

It's not about guns or abortion.

It's about Individual liberty.

Whether one's feelings or beliefs are credible or justifiable, or even noble - is irrelevant if it means limiting some other person's behavior, which does not present a credible and immediate threat.

The attempt to limit individual Liberty usually begins with the rationalization expressed with the phrase "in the name of." In legal parlance it is described as an "interest balancing approach", wherein some projected harm is considered greater than some existing liberty, which is seen as the cause of some harm, and therefore the liberty must in some manner be abridged.

On the more ethereal levels of government behavior the Congress saw fit to usurp certain individual liberties in the name of a national security risk, by passing the USA Patriot Act.

On the more mundane political level, liberties are taken in the name of helping people, such as was done with alcohol prohibition and the never ending War on Drugs. The alcohol prohibition was a very costly abject failure, as is the current prohibition on drugs an even more costly abject failure.

Over the past several decades, there has been an attempt to manipulate Americans into believing that a loss of liberty is worth the cost if we ban semi-automatic guns because it will save lives; or that an intrusion into a woman's life is worth the cost to her individual liberty because it will save the life of what is now termed and "unborn baby" - more correctly and historically called a fetus.

In the instance of the developing fetus - whether or not someone fervently and religiously or morally believes that removing a living but non-viable organism is akin to murder is not the question. The question is whether, in a

democratic republic, any government has the authority to legislate what a woman can do with her body.

In the instance of abortion, the Right uses the interest balancing approach by saying that the saving of the un-born is worth the loss of a woman's individual liberty, and in the instance of guns, the Left uses the interest balancing approach by saying that the lives saved by restricting guns is worth the loss of individual liberty.

In the case of guns, the argument is straight forward because of the structure of the American government, which is based on the existence of a well organized, well armed and well trained citizenry to prevent the establishment of a standing army.

Today the threat of a standing army is two fold because the military is a volunteer force and because of the existence of several strongly armed and equipped paramilitary forces within the government, such as the Department of Homeland Security, DEA, Coast Guard, FBI, CIA and the Department of Energy and others.

Abortion, or a Woman's Right To Choose, is clear cut because the fetus is in the woman's body, but the issue is surrounded by a moral argument - that of a developing fetus with the potential to develop into a viable living baby; and whether that fetus, at any stage of development is to be considered life. Some would say that viability, usually a 22 -24 weeks minimal, is the standard to follow. Looking at the fetus and comparing it to a baby, it appears that after 14 weeks a fetus begins to more closely appear to physically emulate a developed baby. For most of those opposing abortion, conception is seen as the beginning of life. The question involved is whether or not we are to consider an undeveloped, unviable fetus as a life - aside from its potential to develop into a baby, and whether the state has the authority to regulate a woman's birthing decision; assuming that authority for itself.

My position, and the one that I would support legislatively, is that up until the 16th week of pregnancy the State has no authority to intervene in a woman's pregnancy; and after that period of time, abortions are to be considered when the pregnancy endangers the woman's health, or if the condition of the fetus is in some way terribly denigrated. In those cases, the decision on a pregnancy remains with the woman and her doctor.

And, regardless of any other situation, in the case of rape or forced incest, the decision on pregnancy remains with the woman.

