

A  
DETAILED ANALYSIS  
of  
*The New Republic's*  
“SELECTIONS”  
from the  
RON PAUL Newletters.

SHEWING that although Doctor PAUL did not likely author many of the Articles appearing in his Newletter, he nonetheless *should* be held accountable for not taking a more *active Role* in editing what appeared under his Name; and shewing that the establishment Media was interested not in the Truth of the Matter but rather in *smearing* a good Man.

---

*The truth is rarely pure and never simple.*

OSCAR WILDE.

---

B A L T I M O R E :

Printed by ALEX PEAK,

MMVIII.

Copyright 2008 by Alexander S. Peak  
Published under a Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike License 3.0.  
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/>

This license lets you remix, tweak, and build upon this work even for commercial reasons, as long as you credit Mr. Peak and license your new creations under the identical terms. This license is often compared to open source software licenses. All new works based on this one will carry the same license, so any derivatives will also allow commercial use.

AlexPeak.com

To Doctor Martin Luther King, Jr.



## A DETAILED ANALYSIS OF *THE NEW REPUBLIC*'S "SELECTIONS" FROM THE RON PAUL NEWSLETTERS

*The New Republic* has uncovered what a lot of people already knew: *viz.* that some disgusting, racist material, written by ghost-writers, got published under the name of Ron Paul.

Virtually everyone agrees that Dr. Paul did not write these comments himself, and is not himself a racist. Nevertheless, racist comments *did* get published under his name, and for that, for not being more attentive regarding his own newsletter, Dr. Paul ought to be chastised. He dropped the ball, and to ignore this would be to ignore the importance of personal responsibility.

Since *The New Republic* has chosen to present these selections from the aforementioned newsletter, I thought I would take the time to analyse each.<sup>1</sup> In some instances, I am in agreement with *The New Republic*; in other instances, disagreement. But only by analysing each one can we come to any sort of determination.

---

<sup>1</sup> "Selections From Ron Paul's Newsletters," January 8, 2008, *The New Republic*, <http://tnr.com/politics/story.html?id=74978161-f730-43a2-91c3-de262573a129> (accessed January 13, 2008).

"A Special Issue on Racial Terrorism" analyzes the Los Angeles riots of 1992: "Order was only restored in L.A. when it came time for the blacks to pick up their welfare checks three days after rioting began. ... What if the checks had never arrived? No doubt the blacks would have fully privatized the welfare state through continued looting. But they were paid off and the violence subsided."

I cannot say for certain how much of an impact the welfare system had on the ending of the looting. Surely, though, we can agree that those who did engage in looting (regardless of race) are the sort of people who would not find it unethical for the government to loot from tax-payers so as to subsidise them.

Whereas not all of the looters were necessarily black, the majority certainly were blacks males. The riot harmed many people, including blacks, whites, and Asians, and their businesses.

If this comment that *The New Republic* quotes is racist for any reason, it is only because it says "the blacks would have fully privatized the welfare state" rather than saying "the looters would have fully privatized the welfare state." For, certainly, not every black person, or even every black male, in Los Angeles took part in the riot, or took part in the welfare system. But other than this incorrect (and possibly inadvertent) implication, this paragraph that *New Republic* quotes is, as far as I'm aware, accurate: The looting did calm down greatly three days after the rioting began. Whether or not the welfare checks were actually available that day, I know not.

I think the most important thing to remember here is that although the Rodney King beating was certainly unwarranted, the looting, arson, battery, *et cætera* was equally unjust, if not more so because of the large scale of the crime. The

people who tortured Reginald Denny were just as racist as those who beat up Rodney King.

The November 1990 issue of the *Political Report* had kind words for David Duke.

Since this selection doesn't mention what the so-called kind words are, I figured I would read this one for myself.

This piece, upon reading it, confuses me. It seems to be written by someone who seems to think that David Duke was someone who had had a racist past but who had since reformed his views and become an ex-racist, in the same way many neoconservatives are ex-commies. But *we* all know that Duke still maintains his paranoid obsession with race and identity, so: did he not focus on this during his campaign, and assuming he did, was this author somehow unaware?

