

Ron Paul's FREEDOM REPORT

A publication of the Foundation for Rational Economics and Education.

VOLUME 9, NO. 6 JUNE 2005



WEDNESDAY, MAY 4, 2005

Dr. Paul addresses the House

**Republicans Should Not Support
a U.N. Court**

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution. The idea that the United States Congress should demand that Nigeria deport a former president of Liberia to stand trial in a United Nations court in Liberia is absurd!

I do not object to this legislation because I dispute the charges against Charles Taylor. Frankly, as a United States Congressman my authority does not extend to deciding whether a foreign leader has committed crimes in his own country. The charges may well be true. **I do, however, dispute our authority as the United States Congress to demand that a foreign country transfer a former leader of a third country back to that country to stand trial before a United Nations kangaroo court.**

As the resolution itself cites, one top U.N. official, Jaques Klein, has already pronounced Taylor guilty, stating "Charles Taylor is a psychopath and a killer." But the resolution concludes that "Congress urges the Government of the Federal Republic of Nigeria to expeditiously transfer Charles Ghankay Taylor, former President of the Republic of Liberia, to the jurisdiction of the Special Court for Sierra Leone to undergo a fair and open trial" So it is probably safe to guess what kind of "trial" this will be — a Soviet-style show trial. **The United Nations has no business conducting trials for anyone, regardless of the individual or the crime.** It is the business of Liberia and Nigeria to determine the fate of Charles Taylor.

If we in the United States wish to retain our own constitutional protections, we must be steadfast in rejecting the idea that a one-world court has jurisdiction over anyone,

anywhere, regardless of how heinous the accusations. The sovereignty we undermine eventually will be our own.

[H.Con.Res. 127 passed on May 4 2005, by a vote of 421 to 1 — once again, Dr. Paul stood alone.]

**Ron Paul's
Texas Straight Talk**

May 9, 2005

**National ID Cards Won't Stop Terrorism
or Illegal Immigration**

The U.S. House of Representatives passed a spending bill last week that contains provisions establishing a national ID card, and the Senate is poised to approve the measure in the next few days. This week marks the American public's last chance to convince their senators they don't want to live in a nation that demands papers from its citizens as they go about their lives.

Absent a political miracle in the Senate, within two years every American will need a conforming national ID card to participate in ordinary activities. **This REAL ID Act establishes a massive, centrally coordinated database of highly personal information about American citizens: at a minimum their name, date of birth, place of residence, Social Security Number, and physical characteristics.** The legislation also grants open-ended authority to the Secretary of Homeland Security to require biometric information on IDs in the future. This means your harmless looking driver's license could contain a retina scan, fingerprints, DNA information, or radio frequency technology.

Think this sounds farfetched? Read the REAL ID Act, H.R. 418, for yourself. Its text is available on the Library of

Congress website. A careful reading also reveals that states will be required to participate in the “Drivers License Agreement,” which was crafted by DMV lobbyists years ago. This agreement creates a **massive database of sensitive information on American citizens that can be shared with Canada and Mexico!**

Terrorism is the excuse given for virtually every new power grab by the federal government, and the national ID is no exception. But federal agencies have tried to create a national ID for years, long before the 9-11 attacks. In fact, a 1996 bill sought to do exactly what the REAL ID Act does: transform state drivers’ licenses into de facto national ID cards. At the time, Congress was flooded with calls by angry constituents and the bill ultimately died.

Proponents of the REAL ID Act continue to make the preposterous claim that the bill does not establish a national ID card. This is dangerous and insulting nonsense! Let’s get the facts straight: **the REAL ID Act transforms state motor vehicle departments into agents of the federal government.** Nationalizing standards for drivers’ licenses and birth certificates in a federal bill creates a national ID system, pure and simple. Having the name of your particular state on the ID is meaningless window dressing.

Federally imposed standards for drivers’ licenses and birth certificates make a mockery of federalism and the 10th Amendment. While states technically are not forced to accept the federal standards, any refusal to comply would mean their residents could not get a job, receive Social Security, or travel by plane. So rather than imposing a direct mandate on the states, the federal government is blackmailing them into complying with federal dictates.

One overriding point has been forgotten: criminals don’t obey laws! As with gun control, national ID cards will only affect law-abiding citizens. Do we really believe a terrorist bent on murder is going to dutifully obtain a federal ID card? Do we believe that people who openly flout our immigration laws will nonetheless respect our ID requirements? Any ID card can be forged; any federal agency or state DMV is susceptible to corruption. Criminals can and will obtain national ID cards, or operate without them. National ID cards will be used to track the law-abiding masses, not criminals.

