



2022 Platform Committee Minority Report

The undersigned, a minority of the Platform Committee, not agreeing with the majority, desire to express their views and present this Minority Report as an alternative to the committee's recommendations.

Joe Dehn, Santa Clara County Representative

Richard Fast, San Francisco County Representative

Gail Lightfoot, San Luis Obispo County Representative

David Naranjo, Orange County Representative

Mark Suarez, Ventura County Representative

Starchild, San Francisco County Alternate

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Introduction | 3 |
| Problems with the Committee Report | 4 |
| Proposal 1: Revise IV.3 Protection of Privacy | 5 |
| Proposal 2: Revise V.11 Transportation and Mass Transit | 8 |
| Proposal 3: Revise V.1 Taxation | 11 |
| Proposal 4: Revise V.16 Conservation & V.19 Pollution | 13 |
| Proposal 5: Revise V.17 Water & V.20 Energy | 16 |
| Proposal 6: Revise IV.25 Alcohol and Tobacco & IV.26 Drug War and Recreational Drugs | 19 |
| Proposal 7: Revise IV.30 Legislature | 21 |
| Proposal 8: New Plank: Homelessness | 22 |
| Proposal 9: New Plank: Science | 23 |
| Proposal 10: New Plank: Forest Fires | 24 |

Introduction

The purpose of the Platform Committee is to propose amendments to the Platform for consideration by the delegates at the state convention. The Bylaws provide for the Platform to be updated in an incremental way, by the addition, replacement, and deletion of planks—with planks that are not amended remaining part of the Platform until they are up for amendment again at the next convention. It is a process that has allowed the Platform to continually evolve, balancing the need for change with the benefits of continuity and maintaining consistent principles. It is the responsibility of the members of the Platform Committee to present a set of proposals consistent with this process.

This Minority Report is presented to the delegates to give them an opportunity to continue that process of improving the Platform by making changes where necessary, while providing clear and explicit statements about a wide variety of issues, written by and for Libertarians in California. This report includes several types of proposals: some make a single existing plank more concise or better organized; others combine two existing planks into one; and some address topics that were not explicitly addressed previously, but are important to many party members. The proposals are an attempt to strike a balance between the length of the Platform and the need to address topics of concern for Libertarians.

The delegates should have an opportunity to proceed in this way, by debating and voting on these kinds of proposals—an opportunity that the Committee Report would remove—so that the Platform can continue to serve its intended purpose for the coming year and for many years to come.

Problems with the Committee Report

This Minority Report provides an alternative to the Committee Report, which is recommending an approach that recent Party history has shown to be divisive and will deny delegates a voice in deciding party positions on issues. The Committee Report is attempting to remove the entire existing Party Platform in one of two ways:

1. By amending the Party Bylaws to say that the national Libertarian Party Platform is the Libertarian Party of California's Platform and eliminating a separate California platform, or
2. By deleting the Party Platform, plank by plank, and replacing it with references to the national Libertarian Party platform, but no specific language from the national platform.

That approach will deny California party members a voice in deciding official party positions on the issues that they find important. It disenfranchises delegates by taking away their ability to debate and vote on the language of those party positions. It will centralize that power with the national party and with non-California Libertarians, who may not know or understand the issues that are important in California.

The Committee Report proposes eliminating the ability of California members to adopt any platform planks, California-specific or otherwise. While the report claims that the Party Program gives members a way to adopt positions on issues, that is not the purpose of the Program. The Program is a more limited expression—of up to five planks—of interim measures and practical policies, designed to implement party positions on issues. It does not fully express party positions or principles. In addition, the Program is amended and Program Committee members are selected by the Executive Committee: general party membership, convention delegates, and County Central Committees are denied a direct voice in the process.

Furthermore, the Committee Report starts by recommending amendments to the Party Bylaws, but the Platform Committee has not been given that authority. The Bylaws Committee is expressly given the authority to recommend changes to the Bylaws and Convention Rules. By including those amendments in the Committee Report, the committee is attempting to circumvent party rules.

For those reasons, the minority of the Platform Committee disagrees with the views and approach taken by the majority. If the recommendations in the Committee Report are adopted, it would further inflame division in the Party, disenfranchise delegates, and remove a critical mechanism for party members to have a voice in deciding the Party's positions on issues.

