

Ron Paul's FREEDOM REPORT

A publication of the Foundation for Rational Economics and Education.

VOLUME 8, NO. 10 NOVEMBER 2004



TUESDAY, OCTOBER 5, 2004

Dr. Paul addresses the House

Reject Draft Slavery

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose H.R. 163 in the strongest possible terms. The draft, whether for military purposes or some form of “national service,” violates the basic moral principles of individual liberty upon which this country was founded. Furthermore, the military neither wants nor needs a draft.

The Department of Defense, in response to calls to reinstate the draft, has confirmed that conscription serves no military need. Defense officials from both parties have repudiated it. Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld has stated, “The disadvantages of using compulsion to bring into the armed forces the men and women needed are notable,” while President William Clinton’s Secretary of the Army Louis Caldera, in a speech before the National Press Club, admitted that, “Today, with our smaller, post-Cold War armed forces, our stronger volunteer tradition and our need for longer terms of service to get a good return on the high, upfront training costs, it would be even harder to fashion a fair draft.”

However, the most important reason to oppose H.R. 163 is that a draft violates the very principles of individual liberty upon which our nation was founded. Former President Ronald Reagan eloquently expressed the moral case against the draft in the publication *Human Events* in 1979: “[...] [conscription] rests on the assumption that your kids belong to the state. If we buy that assumption then it is for the state — not for parents, the community, the religious institutions or teachers — to decide who shall have what values and who shall do what work, when, where and how in our society. That assumption isn’t a new one. The Nazis thought it was a great idea.”

Some say the 18-year old draftee “owes it” to his (or

her, since H.R. 163 makes woman eligible for the draft) country. Hogwash! It just as easily could be argued that a 50 year-old chicken-hawk, who promotes war and places innocent young people in danger, owes more to the country than the 18 year-old being denied his (or her) liberty.

All drafts are unfair. All 18 and 19 year olds are never drafted. By its very nature a draft must be discriminatory. All drafts hit the most vulnerable young people, as the elites learn quickly how to avoid the risks of combat.

Economic hardship is great in all wars. War is never economically beneficial, except for those in position to profit from war expenditures. The great tragedy of war is that it enables the careless disregard for civil liberties of our own people. Abuses of German and Japanese Americans in World War I and World War II are well known.

But the real sacrifice comes with conscription — forcing a small number of young vulnerable citizens to fight the wars that older men and women, who seek glory in military victory without themselves being exposed to danger, promote. The draft encourages wars with neither purpose nor moral justification, wars that too often are not even declared by the Congress.

Without conscription, unpopular wars are difficult to fight. Once the draft was undermined in the 1960s and early 1970s, the Vietnam War came to an end. But most importantly, liberty cannot be preserved by tyranny. A free society must always resort to volunteers. Tyrants think nothing of forcing men to fight and serve in wrongheaded wars. A true fight for survival and defense of America would elicit, I am sure, the assistance of every able-bodied man and woman. This is not the case with wars of mischief far away from home, which we have experienced often in the past century.

A government that is willing to enslave some of its people can never be trusted to protect the liberties of its own citizens. I hope all my colleagues join me in standing up for individual liberty by rejecting H.R. 163 and all attempts to bring back the draft.

[Universal National Service Act of 2003, H.R. 163, was rejected on October 5, 2004, by a vote of 402 Nays to 2 Yeas.]

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 8, 2004

Before the U.S. House of Representatives

The 9-11 Intelligence Bill: More Bureaucracy, More Intervention, Less Freedom

Mr. Speaker, the 9/11 Recommendations Implementation Act (H.R. 10) is yet another attempt to address the threat of terrorism by giving more money and power to the federal bureaucracy. **Most of the reforms contained in this bill will not make America safer, though they definitely will make us less free.** H.R. 10 also wastes American taxpayer money on unconstitutional and ineffective foreign-aid programs. Congress should make America safer by expanding liberty and refocusing our foreign policy on defending this nation's vital interests, rather than expanding the welfare state and wasting American blood and treasure on quixotic crusades to "democratize" the world.

Disturbingly, H.R. 10 creates a de facto national ID card by mandating new federal requirements that standardize state-issued drivers licenses and birth certificates and even require including biometric identifiers in such documents. **State drivers license information will be stored in a national database,** which will include information about an individual's driving record!

Nationalizing standards for drivers licenses and birth certificates, and linking them together via a national database, creates a national ID system pure and simple. Proponents of the national ID understand that the public remains wary of the scheme, so they attempt to claim they're merely creating new standards for existing state IDs. Nonsense! **This legislation imposes federal standards in a federal bill, and it creates a federalized ID regardless of whether the ID itself is still stamped with the name of your state.** It is just a matter of time until those who refuse to carry the new licenses will be denied the ability to drive or board an airplane. Domestic travel restrictions are the hallmark of *authoritarian states, not free republics.*

The national ID will be used to track the movements of American citizens, not just terrorists. Subjecting every citizen to surveillance actually diverts resources away from tracking and apprehending terrorists in favor of needless snooping on innocent Americans. This is what happened with "suspicious activity reports" required by the Bank Secrecy Act. Thanks to BSA mandates, federal officials are forced to waste countless hours snooping through the private financial transactions of innocent Americans merely because those transactions exceeded \$10,000.