This newsletter describes Martin Luther King Jr. as "a world-class adulterer" who "seduced underage girls and boys" and "replaced the evil of forced segregation with the evil of forced integration."

Even people who admire Dr. King can admit that he indeed was an adulterer. In fact, I don't know if anybody denies this. The claim regarding underage children comes from Reverend Ralph David Abernathy. I don't know how accurate that is.

As for the replacement of the evil of forced segregation with the evil of forced integration, I don't believe that blame ought to rest on Dr. King. King's vision was of a world where black and white children get along with one another because they want to, not simply because they're forced to. Blame for that really rests upon the politicians. Dr. King's

goals remain noble.<sup>2</sup>

Those who support affirmative action are in stark disagreement with Dr. King when he says, "I have a dream that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the colour of their skin but by the content of their character." I share Dr. King's dream.

In any event, we can be sure this piece wasn't written by Dr. Paul, since it states that Dr. King was a "lying socialist satyr," certainly not words that Dr. Paul would ever use to describe a man he calls one of his "heroes because he [Dr. King] believed in nonviolence and that's a libertarian principle. Rosa Parks is the same way. Gandhi, I admire. Because they're willing to take on the government, they were willing to take on bad laws. So I believe in civil disobedience if you understand the consequences. Martin Luther King was a great person because he did that and he changed America for the better because of that."<sup>3</sup>

The January 1991 edition of the *Political Report* refers to King as a "world-class philanderer who beat up his paramours" and a "flagrant plagiarist with a phony doctorate."

One doesn't have to dislike Dr. King to admit that he was awarded twenty honorary degrees. Likewise, one needs not pretend that a Boston University investigatory committee had not concluded that King *had* plagiarized portions of his doctoral dissertation to claim to be an admirer of Dr. King.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> See Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., "I Have a Dream," August 28, 1963, available at <http://alexpeak.com/twr/ihad>.

<sup>3</sup> Ron Paul, interviewed by David Weigel, "Exclusive: Ron Paul Responds To New Republic Story," *Reason Hit & Run*, January 8, 2008, <http://reason.com/blog/show/124281.html> (accessed January 13, 2008).

<sup>4</sup> "Martin Luther King" on Snopes.com, last updated December 2, 2007, <http://snopes.com/inboxer/outrage/mlking.asp> (accessed January 13, 2008).



As to whether or not Dr. King ever used violence against any of his mistresses, I cannot say—I'd never heard that one before.

However, whoever wrote this does claim that Dr. King was a socialist, and for this reason, it seems particularly unlikely that Dr. Paul wrote this. Of the things I've seen Paul write or heard Paul say regarding Dr. King, King's apparent lack of understanding on economic matters was never raised. Rather, Paul consistently focuses on Dr. King's dedication to nonviolence.

Whomever this author is claims that Dr. King supported racial quotas, and as evidence cites King's statement that "if a city has a 30% Negro population," then "Negroes should have at least 30% of the jobs in any particular company, and jobs in all categories." But *nothing* in that statement implies a support for government involvement in the affairs of private companies, or that private companies should *even consider* the race of the individual when hiring. There is nothing inconsistent in Dr. King's statement with libertarian principles. Further, in a purely individualist society, a society which rejects collectivism and judges each man and women by the content of his or her character rather than by the colour of his or her skin, race would in no way be a consideration in the hiring or firing of individuals and we would eventually see the equality of opportunity envisioned by Dr. King and others.

I have serious doubts that the person who wrote this piece is even a libertarian. The author sounds much more like a paleoconservative to me, going so far as to berate Dr. King's nonviolence as nothing more than a "tactical program," *as though that makes it any less honourable!*

Whoever this author is, however, she or he wants us to believe that she or he is Dr. Paul. That much is obvious from

the statement about having run for president in '88. But this one paragraph is the only indication that it could be Paul who wrote this, and everything else seems to indicate some non-libertarian author.

Nevertheless, I can't say it's impossible that this was written by Dr. Paul. All I can say for certain is that there is nothing racist about this piece—it goes after a single man, and not because of his race, but instead because of his clear misunderstanding of economics and his supposed failing in dedication to his own principle of nonviolence.

Nevertheless, whoever this non-libertarian author is, I would like to see him or her step forward and apologise, not only to Dr. Paul, but also to the King family for the implication that Dr. King was a collectivist. Indeed, only through individualism can Dr. King's dream ever be achieved.

A February 1991 newsletter attacks "The X-Rated Martin Luther King."

This piece simply points out what everyone already knows: that Dr. King had affairs. There is nothing racist about pointing this out.

An October 1990 edition of the *Political Report* ridicules black activists, led by Al Sharpton, for demonstrating at the Statue of Liberty in favor of renaming New York City after Martin Luther King. The newsletter suggests that "Welfaria," "Zoo-ville," "Rapetown," "Dirtburg," and "Lazyopolis" would be better alternatives—and says, "Next time, hold that demonstration at a food stamp bureau or a crack house."

Okay, now this certainly sounds racist, specifically the "crack house" comment.

There's certainly nothing wrong in pointing out that there was a lot of rape and other crime in New York, or that the city was dirty. The names, therefore, which are suggested as possible replacements of "New York City" do not disturb

me—indeed, why would anybody want his or her name attached to what was at that time such a crime-ridden city, anyway? I doubt Dr. King would.

However, the “crack house” comment implies that Reverend Al Sharpton, because of his race, condones the use of crack. Whereas I have little doubt, considering his political affiliation, that Sharpton has little opposition to food stamps, there is no reason to assume that he uses or supports the use of crack. The implication that Rev. Sharpton, because of his race, is a crack-head is simply inexcusable.

Whomever wrote this piece should step forward and apologise not only to Rev. Sharpton and Dr. Paul, but also to the black community at large!

In the course of defending homophobic comments by Andy Rooney of CBS, a 1990 newsletter notes that a reporter for a gay magazine “certainly had an axe to grind, and that’s not easy with a limp wrist.”

As many have already pointed out, this statement sounds nothing like the other things Paul has been known to have written.

But what I find most disturbing about this piece is the comment that “Even absent Christianity (or AIDS), natural law proves that sexuality ought to be restricted to marriage (between a man and a woman, I guess I have to say these days.)” Whomever wrote this clearly has a poor understanding of natural law! For one to claim that natural law somehow gives anyone the right to forcefully restrict sexual activity between consenting adults simply because said adults are not joined in a union recognised by others or by the state is to claim the purely absurd. If one has a proper understanding of natural law, one knows that no one has the authority to impose such whimsical restrictions upon the voluntary mutual actions of others, and *ergo* the whole notion that sex-

uality "ought" to be "restricted" to marriage just goes to expose this author's anti-libertarianism.

(For the sake of clarity, I wish to point out that libertarianism does not require one to support, or for that matter not to condemn, sex outside of marriage. But libertarianism *does* require people not to "restrict" it—or in other words, one has no authority to initiate physical force against others because of the consensual sexual activity they have out of wedlock.)

It is equally absurd, I wish to add, for anyone to claim that natural law prevents homosexual marriage, and in a purely libertarian society, we would have a separation of marriage and state.<sup>5</sup>

This article absolutely, and without a doubt, could not have been written by Dr. Ron Paul, unless he had changed his views on gay marriage over the past seventeen years. Dr. Paul believes that all states should voluntarily do away with their anti-gay marriage laws, but that the federal government should not force them to do away with said laws.<sup>6</sup> I share this view.

---

<sup>5</sup> See Alexander S. Peak, "Marriage and The State," October 4, 2007, <http://towson.edu/clt/editorials/peak12.html>.

<sup>6</sup> In 2004, Dr. Paul wrote, "In an ideal world, state governments enforce marriage contracts and settle divorces, but otherwise stay out of marriage. The federal government, granted only limited, enumerated powers in the Constitution, has no role whatsoever." Ron Paul, "Eliminate Federal Court Jurisdiction," March 2, 2004, <http://lewrockwell.com/paul/paul160.html>.

In a 2007 interview, Dr. Paul said, "I am supportive of all voluntary associations and people can call it whatever they want." Congressman Ron Paul, interviewed by Elliot Schrage for Candidates@Google, July 13, 2007, [http://youtube.com/watch?v=yCM\\_wQy4YVg](http://youtube.com/watch?v=yCM_wQy4YVg).

Later that same year, when John Stossel asked Paul if gays should be allowed to marry, Ron Paul said, "Sure." He followed this up by saying, "They can do whatever they want and they can call it whatever they

Whoever the non-libertarian that wrote this article about Andy Rooney was, I think she or he should step forward and apologise, not only to CBS and Dr. Paul, but to the gay community at large. Likewise, this person should apologise to all advocates of natural law, including myself, for making such incorrect statements on the nature of natural law.

The June 1990 issue of the *Political Report* says: "I miss the closet. Homosexuals, not to speak of the rest of society, were far better off when social pressure forced them to hide their activities."

I really don't know what to make of this one. As has been pointed out by others, this doesn't sound like Dr. Paul. But does this even take a stance on anything worth...anything?

It says homosexuals and society were better off before homosexuality became more acceptable. I could easily see people, including both homosexuals and heterosexuals, agreeing with this statement. Likewise, I could also easily see people, including both homosexuals and heterosexuals, *disagreeing* with this statement. I personally disagree with the statement, but I could see how my homosexual friends would disagree with me and *agree* with it, and I certainly wouldn't think any less of them for doing so.

From the August 1990 issue of the *Political Report*: "Bring Back the Closet!"

This piece isn't even about homosexuality, but rather the rumours of a paedophile boy-slave ring connected to high-ranking Republicans. (I heard of the same rumour from a caller who was calling into a low-brow radio programme called *Eliot in the Morning* which I listen to on my way to class.)

---

want. ... In fact, I would like to see *all* governments out of the marriage question. I don't think it's a state function, I think it's a religious function." Ron Paul, interviewed by John Stossel, 20/20, December, 7, 2007, <http://youtube.com/watch?v=UJz811AwY0M>.

A January 1994 edition of the *Survival Report* states that “gays in San Francisco do not obey the dictates of good sense,” adding: “[T]hese men don’t really see a reason to live past their fifties. They are not married, they have no children, and their lives are centered on new sexual partners.” Also, “they enjoy the attention and pity that comes with being sick.”

The real problem here is that this is a generalisation of a group of people that just happen to share a sexual orientation and a region of residence. *Ergo*, the author, whomever it is, is a collectivist, and thus not a libertarian. Instead of judging each San Franciscan homosexual individually by the content of her or his character, this heterosexist non-libertarian author stereotypes them as *all* sharing similar attributes and opinions. An individualist would know better.

I highly recommend that whomever wrote this collectivist drivel go and read Ayn Rand’s essay on racism.<sup>7</sup> Although Ms. Rand’s essay was specifically about racism, I think it can be generally applied to all or at least virtually all forms of xenophobia, including the heterosexist collectivism displayed in this piece.

The November 1994 issue of the *Survival Report* celebrates anti-government militias.

What’s wrong with that? I don’t know who this “Bo Gritz” guy is or why *The New Republic* highlighted that section, but the article itself is great. I highly suspect it was written by Murray N. Rothbard, who was still alive at the time. It seems like Dr. Rothbard’s style.

The January 1995 issue of the *Survival Report*—released just three months before the Oklahoma City bombing—cites an

---

<sup>7</sup> Ayn Rand, “Racism,” *The Objectivist Newsletter*, September 1963. It was included as chapter seventeen of Ayn Rand, *The Virtue of Selfishness: A New Concept of Egoism* (New York, NY: Signet, 1964), 147–157. Also available at <http://alexpeak.com/twr/racism>.

anti-government militia's advice to other militias, including, "Don't fire unless fired upon, but if they mean to have a war, let it begin here."

Um, yeah. Basically that means: abide by the non-aggression axiom. Never initiate force, and only ever use force as a tool of defence, never as a tool of aggression or as a means of harming innocent people. Don't start a war, but if they start it with you, defend yourself.

Don't you agree?

