parents and say you owe me care.

Now I can point my finger at each one of you and say you owe me something and that is to never initiate aggression against me. I, of course, owe you the same respect. Otherwise, when we speak of "owing," it means that a particular person owes a particular debt to a particular person or persons. We have to be able to identify the parties involved and show exactly what that debt is and how it arose. We can't owe to an abstraction such as "society" or "the country", only to individuals.

Libertarians believe strongly in defense, but the freedom of even one of us must not be violated in the name of defense. Defending freedom by infringing freedom is a contradiction in terms. We should and can be both pro-defense and pro-individual liberty at the same time.

The general principle here and the one that should guide all our chosen actions is that the ends do not justify the means; that is, the initiation of coercion or force is impermissible, whether committed by the individual, the group, or the state. This means that peaceful people have the right to be left alone and go their own way. We may stop murder or theft because people owe us non-aggression. We may compel payment on contracts or compensation in the case of accidents. Something is owed in these cases and the debtors and creditors can be identified. We are entitled to gain or to keep our own life, liberty and property for ourselves and free from harm.

Having been harmed in some fashion does not entitle us to make a claim against just anyone. Being in need, even when the need is real, does not justify taking from someone who does not owe us, who is not directly responsible for that owing. If you or I take when nothing is owed, unless that person gives willingly, we are guilty of stealing. And we know the Biblical injunction, "Thou shalt not steal".

Many of us agree that you and I have no right to use coercion against people who don't owe us anything. The same prohibition applies to groups of people who constitute the government. The reason is simple: unjust acts do not become just when legalized. Legalizing abortion did not make that right. Majority rule does not justify aggression. Might does not make right. Defending our liberty is important, but if the United States of America deprives us of our liberty, where can we be safe?

Let's consider the argument that my son and daughter or yours have an obligation to submit to the coercion of a draft. If our children have such an obligation, to whom do they owe it? If it cannot be shown that they owe it to me or to you or to any other individual, then there is no such obligation and you or I have no right to threaten or punish them with imprisonment if they won't go. And therefore, neither do we have the right to use the arm of the law to do so. No law can justify aggression.

It has been argued that they, or perhaps we, too, owe some service to our country because of the benefits the country gives to us. Perhaps we do get some things from the state, but don't we pay for them with our taxes and inflation? Furthermore, the individual has no real choice, for the most part, about what he is given. And then he is compelled to pay for it, sometimes by spilling his blood. If someone were to send you unordered merchandise in the mail, no one would have the right to compel you to pay for it and the state recognizes this fact. The only thing it could be said that each of us owes our country is to respect the freedom of everyone else. That is the only way to pay for the benefit of freedom or to protect it. The protection of the rights of the individual is the only justification for the existence of government, and this is recognized by the Declaration of Independence.

Now pregnancy and abortion are different matters in regard to the justice of involuntary servitude. This is so because we can show very clearly how one individual owes another. We are responsible for the foreseeable consequences of our own actions as they affect others: that is, when we impose ourselves upon others without their permission. We are especially responsible when the person affected has absolutely no choice about being stuck in the situation, as is the child in the case of pregnancy.

Sometimes I hear the argument that the child was not affected by being conceived because no child existed before conception. But how else can we explain the child's situation except by referring to the actions of the parents? Parents can't blame their unborn children for their mother's pregnancies. Conceiving children may be unintentional on our part, but having sex is usually a voluntary act and most people know getting pregnant is a possible side effect. We have some choice in the matter of creating children. It is the children who have no choice about being affected when we experience the pleasures of sex.

Not only are children not responsible for the consequences of a mother's pregnancy upon herself, neither are they to blame for their need to remain in the womb. This need is something we impose upon them when we create them. The child's life and needs are a package deal.

Once having brought children into a state of dependency, we have the obligation to bring them safely out. This means we must wait until they are able to come "out" safely. This also means parental obligation continues after childbirth.

As one libertarian said about abortion: Creating a child is like inviting someone into your home and rendering him incapable of living on the outside for nine months. We have no right to toss him out. Another libertarian, a psychiatrist, made an even stronger analogy. He said when we create children, it could be said we create "captives". We are not entitled to kill captives nor endanger them. In fact, we have the obligation to care for them while they are captive and to see that they gain release from their "captivity." This means in the case of children, we have the duty to bring them to a state where they can take care of themselves.