Proposal 1:

Revise IV.3 Protection of Privacy

Summary

This proposal revises the wording and format of plank IV.3, in order to shorten it, state our principles more clearly, and list the policies we support and oppose in a more concise manner. The revised plank is renamed “Privacy.”

Changes

The plank was completely rewritten with a stand-alone introductory paragraph followed by a list of specific policies that we support or oppose. The total word count of the plank is reduced by about 33%.

Proposed Platform Amendments

~~IV.3. Protection of Privacy~~

~~We oppose any government restriction, regulation, or censorship of speech, literature, or any other medium of expression. It is especially important in a free society that government be prevented from restricting what may be said about government itself. Specifically, we oppose any use of governmental law enforcement agencies to violate the privacy of, or interfere with, those engaged in peaceful political activities. We oppose government violation of the privacy of client-professional relationships.~~

~~The individual's privacy, property, and right to speak or not to speak should not be infringed by the government. No congressional committee, government agency, or grand jury shall have the power to compel any person to appear or testify.~~

~~Government mandated record-keeping by private parties is not only a violation of privacy, but also a form of involuntary servitude, and should be abolished. Correspondence, bank, and other financial transactions and records, doctors' and lawyers' communications, employment and other voluntarily maintained records should not be open to review by government without the consent of all parties involved in these records, except through due process in criminal cases involving violations of the rights of others.~~

~~We support policies that will leave the electronic transmission of data and information in the hands of the people. Therefore, we oppose government encryption policies that would guarantee that the government could conduct surveillance of electronic transmissions by mandating or encouraging government-readable methods of encryption. Such government-imposed standards will foster routine and regular surveillance of private communications by agents of the government.~~

~~We favor repeal of prohibitions on the export of any mathematics, including encryption. Government imposed encryption standards, together with export restrictions, inhibit development of new privacy-enhancing products.~~

~~We also oppose any government policy on digital transmission of telephone messages that requires the installation of surveillance-facilitating software in telephone switching equipment in order to expose personal telephone calling patterns and credit card purchases to the view of the government. Such information should be private.~~

~~So long as the national census and all federal, state, and other government agency compilations of data on an individual continue to exist, they should be compiled only with the consent of the persons from whom the data are sought.~~

~~We call for the repeal of the law requiring the Department of Motor Vehicles to collect an individual's social security number or thumb print for the purposes of obtaining a driver's license or registering a vehicle or vessel. We oppose any federal requirement that states adopt special driver's licenses with biometric indicators, social security number or other data which would allow driver's licenses to be used as national identification cards. Accordingly, we call for repeal of the federal Real ID Act, and for California's refusal to adopt that Act's requirements.~~

~~We oppose laws requiring parents to register the births of their children.~~

~~We believe airlines and airports should determine their own procedures to protect passengers. We oppose government mandated security procedures at airports, and we call for a ban on any use by government agencies of any technology that can see under clothing, such as backscatter x-ray or millimeter wave devices.~~

IV.3. Privacy

We hold that individuals have the right to live their lives without government interference and to be secure in their persons, homes, property, and communications. In a free society, government should not—itsself or in cooperation with private entities—interfere with or restrict people's right to privacy or routinely engage in unwarranted surveillance of individuals, including peaceful protestors. At the same time, government should act openly and with full transparency to allow for accountability and just governance.

Therefore, we support:

- A. Protections from unreasonable searches and seizures including records held by third parties, such as email, medical, financial, and library records.
- B. Requirements that any government agency which compiles data on individuals obtain consent from any person from whom the data is sought.
- C. Any policies that leave the electronic transmission of data and information in the hands of private individuals and companies.

- D. The private development, by airlines and airports, of technologies and procedures to protect passengers and the removal of government-mandated security procedures.
- E. The repeal of export restrictions on any mathematics or method of encryption, which inhibit the development of privacy-enhancing technology.
- F. The repeal of laws requiring the Department of Motor Vehicles, or any government agency, to collect people's social security numbers or biometric information for the purpose of obtaining a driver's license or identification card, or registering a vehicle or vessel. We call on the state government to refuse to adopt Real ID Act requirements.

In addition, we oppose:

- A. Government-mandated record-keeping requirements by private individuals or entities; any voluntarily maintained records should not be open to review by the government without the consent of all parties involved in the records, except through due process in criminal cases.
- B. Any attempts by the government to mandate or encourage government-readable methods of encryption or the installation of surveillance-facilitating technology in telephone switching or other communications equipment.
- C. Any laws that require parents to register the birth of their children with the government.
- D. Any attempt by government officials or agencies, or a grand jury, to compel any person to appear or testify, or to violate the privacy of client-professional relationships.

Proposal 2:

Revise V.11 Transportation and Mass Transit

Summary

This proposal is a revision of V.11 to better organize the presentation, eliminate redundant points, and reduce the overall length. The name would also be changed to "Transportation", to better reflect the range of topics addressed.

Changes

Changes the name from "Transportation and Mass Transit" to "Transportation" and reorganizes the points by consolidating similar points together, reducing the number of lettered points from 12 to 7 and reducing the total word count by about 36%.

Proposed Platform Amendments

~~V.11. Transportation and Mass Transit~~

~~We recognize that transit service has become a major problem in many areas. This problem can be solved properly only through voluntary action in the free market. Governmental interference in transit services has been characterized by monopolistic restrictions and gross inefficiency. We therefore advocate the following:~~

~~A. The repeal of all laws restricting transit competition, such as the granting of taxicab and bus monopolies and the prohibition of ridesharing or private jitney services.~~

~~B. The repeal of the blanket restrictions on the use of bicycles, skateboards, inline skates, roller skates, motorized scooters, and similar non- or minimally-polluting transportation alternatives on public streets and thoroughfares.~~

~~C. The repeal of Clean Air Act rules that require auto trip reduction. These rules fine employers who do not force their employees to participate in car pools, take mass transit, bicycle, walk, work four-day weeks, or telecommute.~~

~~D. The privatization of all public roads, freeways, waterways, and publicly owned transit systems, and until such time as the roadways are privatized, the contracting out to private enterprise of the functions of the Department of Motor Vehicles, Caltrans and other transportation agencies.~~

~~E. An end to government financing of mass transit projects.~~

~~F. An end to government regulation of private transit organizations and to government favors, including subsidies and access to powers of eminent domain.~~

~~G. The transfer to private ownership of airports and air traffic control.~~

~~H. Allowing foreign transportation service companies to offer commercial service in the United States.~~

~~I. The privatization of Amtrak and the end of government regulation of and subsidies to railroads.~~

~~J. The abolition of state and local agencies such as the California Public Utilities Commission, the California High Speed Rail Authority, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, the California Department of Transportation, the Bay Area Rapid Transit District, the Metropolitan Transit Authority, and various other local and regional transit authorities.~~

~~K. The repeal of laws mandating that manufacturers or vehicle owners install seat belts, air bags, or other restraints. We also oppose laws requiring the use of such devices.~~

~~L. The repeal of laws mandating motorcycle, bicycle, or all-terrain-vehicle helmet use.~~

V.11. Transportation

Transportation services are best provided through voluntary action in the free market. Government management of transportation infrastructure and transit services has been characterized by monopolistic restrictions, cronyism, and gross inefficiency.

We therefore advocate the following:

- A. The privatization of all public roads, freeways, waterways, airports, and related infrastructure. Until such time as these are fully privatized, services currently provided by the DMV and Caltrans should be contracted out to private enterprise and those state agencies eliminated.
- B. An end to government ownership, financing, management, or subsidy by granting special powers such as eminent domain, of railroads and mass transit systems, including the California High Speed Rail Project.
- C. Repeal of all laws restricting transit competition, such as the granting of taxicab and bus monopolies and regulations limiting the ability of individuals to provide ride sharing services as private contractors.
- D. Repeal of blanket restrictions on the use of bicycles, motorized scooters, and similar minimally-polluting transportation alternatives on public streets.
- E. Repeal of laws mandating that manufacturers or vehicle owners install or use devices such as seat belts, air bags, or helmets.
- F. Elimination of "trip reduction" regulations and fines that aim to force employees into telecommuting or making use of car pools, mass transit, bicycles, or walking.

- G. The abolition of regional transportation agencies such as the Metropolitan Transportation Authority, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, and the Bay Area Rapid Transit District.

Proposal 3:

Revise V.1 Taxation

Summary

This proposal contains minor revisions to the Taxation plank to make one point more California-specific, to address the issue of government getting around requirements for a popular vote on taxes by raising revenue through "fees" and "fines" that are effectively taxes instead, and to make the overall format more consistent with that of other planks.

Changes

Item A is reworded to address state and local income taxes specifically. Item H is added to address fees and fines being used to get around popular vote requirements. Other existing single-sentence paragraphs are moved, without any change in the substance of their wording, to be part of lettered lists.

Proposed Platform Amendments

V.1. Taxation

Taxation is government's confiscation of property of its citizens. Because of its non-voluntary nature, it cannot be justified, regardless of the purpose for which the proceeds are to be used. Therefore, we oppose taxation of any kind. To that end, we support any and all initiatives to cut or abolish any tax, and oppose any initiatives to increase taxes or add new ones. ~~We call for:~~

We call for:

- A. ~~The repeal of all income taxes.~~ The repeal of California state and local income taxes.
- B. The repeal of all sales and use taxes, including special taxes on so-called sinful activities.
- C. The repeal of all corporate and business taxes and fees, including special burdens on business inventories and out-of-state business firms.
- D. The repeal of all gift and inheritance taxes.
- E. The repeal of all property taxes.
- F. The abolition of all tax-collecting agencies, including the Franchise Tax Board and Board of Equalization.
- G. The rejection of any national sales tax or value added tax (VAT).
- H. An end to the practice of imposing fees or fines as a revenue source to avoid the requirement of a popular vote.

- I. All so-called “public services” to be funded in the same manner as private organizations – through voluntary contributions and charges for services for which the user has voluntarily contracted.

We oppose:

- A. All suggestions to split the owners' property tax rolls in order to increase the burden on business property, and to increase revenues.
- B. All efforts to repeal or undermine existing laws requiring greater than a simple majority vote to raise taxes.
- C. Any compulsory withholding of any taxes or fees from the paychecks of California workers.

~~We oppose all suggestions to split the owners' property tax rolls in order to increase the burden on business property, and to increase revenues.~~

~~We oppose all efforts to repeal or undermine existing laws requiring greater than a simple majority vote to raise taxes.~~

~~We further oppose any compulsory withholding of any taxes or fees from the paychecks of California workers.~~

~~We advocate that so-called “public services” be funded in the same manner as private organizations — through voluntary contributions and charges for services for which the user has voluntarily contracted.~~

Proposal 4:

Revise V.16 Conservation & V.19 Pollution

Summary

This proposal combines planks V.16 and V.19 in order to reduce their overall length, state our principles more clearly, and list the policies we support and oppose in a more concise manner. Our principles and policy solutions on each of these issues are similar enough to warrant a single, combined plank. The combined plank is called “Environment,” which is more in tune with current labeling of these issues, and would remain in the same position as the existing Conservation plank.

Changes

The planks were combined and completely rewritten with a stand-alone introductory paragraph followed by a list of the specific policies that we support or oppose. The combined plank reduces the overall word count of the original planks by about 24%.

Proposed Platform Amendments

~~V.16. Conservation~~

~~We support the right of private citizens and organizations to rightfully acquire natural resources for the purpose of conservation. However, the desire to conserve natural resources is not a valid excuse for the violation of individual rights, and we therefore oppose such violations.~~

~~We oppose government mandated conservation. Conservation should be the choice of the owners of private property. We therefore advocate:~~

~~A. That methods be devised for the transference to private ownership of all currently unowned and government held property, including waterways and airspace.~~

~~B. That conservationists buy areas or resources they wish to conserve.~~

~~C. The repeal of laws mandating the recycling of waste products and laws offering government loans to finance recycling plants.~~

~~D. That laws providing for governmental protection of endangered species be repealed, allowing private wildlife groups and private conservancy funds to assume responsibility for such efforts.~~

~~E. That all conservation laws controlling or regulating the use, development, sale, or production of resources — e.g., land, minerals and woodlands — be repealed.~~

~~F. That private deed restrictions be the method of choice to conserve natural resources for future generations.~~

V.19. Pollution

~~Pollution of air, water and land violates the rights of individuals to their lives and property. Physical harm to health or property by pollution is as real as harm due to assault or theft, and must be dealt with through objective legal procedures. In order to handle the problems of air, water, soil, radiation, and noise pollution, we call for an extension of the laws governing such torts as trespass and nuisance to cover persons who cause substantial damage by intruding on the persons or property of others. Current government measures concerned with pollution often bypass court proceedings, without concern for restitution to the victims of pollution or the rights of the accused. Governments, being major contributors to pollution, must be held legally responsible for their waste products.~~

~~We oppose all anti-litter tax laws and all mandatory bottle-deposit laws.~~

~~We call for the repeal of the Clean Air Act and call for the abolition of the federal and state Environmental Protection Agencies and the return, to the jurisdiction of the courts, of all questions of violations of the rights to life and property.~~

~~We support holding property owners fully liable for damages done by their toxic waste. We oppose the creation of governmental funds, backed by the taxing power, to finance toxic waste clean-up.~~

V.16. Environment

Good stewardship of our natural world is best accomplished through a system of voluntary exchange with a clear definition and enforcement of property rights and responsibilities. Through market-based incentives, private property owners and conservation groups can maintain natural resources, protect the environment, and make restitution to injured parties where damages are proven and quantified through legal procedures. Pollution of air, water, and land violates people's rights to their lives and property, since harm to health or property due to pollution is as real as harm due to assault or theft.

Therefore, we support:

- A. The ability of private individuals and organizations to acquire natural resources for the purpose of conservation, provided they do not violate individual rights in the process.
- B. The use of private deed restrictions to conserve natural resources.
- C. The transfer of all currently unowned and government-owned property, including waterways and airspace, to private ownership.
- D. An extension of the laws governing torts, such as trespass and nuisance, to include substantial damage caused by air, water, soil, radiation, and noise pollution.
- E. The abolition of the California Environmental Protection Agency and a return of all questions related to violations of the rights to life and property to the jurisdiction of the courts.

- F. Holding property owners fully liable for damages caused when they pollute.
- G. Holding governments legally responsible for being major contributors to pollution.

In addition, we oppose:

- A. Government-mandated conservation and laws that control or regulate the use, development, sale, or production of resources — e.g., land, minerals, and woodlands.
- B. Laws providing for governmental protection of endangered species—private wildlife and conservancy groups should assume responsibility for such efforts.
- C. Laws mandating the recycling of waste products, imposing anti-litter taxes or bottle deposits, and offering government loans to finance recycling plants.
- D. The creation of governmental funds, backed by the taxing power, to finance pollution clean-up.

Proposal 5:

Revise V.17 Water & V.20 Energy

Summary

This proposal combines planks V.17 and V.20 in order to reduce their overall length, state our principles more clearly, and list the policies we support and oppose in a more concise manner. Our principles and policy solutions on each of these issues are similar enough to warrant a single, combined plank. The combined plank is called “Energy, Water, and Resources” and would remain in the same position as the current “Water” plank.

Changes

The planks are combined and rewritten with a stand-alone introductory paragraph followed by a list of specific policies that we support or oppose. The combined plank reduces the overall word count of the original planks by about 23%.

Proposed Platform Amendments

~~V.17- Water~~

~~The history of government water projects in the State of California has been one of increased taxes to finance dams, canals, and pipelines. The state government has supplied subsidized water to growers who in turn produce federally subsidized crops, especially rice and cotton. Government run water rationing has channeled water to political favorites and burdened the public with arbitrary cutbacks. Government aided insurance programs have subsidized those living or doing business in flood prone areas, and created regional antagonism between beneficiaries and victims of water policy.~~

~~We advocate basing water rights on principles of appropriation and transferability.~~

~~We also advocate the transfer of all water works to private ownership. We oppose the tax financing and eminent domain land acquisitions for all projects and facilities in the state water plan, including the Peripheral Canal. We favor repeal of all government drought and flood emergency powers and all government ability to impose water rationing. We propose elimination of all government flood insurance programs. We favor an end to all government weather modification programs, and we favor holding private weather modifying firms liable for damages they may cause. We call for the elimination of the current doctrine of "use it or lose it" that automatically transfers unused privately owned water to governments or other claimants. Under the current doctrine of prior appropriation, recreational use is not considered a beneficial use. We hold that owners of land adjacent to bodies of water should be able to establish riparian property rights through "first regular use" of the water for recreational purposes.~~

~~V.20- Energy~~

~~California's energy crises are caused by the state's interference in energy markets. We support:~~

~~A. The creation of free markets for all energy types through the repeal of all government controls over energy prices to consumers and costs to distributors.~~

~~B. The right of persons to build, own or use refineries, pipelines, power generation units, or any other asset, as long as they don't violate the rights of others.~~

~~C. The abolition of the federal Department of Energy and the California Public Utilities Commission and their component agencies, without the transfer of their powers elsewhere in government.~~

~~D. Privatizing all government owned energy assets such as the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, the power marketing agencies, and mineral-bearing on-shore and off-shore lands.~~

~~We oppose:~~

~~A. The refusal of government agencies to permit the development of energy sources located on government held land.~~

~~B. Any government requirements intended solely to conserve energy, such as artificially low speed limits, subsidies for insulation, and preferential treatment for users of "alternative" energy sources.~~

~~C. Any taxes on energy producers.~~

~~D. Implementation by California of federal programs for coercive government control of energy production, distribution or use.~~

V.17. Energy, Water, and Resources

The most effective way to allocate resources is through a competitive system of voluntary exchange with a clear definition and enforcement of individual property rights and responsibilities. Government interference in resource markets—through ownership, subsidies, and control of pricing, allocation, and production—distorts economic activity, creates perverse incentives, and increases prospects for government corruption.

Therefore, we support:

- A. Privatizing all government-owned energy assets and water works, power marketing agencies, and mineral-bearing on-shore and off-shore lands.
- B. The ability of private individuals and organizations to build, own, or use refineries, pipelines, power-generation units, or other energy assets, provided they do not violate individual rights.

- C. Basing water rights on principles of appropriation and transferability; owners of land adjacent to bodies of water should be able to establish riparian property rights through "first regular use" of the water for recreational purposes.
- D. The repeal of all government subsidies related to energy and water, and controls over prices to consumers and costs to distributors.
- E. The repeal of the government's emergency powers related to energy, drought, and flood; and its ability to impose energy and water rationing.
- F. The elimination of all government flood insurance programs, as they subsidize those in flood-prone areas and create regional antagonism between beneficiaries and victims of water policy.
- G. The abolition of the California Public Utilities Commission and its component agencies, without the transfer of its authority elsewhere in government.

In addition, we oppose:

- A. Any taxes on energy or water producers and consumers.
- B. Government-imposed energy or water conservation requirements, including any preferential treatment for users of "alternative" energy sources.
- C. The tax financing and eminent domain land acquisitions for all projects and facilities in the state water plan.
- D. The doctrine of "use it or lose it" which automatically transfers unused privately-owned water to governments or other claimants.
- E. Government-funded weather-modification programs; private weather-modifying firms should be held liable for damages they may cause.
- F. Regulations that ban the development of energy sources on government-held land.
- G. The implementation by the State of California of federal programs intended to control energy production, distribution, or use.

Proposal 6:

Revise IV.25 Alcohol and Tobacco & IV.26 Drug War and Recreational Drugs

Summary

This proposal combines planks IV.25 and IV.26 in order to reduce their overall length, state our principles more clearly, and list the policies we support and oppose in a more concise manner. Our principles and policy solutions on each of these issues are similar enough to warrant a single, combined plank. The combined plank is called “Alcohol, Tobacco, and Recreational Drugs,” and would remain in the same position as the existing “Alcohol and Tobacco” plank.

Changes

The planks are combined and rewritten with a stand-alone introductory paragraph followed by a list of specific policies that we support or oppose. The combined plank results in a small reduction in overall word count.

Proposed Platform Amendments

~~IV.25. Alcohol and Tobacco~~

~~We oppose the regulation of alcoholic beverages by the State of California. Specifically, we oppose setting a drinking age or using zoning or land use laws to restrict the placement of bars or liquor stores. We also oppose road blocks that stop and detain sober motorists on public roads. Private road owners should be free to exclude alcohol abusers or others from their roads for safety or other reasons.~~

~~We oppose the efforts of the State of California trying to discourage tobacco use, that use being an individual right. And further we oppose any further state litigation against tobacco companies; support the repeal of all tobacco taxes and the end of all state-funded advertising to convince people to adopt non-smoking lifestyles. Instead, private groups and individuals are welcome to promote their viewpoints. We support the right of employers and business owners to decide rules for smoking at their businesses and properties, without government involvement.~~

~~We oppose current attempts to ban e-cigarettes or vaping, as well as any attempts to raise the smoking age to 21.~~

