

2010 Election

Ohio Right to Life State Candidate Survey

Return to: Ohio Right to Life Society
665 E. Dublin-Granville Rd., Suite 200
Columbus, Ohio 43229-3245
Phone: 614-547-0099 Fax: 614-547-0096

(Please print or type)

CANDIDATE NAME DAVID MACKO

HOME ADDRESS 28810 CANNON ROAD

CITY OLON ZIP 44139 COUNTY CUYAHOGA

Home Phone 440-248-8620 Work Phone RETIRED

Fax N/A E-mail DMACKO@ROADRUNNER.COM

Candidate for: { } State Senator State Representative District # 17

Candidate Status: { } Incumbent Non-Incumbent

Campaign Committee Name: MACKO FOR LIBERTY

Campaign Committee Contact: DAVID Phone: _____

Party Affiliation: { } Republican { } Democratic Other LIBERTARIAN

Ohio Right to Life Principles

Ohio Right to Life holds firmly to the principle that human life is precious and demands utmost respect. In the face of compelling biological evidence (e.g., distinctive genetic make-up at fertilization, heartbeat present 18-21 days after conception, brain waves at 40 days), it is evident that the unborn child is a person who is innocent, vulnerable, and in need of our protection and the protection of our laws. We believe that the right to life of all innocent persons, born and unborn, must be protected regardless of race, age, sex, health, degree of disability or circumstances of conception and that encouragement and positive options be offered to the expectant mothers.

A proposed constitutional amendment, which would have the effect of nullifying the U.S Supreme Court ruling on abortion and which would recognize the right to life of the unborn child, has been introduced in the U.S. Congress. The full text reads as follows:

The Unity Human Life Amendment

Section 1. The right to life is the paramount and most fundamental right of a person.

Section 2. With respect to the right to life guaranteed to persons by the Fifth and Fourteenth articles of amendment to the Constitution, the word "person" applies to all human beings, irrespective of age, health, function or condition of dependency, including their unborn offspring at every stage of their biological development including fertilization.

Section 3. No unborn person shall be deprived of life by any person: Provided, however, that nothing in this article shall prohibit a law allowing justification to be shown for only those medical procedures required to prevent the death of either the pregnant woman or her unborn offspring, as long as such law requires every reasonable effort be made to preserve the life of each.

Section 4. Congress and the several states shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

1. Realizing that it took a constitutional amendment to confer "personhood" and citizenship on all Americans even though these rights should have been evident, do you personally agree or disagree with the proposal for an amendment to the U.S. Constitution in the language quoted above or comparable language designed to ensure recognition of the personhood of the unborn, so as to afford constitutional protection of unborn life?

Agree { } Disagree { } No Opinion/Don't Know

Comments SEE ATTACHMENT ONE,

2. In 1973 the U.S. Supreme Court decisions in *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton* struck down all existing state statutes regulating abortion. In the event *Roe v. Wade* is overturned by the Supreme Court, would you **SUPPORT** legislation that would prohibit abortion in Ohio except to prevent the death of the mother?

YES { } NO

Comments _____

3. Do you **OPPOSE** the use of public tax dollars to fund abortions except to prevent the death of the mother?

YES { } NO

Comments I OPPOSE ALL TAX FUNDS FOR ANY MEDICAL TREATMENT.

4. Do you **OPPOSE** the use of public funds to support embryonic stem cell research that involves the destruction of a human embryo?

YES

NO

Comments I OPPOSE ALL USE OF TAX MONEY FOR ANY STEM CELL RESEARCH.

5. The Planned Parenthood Federation of America is the largest abortion provider in the U.S., performing 305,310 abortions in 2007. In the past, several Ohio Planned Parenthood affiliates received tax funding through Ohio's state "family planning" program. Although these state funds could not be used to directly pay for abortions, they did "free up" funds that Planned Parenthood received from other sources to be used for abortion-related activities. Do you **OPPOSE** state funding of abortion-providing organizations, such as Planned Parenthood?

YES

NO

Comments _____

6. Many pro-life people oppose use of the "morning-after pill" (often called "emergency contraception") because it may sometimes destroy a human embryo by preventing implantation after fertilization. Do you **SUPPORT** "freedom of conscience" legislation which would protect pharmacists and other medical professionals from being required to distribute the "morning-after pill" if they have religious or moral objections against do so?

YES

NO

Comments _____

7. Please see the attached "Ohio Right to Life Position Statement on Euthanasia". Do you **OPPOSE** legislation that promotes euthanasia?

YES

NO

Comments SEE ATTACHMENT TWO.

8. Do you **SUPPORT** state funding to assist pregnancy help centers, which provide alternatives to abortion?

YES

NO

Comments I OPPOSE TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ALL HEALTH CARE.
IF A GOVERNMENT CAN CONTROL YOUR HEALTH, THEN YOU ARE A SLAVE.