The REAL ID Act was included in H.R. 1268, the Conference Report, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005, which was unanimously accepted in the Senate on May 10, 2005.]

Ron Paul’s *Texas Straight Talk*

May 2, 2005

Reconsidering the Patriot Act

When Congress passed the Patriot Act in the emotional aftermath of the September 11th terrorist attacks, a sunset provision was inserted in the bill that causes certain sections to expire at the end of 2005. But this begs the question: If these provisions are critical tools in the fight against terrorism, why revoke them after five years? Conversely, if these provisions violate civil liberties, why is it acceptable to suspend the Constitution for any amount of time?

Congress is scheduled to review those sections this year, but there is little chance any portion of the Act will be allowed to lapse. If anything, many members of Congress are eager to expand federal police powers.

Supporters of the Patriot Act argue that its provisions have not been abused since its passage in 2001. In essence, Justice Department officials are claiming, “Trust us — we’re the government and we say the Patriot Act does not threaten civil liberties.”

But this argument misses the point. Government assurances simply are not good enough in a free society. The overwhelming burden always must be placed on government to justify any new encroachment on our liberty. Now that the emotions of September 11th have cooled, the American people are less willing to blindly accept terrorism as an excuse for expanding federal surveillance powers.

Many of the most constitutionally offensive measures in the Act are not limited to terrorist offenses, but apply to *any criminal activity*. **In fact, some of the new police powers could be applied even to those engaging in peaceful protests against government policies.** The bill as written defines terrorism as acts intended “to influence the policy of a government by intimidation or coercion.” Under this broad definition, a scuffle at an otherwise peaceful pro-life demonstration might subject attendees to a federal investigation. We have seen abuses of law-enforcement authority in the past to harass individuals or organizations with unpopular political views. **Congress has given future administrations a tool to investigate pro-life or gun rights organizations on the grounds that fringe members of such groups advocate violence.**

The Patriot Act waters down the Fourth amendment by

*A scuffle at
an otherwise
peaceful
pro-life
demonstration
might subject
attendees to
a federal
investigation.*

expanding the federal government's ability to use wiretaps without judicial oversight. The requirement of a search warrant and probable cause strikes a balance between effective law enforcement and civil liberties. **Any attempt to dilute the warrant requirement threatens innocent citizens with a loss of their liberty.** This is particularly true of provisions that allow for issuance of nationwide search warrants that are not specific to any given location, nor subject to any local judicial oversight.

The Act makes it far easier for the government to monitor your internet usage by adopting a lower standard than probable cause for intercepting e-mails and internet communications. I wonder how my congressional colleagues would feel if all of their e-mail headings and the names of the web sites they visited were available to law enforcement upon a showing of mere "relevance."

It's easy for elected officials in Washington to tell the American people that government will do whatever it takes to defeat terrorism. Such assurances inevitably are followed by proposals either to restrict the constitutional liberties of the American people or to spend vast sums from the federal treasury. We must understand that politicians and bureaucrats always seek to expand their power, without regard to the long-term consequences. If you believe in smaller government, ask yourself one simple question: Does the Patriot Act increase or decrease the power of the federal government over your life? The answer is obvious to those who understand that freedom cannot be exchanged for security.

**Ron Paul's
Texas Straight Talk**

April 18, 2005

Why Do We Fund UNESCO?

At the end of 2002, President Bush announced that the United States would rejoin UNESCO, an educational agency of the United Nations. One year later, the First Lady was dispatched to Paris for a ceremony marking the end of our 20-year absence from UNESCO, where she assured the world that the US would be a "full, active and enthusiastic participant" in the organization.

Rejoining UNESCO, of course, means paying for it. **Our new commitment to UNESCO costs \$60 million annually for starters,** fully one-quarter of the agency's budget.

Sadly, I believe the administration made this decision as a concession to our *globalist critics*, who decry supposed American unilateralism.

UNESCO stands for United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, which sounds lofty. In truth, the agency is nothing but a mouthpiece for the usual U.N. causes, including international abortion and population control; politically correct U.N. curriculum for American schools; and U.N. control of federal land in America through so-called World Heritage sites.