Furthermore, the federal government has no constitutional authority to require law-abiding Americans to present any form of identification before engaging in private trans-

actions (e.g. getting a job, opening a bank account, or seeking medical assistance). **Nothing in our Constitution can reasonably be construed to allow government officials to demand identification from individuals who are not suspected of any crime.**

H.R. 10 also broadens the definition of terrorism contained in the PATRIOT Act. H.R. 10 characterizes 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 allow the federal government to label the sponsoring organization and its members as terrorists.** Before dismissing these concerns, my colleagues should remember the abuse of Internal Revenue Service power by both Democratic and Republican administrations to punish political opponents, or the use of the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations (RICO) Act on anti-abortion activists. It is entirely possible that a future administration will use the new surveillance powers granted in this bill to harm people holding unpopular political views.

Congress could promote both liberty and security by encouraging private property owners to take more responsibility to protect themselves and their property. **Congress could enhance safety by removing the roadblocks thrown up by the misnamed Transportation Security Agency that prevent the full implementation of the armed pilots program. I cosponsored an amendment with my colleague from Virginia, Mr. Goode, to do just that, and I am disappointed it was ruled out of order.**

Immediately after the attack on September 11, 2001, I introduced several pieces of legislation designed to help fight terrorism and secure the United States, including a bill to allow airline pilots to carry firearms and a bill that would have expedited the hiring of Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) translators to support counterterrorism investigations and operations. I also introduced a bill to authorize the president to issue letters of marque and reprisal to bring to justice those who committed the attacks of September 11, 2001, and other similar acts of war planned for the future.

The foreign policy provisions of H.R. 10 are similarly objectionable and should be strongly opposed. I have spoken before about the serious shortcomings of the 9/11 Commission, upon whose report this legislation is based. I find it incredible that, in the 500-plus page report, there is not one mention of how our interventionist foreign policy creates enemies abroad who then seek to harm us. **Until we consider the root causes of terrorism, beyond the jingoistic explanations offered thus far, we will not defeat terrorism and we will not be safer.**

Among the most ill-considered foreign policy components of H.R. 10 is a section providing for the United States to increase support for an expansion of the United Nations

“Democracy Caucus.” Worse still, the bill encourages further integration of that United Nations body into our State Department. The last thing we should do if we hope to make our country safer from terrorism is expand our involvement in the United Nations.

This bill contains a provision to train American diplomats to be more sensitive and attuned to the United Nations, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) — which will be in the U.S. to monitor our elections next month — and other international non-governmental organizations (NGOs). Even worse, this legislation actually will create an “ambassador-at-large” position solely to work with non-governmental organizations overseas. It hardly promotes democracy abroad to accord equal status to NGOs, which, after all, are un-elected foreign pressure groups that, therefore, have no popular legitimacy whatsoever. Once again, we are saying one thing and doing the opposite.

This bill also increases our counterproductive practice of sending United States’ taxpayer money abroad to prop up selected foreign media, which inexplicably are referred to as “independent media.” This is an unconstitutional misuse of tax money. Additionally, does anyone believe that citizens of countries where the U.S. subsidizes certain media outlets take kindly to, or take seriously, such media? The U.S. government should never be in the business of funding the media, either at home or abroad.

Finally, I am skeptical about the reorganization of the intelligence community in this legislation. **In creating an entire new bureaucracy, the National Intelligence Director, we are adding yet another layer of bureaucracy to our already bloated federal government. Yet, we are supposed to believe that even more of the same kind of government that failed us on September 11, 2001, will make us safer.** At best, this is wishful thinking. The constitutional function of our intelligence community is to protect the United States from foreign attack. Ever since its creation by the National Security Act of 1947, the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) has been meddling in affairs that have nothing to do with the security of the United States. Considering the CIA’s overthrow of Iranian leader Mohammed Mossadeq in the 1950s, and the CIA’s training of the Mujahadin jihadists in Afghanistan in the 1980s, it is entirely possible the actions of the CIA abroad have actually made us less safe and more vulnerable to foreign attack. It would be best to confine our intelligence community to the defense of our territory from foreign attack. This may well mean turning intelligence functions over to the Department of Defense, where they belong.

For all of these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I vigorously oppose H.R. 10. It represents the worst approach to combating terrorism — more federal bureaucracy, more foreign intervention, and less liberty for the American people.

[9/11 Recommendations Implementation Act, H.R. 10, was passed by a vote of 282 Ayes to 134 Noes, October 8, 2004.]

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 2004

Dr. Paul addresses the House

Federal Courts and the Pledge of Allegiance

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support, and cosponsor, the *Pledge Protection Act* (H.R. 2028), which restricts federal court jurisdiction over the question of whether the phrase “under God” should be included in the pledge of allegiance. Local schools should determine for themselves whether or not students should say “under God” in the pledge.