Sometimes I hear the argument that yes, it is true that the unborn child needs care and thus is in harm's way. However, they say, we've given the gift of life, something so valuable, that we bear no net obligation. The answer is that we do not have the right to force a gift upon anyone, and that we did not get the child's permission. This is not a case where the child freely accepts the good with the bad. So we are still responsible for protecting the child from harm. The net gain to the child is irrelevant. Our obligation comes from the fact that we impose the situation upon children without their assent.

Where parents choose not to fulfill their duty to children, such as when they choose to have an abortion, others are entitled to defend the child's rights, for such defense is no aggression upon anyone. We must exercise caution here in that the question of what other things do or do not constitute proper care is a separate question apart from abortion and which perhaps remains unsettled at this time.

Another point I must mention is that libertarians hold that human needs, even when they are real needs, are no obligation in themselves. While parents owe care to their own children, we don't owe care to anyone else's. The libertarian makes a distinction between purely moral obligations and legal obligation, legal in the sense that someone is entitled to use force against us, not merely because the law says so, but because we have a morally enforceable debt. Anyone who claims there is such a debt and wishes to compel payment has the burden of proving such a debt exists and the responsibility of his own actions if he is in error.

Libertarianism does not require us to give to charity, but charity is not charity unless it is given voluntarily. If taken by force, it is not charity but theft. The one who forces us to give owes us a debt. Libertarianism is silent about the religious or moral belief that we have a general duty to others or to God to help feed the hungry. Libertarianism is only about owing, as I have explained before. In order to avoid being guilty of committing aggression ourselves, we must leave it to each one of us to decide if, and when, and how much one wishes to willingly help others they don't owe. If we learn to solve human problems by non-aggressive means, the need for charity will be far less than it is today.

One final point about parental obligation. If there is no such obligation, we would have to say that at least non-lethal abortions are permissible. This is because parents would have a right to evict and to abandon their children, as in the hysterotomy abortion. I would be interested in hearing other arguments in support of parental obligation, including those based upon the Bible.

I seldom see any mention of parental obligation in pro-life literature. I wonder why it is not emphasized more. Sometimes I read that there is a conflict of rights between mother and child. There may be a conflict of needs, but not of rights. I also hear pro-lifers say in response to the "woman's right to control her own body" argument that life is a higher value than liberty and, therefore the child's rights come before the mother's. But again, it is not a matter of the child's rights vs. the mother's. It is a matter of the child's rights and the mother's obligations. The child has two rights against the mother: the right to life, that is, the right not to be killed, and the right to parental care. And the mother has two obligations: her obligation not to kill the child and the obligation to care for her child. Libertarians for Life thinks this is an important argument and would like others to try it out. I hope you will tell me your thoughts on this.

As I said at the beginning, it was the ideas of Rand and Branden that made me eventually pro-life. It was an article by Branden* in one of Rand's publications that had to do with parental obligation in the case of born children. When I made the connection with what he said there to the abortion issue, the lights went on and the bells rang. I had solved what I had thought was the insoluble issue.

*"What are the respective obligations of parents to children, and children to parents?", Nathaniel Branden, *The Objectivist Newsletter*, December 1962.

Doris Gordon (dorisgordon@comcast.net) heads the group *Libertarians for Life*. This article is reprinted, with her permission, from the *Libertarians for Life* Web site, <http://L4L.org>.

Convention Awards

You do not have to attend the convention to vote for these awards. All party members are eligible to cast votes for these awards. However, please only vote once. You can mail this ballot to **Barbara Howe, 5046 Tar Hill Drive, Oxford, NC 27565**

Any comments you add will be helpful as we prepare these awards for presentation at the banquet.

Thank you
2006 Convention Committee

Most Valued Activist

Vote for the person you believe best represents the work of the party by an individual. This can be someone who organizes activities, writes letters to the editor, is often willing to donate time and energy to the cause or whatever other measure you find valuable.

NAME: _____

Comments:

Most Valued Campus Affiliate

Vote for the Campus Affiliate that you believe best represents the cause of liberty. This does not have to be the largest group or the most active. Use your own criteria to measure value.

NAME: _____

Comments:

Most Valued County Affiliate

Vote for the group that you believe best represents the energy that is needed to promote liberty in North Carolina. This does not have to be the largest group or the most active. Use your own criteria to measure value.

NAME: _____

Comments: