
Subject: Re: Random political views survey
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 10 Oct 2008 13:42:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Oh, I get that just fine. It's just like people who refuse to drink because they see how their family members react to it or something traumatic happened with a friend/family member. The problem is, you're then trying to make public policy out of your personal convictions.

I'll quote myself:

Quote:It's always easy to argue the way you think things should be based on your personal convictions, but that gets dangerous if you're arguing politics. To try to suggest that your morality is the correct way to go about politics is wrong because everybody has a different view. Instead, I try to keep my morals to myself when I am debating topics like gay marriage, abortion, and welfare.

Most people have good intentions and only want what they view is best for the nation, and what they view as best is usually what they hold to be their truths. A lot of neo-conservatives try to argue against homosexuality and gay marriage because they think homosexuality is immoral. A lot of bleeding-heart liberals try to argue in favor of government spending for welfare out of altruism. Doing this creates a problem because they actively ignore the rights of others while catering to their comfort.

Instead, I argue based strictly on the rights of the individual. This is why I am in favor of gay marriage much like many liberals, but I am strictly against welfare programs like most conservatives. Siding any other way on these issues is a blatant disrespecting of individual rights. Morality should not be legislated.

My opinion of whether or not homosexuality and welfare are moral is irrelevant whether or not these things should be legislated. If I were to view homosexuality as an abomination, that still doesn't change the fact that the act is not harming someone else. As long as the participants are consenting adults, there are no rights being infringed on. If I view charity as an absolute moral responsibility that we have, that does not change the fact that forcing people to give money out of their wages and income to support the welfare program is a blatant infringement of individual rights as I view government spending should be universally applied to every contributor.

If we argue rights based principles, then we allow ourselves to keep the veil of ignorance that allows for the least amount of discrimination and the most amount of individual rights without impeding on any other's rights. Anything else you argue starts to discriminate against individuals and groups. By supporting one person's moral agenda, you start to oppress another person's rights. The simplest way to go about this is to uphold the veil of ignorance.

TL;DR version: You start to discriminate against people and their rights when you start going by personal convictions. While you may only be trying to do what you truly feel is best for others, you have to allow them to make their own decisions. As long as actions only involve willing participants, there should be no problem in letting people do as they wish, no matter how dangerous. Something should only be illegal when it negatively affects someone who's non-consenting or it involves a minor.