The case finding it is a violation of the First Amendment to include the words “under God” in the pledge is yet another example of federal judges abusing their power by usurping state and local governments’ authority over matters such as education. Congress has the constitutional authority to rein in the federal courts’ jurisdiction and the duty to preserve the states’ republican forms of governments. Since government by the federal judiciary undermines the states’ republican governments, Congress has a duty to rein in rogue federal judges. I am pleased to see Congress exercise its authority to protect the states from an out-of-control judiciary.

Many of my colleagues base their votes on issues regarding federalism on whether or not they agree with the particular state policy at issue. **However, under the federalist system as protected by the Tenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, states have the authority to legislate in ways that most Members of Congress, and even the majority of the citizens of other states, disapprove.** Consistently upholding state autonomy does not mean approving of all actions taken by state governments; it simply means acknowledging that the constitutional limits on federal power require Congress to respect the wishes of the states, even when the states act unwisely.

I would remind my colleagues that an unwise state law, by definition, only affects the people of one state. Therefore, it does far less damage than a national law that affects all Americans.

While I will support this bill even if the language removing the United States Supreme Court’s jurisdiction over cases regarding the pledge is eliminated, I am troubled that some of my colleagues question whether Congress has the authority to limit Supreme Court jurisdiction in this case. **Both the clear language of the United States Constitution and a long line of legal precedents make it clear that Congress has the authority to limit the Supreme Court’s jurisdiction.** The Framers intended Congress to

use the power to limit jurisdiction as a check on all federal judges, including Supreme Court judges, who, after all, have *lifetime tenure* and are thus unaccountable to the people.

Ironically, the author of the Pledge of Allegiance might disagree with our commitment to preserving the prerogatives of state and local governments. Francis Bellamy, the author of the Pledge, was a self-described socialist who wished to replace the Founders' constitutional republic with a strong, centralized welfare state. Bellamy wrote the Pledge as part of his efforts to ensue that children put their allegiance to the central government before their allegiance to their families, local communities, state governments, and even their creator! In fact, the atheist Bellamy did not include the words "under God" in his original version of the Pledge. That phrase was added to the Pledge in the 1950s.

Today, most Americans who support the pledge reject Bellamy's vision and view the pledge as a reaffirmation of their loyalty to the Framers' vision of a limited, federal republic that recognizes that rights come from the creator, not from the state. In order to help preserve the Framers' system of a limited federal government and checks and balances, I am pleased to support H.R. 2028, the *Pledge Protection Act*. I urge my colleagues to do the same. [The Pledge Protection Act, H.R. 2028, was accepted by a vote of 247 Yeas to 173 Nays on September 23, 2004.]

Dr. Paul's Texas Straight Talk

September 13, 2004

Forcing Kids Into a Mental Health Ghetto

A presidential initiative called *The New Freedom Commission on Mental Health* has issued a report recommending *forced mental health screening for every child in America, including preschool children*. The goal is to promote the patently false idea that we have a nation of children with undiagnosed mental disorders crying out for treatment.

One obvious beneficiary of the proposal is the pharmaceutical industry, which is eager to sell the psychotropic drugs that undoubtedly will be prescribed to millions of American schoolchildren under the new screening program. Of course a tiny minority of children suffer from legitimate mental illnesses, but **the widespread use of Ritalin and other drugs on youngsters who simply exhibit typical rambunctious, fidgety, and impatient behavior is nothing short of criminal**. It may be easier to teach and parent drugged kids, but convenience is no justification for endangering them. Children's brains are still developing, and the truth is we have no idea what the long-term side effects of psychiatric drugs may be. Medical science has not even exhaustively identified every possible brain chemical, even as we alter those chemicals with drugs.

Dr. Karen Effrem, a physician who strongly opposes mandatory mental health screening, warns us that "America's children should not be medicated by expensive, ineffective, and dangerous medications based on vague and dubious diagnoses." She points out that psychiatric diagnoses are inherently subjective, as authors of the diagnostic manuals admit. She also is concerned that mental health screening could be used to label children whose attitudes, religious beliefs, and political views conflict with the secular orthodoxy that dominates our schools.

The greater issue, however, is not whether youth mental health screening is appropriate. **The real issue is whether the state owns your kids**. When the government orders "universal" mental health screening in schools, it really means "mandatory." Parents, children, and their private doctors should decide whether a child has mental health problems, not government bureaucrats. That this even needs to be stated is a sign of just how obedient our society has become toward government. **What kind of free people would turn their children's most intimate health matters over to government strangers? How in the world have we allowed government to become so powerful and arrogant that it assumes it can force children to accept psychiatric treatment whether parents object or not?**

Parents must do everything possible to retain responsibility and control over their children's well-being. There is no end to the bureaucratic appetite to rule every aspect of our lives, including how we raise our children. Forced mental health screening is just the latest of many state usurpations of parental authority: compulsory education laws, politically correct school curricula, mandatory vaccines, and interference with discipline through phony "social services" agencies all represent assaults on families. **The political right has now joined the political left in seeking the de facto nationalization of children, and only informed resistance by parents can stop it**. The federal government is slowly but surely destroying real families, but it is hardly a benevolent surrogate parent.

[Editor's note: there will be more of this important subject in the next issue of Ron Paul's Freedom Report.]

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.