~~IV.26. Drug War and Recreational Drugs~~

~~We applaud and encourage the growing state trends toward legalization and/or decriminalization of marijuana, as well as other recreational drugs. The war on drugs not only significantly undermines true civil liberty, it likewise erroneously harms communities by disproportionately increasing violent criminal activity. Furthermore, it is unsustainably expensive and, as history has shown, wildly ineffective. This is why we also vehemently oppose any increase in new laws, regulations, or taxation which seem to accompany the aforementioned~~

~~trends, given that such measures are clearly intended to discreetly continue prohibition. As such, we support our state's exercise of nullification, in enacting laws removing ourselves from participation in the federal government's drug war, and recognize any attempt of a federal agent to circumvent these laws as an act of aggression to be handled by state authorities.~~

IV.25. Alcohol, Tobacco, and Recreational Drugs

The principle of self-ownership ensures that no government has the authority to interfere with an individual's bodily autonomy or to dictate which substances a person should consume—those decisions belong to individuals, not the government. In a free society, laws should be limited in their application to protecting people from violent offenders, property crimes, and fraud.

Therefore, we support:

- A. Any effort by state or local governments to decriminalize non-violent offenses related to substance use, implement policies that move towards legalization of recreational drugs, and resist the federal government's aggressive enforcement of alcohol, tobacco, or drug laws.
- B. The repeal of any taxes specifically levied on alcohol, tobacco, cannabis, or any good that the government may deem "harmful."
- C. The right of individuals to grow or manufacture drugs for their own use on their own property.
- D. Education and advice regarding the use of these substances by individuals or private groups rather than by government.
- E. The management of where drugs, alcohol, or tobacco products may be used or sold by private property owners rather than government regulations.

In addition, we oppose:

- A. Any law banning the consumption or sale of alcohol, tobacco, e-cigarette or vaping products, cannabis, or other substances.
- B. The application by local governments of zoning or land-use ordinances, or explicit numerical limits, to restrict the locations where tobacco, cannabis, alcohol, or other drugs may be sold.
- C. The regulation of alcoholic beverages by the state government, including drinking age laws and checkpoints that stop and detain sober motorists on public roads.
- D. Any effort by the state government to discourage tobacco use, including state-funded advertising or raising the smoking age to 21 and any litigation against tobacco companies by the state.
- E. The "War on Drugs", which undermines civil liberties, increases violent crime, and disproportionately harms low-income and minority communities.

Proposal 7:

Revise IV.30 Legislature

Summary

This plank currently emphasizes smaller districts as a way to provide the people with better representation. But proportional representation is another approach, one which can enhance representation of more kinds of interests, and which many party members are actively working to promote. This revision advocates adoption of proportional representation for the California legislature specifically, while still recommending smaller districts to the extent applicable (e.g., if only one house were elected by proportional representation, or if a system involving multi-member districts were adopted).

Changes

Language advocating proportional representation is added, while reducing the amount of language relating to district size, leaving the plank as a whole approximately the same size.

Proposed Platform Amendments

IV.30 Legislature

The legislature should have a real and effective connection with the people [and be representative of their diverse interests](#), ~~so that citizens can develop and maintain healthy relationships with those who represent them.~~

[We propose that at least one house of the legislature be chosen through a proportional representation method, such as Single Transferable Vote.](#)

[If geographic districts continue to be used, California has only 40 Senators and 80 Assembly members to represent a population of almost 40 million.](#) ~~T~~ [the number of districts should be increased, thereby decreasing the number of citizens within each district, and the number of districts should increase as the population grows. This would also reduce the need for officeholders to waste their time as perpetual fundraisers, and would reduce their power to unethically benefit from their positions.](#)

Additionally, we oppose a full-time legislature in California and support efforts to make the job of legislator at most a part-time one with drastically reduced salaries, staff, and expenses.

Proposal 8:

New Plank: Homelessness

Summary

Homelessness is a very serious issue in California, with constant mention in the media. This new plank makes a general statement about the importance of the issue, how it relates to government policies, and our support for the rights of homeless people. It then identifies specific policy changes that we advocate to improve the situation.