9. Do you **SUPPORT** legislation to prohibit medical/scientific cloning activities that create a human embryo for any purpose, including therapeutic or reproductive purposes?

YES

NO

Comments SEE ATTACHMENT THREE.

Signature David Macko Date March 1, AD 2010

Ohio Right to Life Society Euthanasia Position Statement

The Ohio Right to Life Society, Inc. reaffirms its commitment to the principle that each human being has intrinsic dignity and value, regardless of age, physical or mental condition, or state of dependency. This principle constitutes the basis for the inherent right to life which must be secured by law.

A direct violation of this principle is the growing acceptance of euthanasia—the purposeful killing by act or omission of a dependent human being for his/her alleged benefit. Euthanasia has been advocated for certain classes of human beings, including the handicapped young, the mentally impaired, the elderly or the senile, the seriously ill and the comatose. The inevitable result of this trend will be to escalate from killing for the alleged benefit of an individual to killing for the convenience of others.

Various social, economic, philosophical and medical factors in our society are responsible for this discriminatory and utilitarian ethic which would deny the inalienable right to life to those judged imperfect or unproductive. The callous and arrogant act of deciding that some lives are inferior and, therefore, may be eliminated degrades not only the victims but also the people that participate in it and the society that permits it. Such an attitude stands in contradiction to the duty that falls to all of us as members of a civilized society – the duty of human beings to take care of one another – the duty to be compassionate.

Euthanasia seeks to improve the quality of life, not by mutually ennobling acts of care and assistance, but by exterminating those who fall below some arbitrary standard. Killing is never a proper expression of compassion.

We recognize that the competent patient properly has broad rights to determine the nature of his/her medical treatment in a non-coercive context after being fully informed. We do not oppose the withholding or withdrawal of inappropriate or futile treatment which serves only to prolong the act of dying when there is irrefutable evidence that biological death is imminent. However, we oppose the withholding of nutrition or hydration in order to cause or hasten the death of a patient. We approve the accepted medical practice of administering pain-relieving drugs in whatever dosage necessary to alleviate the suffering of the terminally ill, as long as there is no intent to bring about or hasten the patient's death.

Proponents of euthanasia related legislation often use terminology which is imprecise and lends itself to expansion and abuse. For example, the “right to die” implies a right to choose death at any particular time and is the natural forerunner of a “duty to die”. When life and death are merely equivalent choices, the pressure of medical costs combined with the desire not to be a burden would inescapably lead to subtle but coercive expectations that a patient should exercise his choice “responsibly” and “unselfishly”.

Euthanasia proponents have also advocated legalized “assisted suicide” which is, in reality, voluntary euthanasia. The proper response of a civilized society toward the suicidal person is to help him recognize his self-worth and learn to cope with his problems, not to assist him in taking his own life.

The Ohio Right to Life Society cares about human life and about people and families facing difficult medical decisions. We promote positive steps of advocacy to protect all human life, no matter what its situation on the continuum of life. We are committed to informing and educating the general public as well as our own membership on the euthanasia issue and to supporting programs for people threatened by euthanasia.

2010 OHIO RIGHT TO LIFE CANDIDATE INQUIRY EXTENDED RESPONSES

1. Question One:

I prefer Congressman Ron Paul's Sanctity of Life Act, <http://www.govtrack.us/congress/billtext.xpd?bill=h111-2533>. I greatly fear giving the fedgov more power for any reason. It has had an almost uniformly bad result.

An even quicker method to preserve lives, which Congressman Paul also supports, is to remove the appellate jurisdiction of federal courts over abortion, which would restore the right of the people to enact abortion laws, acting through the sovereign states.

2. Question Seven:

As a Russian Orthodox Christian, I believe that it is a sin to commit suicide or to assist another person to do so.

As a Libertarian, I believe that government should only punish crimes, acts which harm innocent people, and not sins, which harm only oneself and which I have faith that God will punish.

Anyone who contemplate euthanasia is no longer innocent.

However, I recognize the great danger of the possibility of coercion of weak, sick, elderly people. Any such coercion should be treated as murder or conspiracy to commit murder and be punished appropriately.

3. Question Nine:

I see nothing wrong with cloning human beings for reproductive purposes. As long as it is recognized that they have the same rights as naturally created humans from conception, there is no reason to prohibit that practice.

Cloning to produce spare body parts or for any other reason which kills the cloned human being should be punished as murder.

My 2010 website will be www.mackoforliberty.com. Please check weekly. Until it is up and running, please consult my 2008 website, www.mackoforcongress.com.

When I publish my campaign literature, I will send you copies of each piece.

I look forward to your endorsement.

For life and liberty,
David Macko