

Ron Paul's FREEDOM REPORT

A publication of the Foundation for Rational Economics and Education.

VOLUME 11, NO. 8 AUGUST 2007



Ron Paul's TEXAS STRAIGHT TALK

August 6, 2007

As Recess Begins, Spending Spree Continues

These last few weeks the House has been in a rush to pass spending bills before August recess. In fact, visitors walking the hallways of Congress become immediately struck by the apparent spending battle between the “conservative Democrats” of the so-called “Blue Dog Coalition,” and the Republican Study Committee, or RSC, generally representing the more conservative bloc of Republican House members. Members of each of these groups place large posters on easels outside their offices. The purpose behind this seems clear, to point the finger at the opposite party for the current budget mess that continues to threaten America’s future.

When Republicans had control of the Presidency and both houses of Congress, very little was done to stem the tide of federal spending. In fact, spending increased every year over the past decade. New programs such as “No Child Left Behind,” and entitlements like the Prescription Drug Benefit, were added at great cost to federal taxpayers.

During this period, the Blue Dogs continued to make the rhetorical point of government financial misdeeds. Now that Democrats control the House, the RSC is highlighting the increases in spending and debt that will occur based on bills passed this year by the new majority.

While both sides continue attempting to score political

points, the country goes further and further into debt, because neither side is really willing to make the tough decisions necessary to halt the runaway train of federal spending. Several Republicans go to the House floor with amendments to stop spending directed by Congress, often seeking to cut projects that total \$100,000 or less. While it is true that hundreds of thousands can and do add up, the same people who argue for these spending cuts think nothing of spending billions more in Iraq. At the same time, basically every spending bill that comes to the House Floor would have the majority spend more, even over and above the increases requested by the Administration.

Current arguments over spending really have no connection to the idea of the overall reduction in the size and scope of government. The Democrats who argue that tax cuts are a form of spending are just as misleading as the Republicans who say they can make a serious dent by changing congressionally directed spending into administration directed spending.

The federal government has a spending problem. Each year our current accounts balance gets worse and worse, and the amount of foreign held government debt has skyrocketed. Both Republicans and Democrats, conservatives, liberals and moderates, indeed nearly every single-member of the Washington political establishment, is addicted to one form of federal spending or another.

Only when the American people absolutely demand that the spending spree be stopped, will their representatives in Washington stop using this issue as a political

football to score public relations points, and finally face-up to the fact that we are a nation in a very precarious financial position, which demands real spending cuts in order to avoid bankrupting our next generation.

[N]early every single-member of the Washington political establishment, is addicted to one form of federal spending or another.

**Ron Paul's
TEXAS STRAIGHT TALK**

July 30, 2007

The Fear Factor

While fear itself is not always the product of irrationality, once experienced it tends to lead away from reason, especially if the experience is extreme in duration or intensity. When people are fearful they tend to be willing to irrationally surrender their rights.

Thus, fear is a threat to rational liberty. The psychology of fear is an essential component of those who would have us believe we must increasingly rely on the elite who manage the apparatus of the central government.

The statement “Those who would give up Essential Liberty to purchase a little Temporary Safety, deserve neither Liberty nor Safety” has been attributed to Benjamin Franklin. It is clear, people seek out safety and security when they are in a state of fear, and it is the result of this psychological state that often leads to the surrender of liberty.

As Washington moves towards its summer legislative recess, indications of fear are apparent. Things seem similar to the days before the war in Iraq. Prior to the beginning of the war, several government officials began using phrases like “we don’t want the smoking gun to come in the form of a mushroom cloud,” and they spoke of drone airplanes being sent to our country to do us great harm.

It is hard to overstate the damage this approach does psychologically, especially to younger people. Of course, we now know there were no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, let alone any capacity to put them to successful use.

To calm fears, Americans accepted the Patriot Act and the doctrine of pre-emptive war. We tolerated new laws that allow the government to snoop on us, listen to our phone calls, track our financial dealings, make us strip down at airports and even limited the rights of habeas corpus and trial by jury. Like some dysfunctional episode of the twilight zone, we allowed the summit of our imagination to be linked up with the pit of our fears.