President Reagan rightly withdrew the U.S. from UNESCO in 1984, citing the organization's financial mismanagement, blatant anti-Americanism, and general hostility to freedom. He believed the organization had become too politicized, too bloated, and too hostile to free markets. Furthermore, UNESCO enjoyed rapidly expanding budgets during the 1970s and 1980s, which President Reagan felt American taxpayers should not shoulder. **President Reagan was correct in identifying UNESCO as an organization that did not act in America's interest, and he was correct in questioning why the United States should fund 25 percent of UNESCO's budget for that privilege.**

From its inception, UNESCO has been openly hostile to American values, our Constitution, and Western culture. **Why in the world should we send tax dollars to an organization that actively promotes values so contrary to those of most Americans?** To

better understand the origins and ambitions of UNESCO, we need only consider a quote from Sir Julian Huxley, brother of the famous Aldous Huxley. Julian Huxley was the founding director-general of UNESCO when he said the following:

"The general philosophy of UNESCO should be a scientific world humanism, global in extent... It can stress the transfer of full sovereignty from separate nations to a world political organization. Political unification in some sort of world government will be required to help the emergence of a single world culture."

Those who supported rejoining UNESCO claim the organization has been reformed over the years. Yet it's strange that in two decades since the United States left UNESCO, we only started reading about purported reforms in the year 2000. Are we to believe that after nearly twenty years of business as usual, a large bureaucracy like UNESCO suddenly reinvented itself in a few short years? Is it worth spending \$60 million every year on an organization with such a terrible history of waste, corruption, and anti-Americanism?

President Reagan's politically brave withdrawal from

From its inception UNESCO has been openly hostile to American values, our Constitution, and western culture.

UNESCO portended an era of greater disengagement from the United Nations itself. Congress can revitalize that worthy goal by urging the administration to rethink its terrible decision to entangle the American people with an organization as rotten as UNESCO. I recently introduced a congressional resolution urging an official withdrawal from UNESCO [H.Con.Res. 132], and I plan to attach the resolution as an amendment to a foreign aid spending bill this summer. It will be interesting to see whether the same members of Congress who savaged the U.N. before the Iraq war actually vote to get America out of UNESCO.

[H.Con.Res. 132, was introduced on April 14, 2005, and sent to the House International Relations Committee.]

**Ron Paul's
Texas Straight Talk**

April 4, 2005

Empty Rhetoric for Veterans

Many military veterans were shocked to see that the federal budget for 2006 makes several cuts in veterans' benefits and services. Under the proposed budget, the Veterans Administration will increase once again the co-pay cost of prescription drugs, while adding a new annual fee for medical benefits. The budget also calls for the reduction of veterans homes funding and limits the number of VA nursing-home beds. Some members of Congress have even suggested rewriting the definition of "veteran" in a way that could deny VA health benefits for millions of retired servicemen.

Unfortunately, the trust that members of our armed forces put in their government has been breached time and time again, and the recent budget vote represents another blow to veterans. Even as we send hundreds of thousands of soldiers into Iraq, Congress can't get its priorities straight.

Our invasion of Iraq will swell the ranks of our combat veterans, many of whom will need medical care as they grow older. Sadly, health issues arising from the first war with Iraq still have not been addressed. **Congress should immediately end the silence and formally address Gulf War Syndrome, which has had a devastating impact on veterans who served in Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and Kuwait.** As a medical doctor, I believe the syndrome is very real, and likely represents several different maladies caused by exposure to conditions specific to the Gulf region at the time. **Congress and the VA should stop insulting Gulf War**

veterans and recognize that the syndrome is a serious illness that needs treatment. We can only hope and pray that our soldiers in Iraq today do not suffer from similar illnesses in the future.

It's easy to talk about honoring veterans and their sacrifices, even while the federal government treats veterans badly. Congress wastes billions of dollars funding countless unconstitutional programs, but fails to provide adequately for the men and women who carry out the most important constitutional function: national defense.

We can best honor both our veterans and our current armed forces by pursuing a coherent foreign policy. No veteran should ever have to look back and ask himself, "Why were we over there in the first place?" Too often history demonstrates that wars are fought for political and economic reasons, rather than legitimate national security reasons. Supporting the troops means never putting them in harm's way unless America is truly threatened.

Today's American soldiers are the veterans of the future, and they should never be sent to war without clear objectives that serve definite American national security interests. They should never fight at the behest of the United Nations or any other international agency. They should never serve under a U.N. flag or answer to a U.N. commander. They deserve to know that they fight for the American people and the Constitution, and that the decision to send them into battle was made by their own Congress via an express declaration of war — NOT by U.N. bureaucrats who don't care about them.

Only by using American troops judiciously and in service of the Constitution can we avoid

the kind of endless military entanglements we witnessed in Korea and Vietnam. We honor our veterans by ensuring that their service to the nation is never in vain.

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

*Even as we
send hundreds
of thousands
of soldiers into
Iraq, Congress
can't get its
priorities
straight.*

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.