Proposed Platform Amendment

V.x. Homelessness [to follow current V.1 Taxation]

It is a moral outrage that there are hundreds of thousands of people living homeless on the streets in California as a result of government policies. The Libertarian Party of California opposes cruel policies criminalizing people for attempting to meet humanitarian needs that Big Government is unsuited to address. We support the rights of all people, homeless or not, to use the commons (outdoor public spaces) as they choose, so long as the use does not violate anyone else's rights and leaves "as much and as good" opportunity for use of these spaces by others. We stand with poor and homeless residents in asserting their rights to peacefully express themselves, seek assistance, and support themselves via gainful employment.

Therefore, we demand:

- A. That the charitable provision of food, tiny homes, and other materials to the homeless be decriminalized.
- B. That the property rights of homeless people be respected along with the property rights of housed Californians.
- C. An end to government restrictions on non-aggressive busking, panhandling, and artists and others offering their wares on public sidewalks and other public spaces so long as these uses allow others to pass through unobstructed.
- D. That homeless or marginally housed persons are not profiled or denied services on an equal basis with other Californians.
- E. An end to restrictions on the construction of multi-family housing units as well as zoning rules, building codes, and building permit requirements, all of which, by driving up the cost of housing, benefit the construction industry and well-connected homeowners at the expense of those who desperately need affordable homes.

Proposal 9:

New Plank: Science

Summary

Government misuse, manipulation, and misrepresentation of "science" as a way to justify policy has been highlighted by the current pandemic, but is a long-standing problem and one that will get worse the more government is involved with scientific research. This new plank proposes "the separation of science and state", and then elaborates on that general principle by addressing issues relating to government endorsing or attempting to discredit scientific ideas or scientists, and by advocating that research be funded privately rather than by government.

Proposed Platform Amendment

V.x. Science [to follow current V.4 Education]

We support the separation of science and state. Science is a process by which we increase our understanding of the natural world, always seeking better models, not a set of facts that can properly be the subject of legislation or edict.

Government has no business endorsing scientific theories or findings. Throughout history, attempts by authoritarian institutions to impose "official" views on scientific questions have interfered with progress. Famous examples include suppression of the heliocentric model of our solar system and the promotion of the Lamarckian theory of evolution. Our society today is not exempt from repetition of similar follies.

Similarly, government should not endorse or attempt to discredit scientists or scientific organizations. Experts in various scientific fields are best identified by their peers, and the general public should not be misled by titles bestowed by politicians and bureaucrats.

We oppose government funding of scientific research and education, which creates perverse incentives that can lead to waste of resources, while discouraging research that might lead to both better theories and practical new products and methods. Research should be privately funded by businesses, universities, and other institutions that allow those interested in various fields to pool their resources for this purpose.

Proposal 10:

New Plank: Forest Fires

Summary

Forest fires are a major issue in California, one that affects the lives and livelihood of many people and so is repeatedly in the news. This plank presents a libertarian view of the problem of forest fires, explaining how government is not the appropriate mechanism for dealing with the problem, and recommending instead an approach based on the principles of liability and private property.

Proposed Platform Amendment

V.x. Forest Fires [to follow current V.18 Agriculture]

Forest fires are a phenomenon that has existed from before California was established, but which can have worse outcomes for those of us living here depending on how forests are managed and the decisions we all make about where and how we live and other uses of land.

The risk of unwanted fires can be reduced through more careful design and placement of equipment. The uncontrolled spread of fires can be reduced by appropriate forest management practices, and by decisions about land use. Different approaches for areas that differ in topography and economic activity need to be made by the relevant communities cooperating for their mutual benefit. New technologies for detecting and controlling fires need to be developed and introduced expeditiously.

This is the kind of complex management problem which government is especially ill-equipped to address, because government replaces the natural processes of individuals defending their own interests and the economic calculations of the market with political decisions by people who are not held accountable for their actions.

We call for adjustment of liability laws to hold equally accountable private and government owners of equipment and land where fires start and spread to cause damage to others.

We call for deregulation of insurance companies to be able to provide stronger incentives to reduce causes of fires and make property less susceptible to damage.

We call for the privatization of fire protection services so that the true costs of protecting different properties can be better allocated through a competitive marketplace.

We call for the privatization of all forests in California currently under the control of federal, state, or local government. The people of California would be better off with these lands under the control of any combination of private entities dedicated either to conservation or productive use rather than continuing under the existing regime of politically-directed mismanagement.