Paranoia can be treated, but the loss of liberty resulting from the social psychology to which we continue to subject ourselves is not easily reversed. People who would have previously battled against encroachments on civil liberties now explain the “necessity” of those “temporary security measures” Franklin is said to have railed against.

Americans must reflect on their irrational fears if we are to turn the tide against the steady erosion of our

freedoms. Fear is the enemy. The logically confusing admonition to “fear only fear” does not help, instead we must battle against irrational fear and the fear-mongers who promote it.

It is incumbent on a great nation to remain confident, if it wishes to remain free. We need not be ignorant to real threats to our safety, against which we must remain vigilant. We need only to banish to the ash heap of history the notion that we ought to be ruled by our fears and those who use them to enhance their own power.

**Ron Paul's
TEXAS STRAIGHT TALK**

July 23, 2007

Exposing the True Isolationists

Last week, I wrote about the ideology of globalism and how it underlies certain government policies. Managed trade agreements, international military adventurism, and amnesty for illegal immigrants all emanate from this ideology.

Yet globalism has a consequence that is, if we are to believe the rhetoric of its greatest proponents, entirely unintended. Globalists often label those of us who resist their schemes as “isolationists.” Yet it is, somewhat remarkably, the globalists themselves who promote policies that isolate our nation from the rest of the world. In terms of modern politics, isolationism is not so much an approach to American foreign policy as it is the result of the policies enacted by proponents of globalism. From offensive statements about “Old Europe” (as differentiated from “New Europe”), necessitated by the desire to justify a military presence in Iraq, to conflicts at the WTO, the flowery rhetoric of the neo-conservatives often takes vicious turns when unrealistic policies meet with reality.

In their hopes to remake the world in their image, the globalist elite who run much of America’s policy-making apparatus simply further isolate our country from the rest of the world. By claiming a moral superiority that is so evidently absent when the effects of their policies are witnessed, neo-conservatives have made America seem hypocritical to many abroad.

America is now held in low esteem in many nations, not because we follow our own interests, but because the elites make claims that are not reflected in reality. They have, for example, undertaken economic sanctions in an

entirely new way in recent years. When they wanted to take aim at Iraq and Iran, they imposed sanctions against those countries, but also against countries doing business with those countries. This meant we were in no position to negotiate with our adversaries, and we also could not rely on support from our allies.

Yet this globalism often bumps into itself, because of our second party sanctions against Iran, our international commitments to the space station, for example, were put into jeopardy. Also consider the fiasco that happened as a result of sanctions on Iraq. Thousands of Iraqi children starved to death, causing (according to the 9/11 commission report) great resentment against America, yet some managed trade was allowed to continue, managed of course by the globalists in the UN oil for food program. This program resulted in yet another UN scandal.

Despite the protestations of the neo-conservatives, this UN program is not the only example of personal enrichment that comes to the mind of those who doubt America's authenticity due to these policies. Does anybody remember Richard Perle's resignation from the defense policy board?

To reset the debate in a way that reflects reality, it is important for us to reject the idea that the choice is between globalism and isolation. Instead we must stand firm for national sovereignty, constitutional republicanism and international cooperation. We should realize that America's current isolation is simply a consequence of globalism gone awry.

**Ron Paul's
TEXAS STRAIGHT TALK**

July 16, 2007

Globalism

The recent defeat of the amnesty bill in the Senate came after outraged Americans made it clear to the political elite that they would not tolerate this legislation which would further erode our national sovereignty. Similarly, polls increasingly show the unpopularity of the Iraq war, as well as of the Congress that seems incapable of ending it.

Because some people who vocally oppose amnesty are supportive of the war, the ideological connection

between support of the war and amnesty is often masked. If there is a single word explaining the reasons why we continue to fight unpopular wars and see legislation like the amnesty bill nearly become law, that word is "globalism."

The international elite, including many in the political and economic leadership of this country, believe our constitutional republic is antiquated and the loyalty Americans have for our form of government is like a superstition, needing to be done away with. When it benefits elites, they pay lip service to the American way, even while undermining it.

We must remain focused on what ideology underlies the approach being taken by those who see themselves as our ruling-class, and not get distracted by the passions of the moment or the rhetorical devices used to convince us how their plans will be "good for us." Whether it is managed trade being presented under the rhetoric of "free trade," or the ideas of "regime change" abroad and "making the world safe for democracy"—the underlying principle is globalism.

Although different rhetoric is used in each instance, the basic underlying notion behind replacing regimes abroad and allowing foreign people to come to this country illegally is best understood by comprehending this ideal of the globalist elite. In one of his most lucid moments President Bush spoke of the "soft bigotry of low expectations." Unfortunately, that bigotry is one of the core tenets at the heart of the globalist ideology.

The basic idea is that foreigners cannot manage their own affairs so we have to do it for them. This may require sending troops to far off lands that do not threaten us, and it may also require "welcoming with open arms" people who come here illegally. All along globalists claim a moral high ground, as if our government is responsible for ensuring the general welfare of all people. Yet the consequences are devastating to our own taxpayers, as well as many of those we claim to be helping.

Perhaps the most seriously damaged victim of this approach is our own constitutional republic, because globalism undermines both the republican and democratic traditions of this nation. Not only does it make a mockery of the self-rule upon which our republic is based, it also erodes the very institutions of our republic and replaces them with international institutions that are often incompatible with our way of life.

The defeat of the amnesty bill proves though that there is no infallible logic, or predetermined march of history, that forces globalism on us.

**Ron Paul's
TEXAS STRAIGHT TALK**

July 9, 2007

**Signing Statements Erode
Constitutional Balance**

Recently, the General Accounting Office studied nineteen instances where the President issued so-called “signing statements.” In such statements, the President essentially begins the process of interpreting legislation—up to and including declaring provisions unconstitutional—hence often refusing to enforce them. The GAO study found that in nearly a third of the cases studied, the administration failed to enforce the law as enacted. This approach is especially worrisome for several reasons.

First, these signing statements tend to move authority from the legislative branch to the executive, thus upsetting our delicate system of checks and balances. Next, these statements grant the President power not given by the Constitution, allowing him to usurp powers of the judicial branch. Finally, the idea of agencies refusing to enforce the law as enacted sets precedent for the type of runaway administrative actions our Constitution was expressly enacted in order to avoid.

Although these signing statements are at record high numbers, the problem is not with a single administration. Contrary to the claims of those who raise this issue for purely political purposes, the most significant challenge to liberty presented by these statements is that they can serve to further erode our constitutional republic.

I have long been skeptical of the line item veto on spending bills for the same reason I oppose these signing statements. The legislature should not yield its authority to the executive. Our constitutional republic demands that all branches of government understand and respect our system and jealously guard their own prerogatives.

In modern Washington nothing is more misunderstood, and less appreciated, than the genius of republicanism. Presidents issue signing statements that effectively “approve in part and reject in part,” laws of the land—even though there is no constitutional provision for such a process. In addition, Congress cedes its powers at the crucial moment when a decision on whether or not a war is to be fought will be made, only to then criticize the effort it could have used its powers to stop.

In his “Notes on Virginia,” Thomas Jefferson spoke

clearly and directly about the idea of elected representatives delegating their responsibility to other branches of government, saying in no uncertain terms that since such representatives had received their authority by delegation from the people—expressly for the use as representative—the legislature had to choose to either use the authority granted or return it to the people. In other words, there is to be no delegation of authority from the representatives to the executive branch of government.

Concerns with signing statements ought to include a concern for the health of our constitutional republic, it ought not to be based upon the political battle of the day. Regardless of whether the President is named Bush or Clinton, and without respect to any particular political interest, we in Congress need to fulfill our oath of office and protect and defend the Constitution and our republic. Our constituents deserve no less, and should demand it of all of us.

If you make a donation of
\$25 or more to help FREE reach
more people with
its message of liberty,
Congressman Paul would like to
reward your generosity
by sending you a copy
of his new book,
A Foreign Policy of Freedom.

Nothing in this publication is intended to aid or hinder the passage of legislation before Congress.

About the F.R.E.E. Foundation

The Foundation for Rational Economics and Education, Inc. is a 501(c)(3) tax-exempt public foundation dedicated to individual liberty and free-market economics. It was founded by Congressman Ron Paul of Texas and publishes his Freedom Report. For more information, or to make a tax-deductible donation write: F.R.E.E., Inc., P.O. Box 1776, Lake Jackson, Texas 77566, or call 979-265-3034.