Timothy McVeigh, unfortunately, did *not* agree. He wanted to *start* a war, and aggressed against a large number of innocent people, including women and children. McVeigh did not care about the non-aggression axiom.

The October 1992 issue of the *Political Report* paraphrases an "ex-cop" who offers this strategy for protecting against "urban youth": "If you have to use a gun on a youth, you should leave the scene immediately, disposing of the wiped off gun as soon as possible. Such a gun cannot, of course, be registered to you, but one bought privately (through the classifieds, for example)."

Um, yeah...now that's disturbing. At least the author adds, "I frankly don't know what to make of such advice."

The author is correct that hijackers are "animals," but I will go a step further and say that all thieves are "animals," regardless of what it is they steal. I also agree with the author that it is good to know how to properly and safely handle a gun for self-defence, but would like to add that guns save lives most of the time without the owner even having to pull the trigger.

As for the advice of the ex-cop, that's just creepy.

This 1978 newsletter says the Trilateral Commission is "no longer known only by those who are knowledgeable about international conspiracies, but is routinely mentioned in the

daily news."

Um, so what? There's nothing wrong with writing this paragraph. The Trilateral Commission is a real organisation and even has its own website.<sup>8</sup>

The paragraph mentions that former president Jimmy Carter was a member. According to wikipedia, this is true.<sup>9</sup>

The paragraph also says that the commission has influenced American politicians in both establishment parties. One doesn't have to be a conspiracy nut to agree that this is true. The Cato Institute also has influenced politicians in both establishment parties, but that doesn't mean that the Cato Institute is a nefarious organisation meeting in smoke-filled rooms. Whoever this author is does not seem to be implying that any secret organisation is doing nefarious things behind our back, but rather that popular, well-known organisations are doing things out in the open, as one would expect.

To use a different example, I, for one, don't like the things that were done at Bretton Woods, but I would hardly label that a "conspiracy." I don't like the IMF, but I wouldn't say their activities are all that "secret." I think the WTO has too much power, but that doesn't mean its members meet in smoke-filled rooms and plot out a take-over of the world. I want to see the United States withdraw from the United Nations, but this doesn't make the U.N. a secret cabal.

So I say to *The New Republic*, "So what?"

A 1986 newsletter names Jeane Kirkpatrick and George Will as "two of our enemies" and notes their membership in the

---

<sup>8</sup> See <http://trilateral.org>.

<sup>9</sup> "Trilateral Commission," Wikipedia, last updated January 6, 2008, [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Trilateral\\_Commission](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Trilateral_Commission) (accessed January 13, 2008).



Trilateral Commission.

Again, so what? The article says they are “two of our enemies, active opponents of limited government, sound money, and a pro-American foreign policy.”

In an undated solicitation letter for *The Ron Paul Investment Letter* and the *Ron Paul Political Report*, Paul writes: “I’ve been told not to talk, but these stooges don’t scare me. Threats or no threats, I’ve laid bare the coming race war in our big cities. The federal-homosexual cover-up on AIDS (my training as a physician helps me see through this one.) The Bohemian Grove—perverted, pagan playground of the powerful. Skull & Bones: the demonic fraternity that includes George Bush and leftist Senator John Kerry, Congress’s Mr. New Money. The Israeli lobby, which plays Congress like a cheap harmonica.”

I went ahead and read all eight pages of this solicitation letter. Like most solicitation letters I’ve read (whether left-wing, right-wing, or libertarian), it is filled with facts mixed with hyperbole. The idea of solicitation letters is often to convince the reader that she or he *needs* to buy this or that magazine, or help fund this or that organisation, and that not doing so may entail negative consequences for the reader. In that way, this letter is almost standard.

This paragraph in particular has some things that stand out. For one, we luckily did not have massive race wars throughout the ’90s, although racism does still exist and we should still be aware of it. Not-wanting-a-race-war is certainly a good thing.

I think nearly everyone knows that AIDS was a huge threat to the homosexual community in the late ’80s and early ’90s. Although it does not solely attack homosexuals, and is also a threat to heterosexuals, the gay community was particularly hurt by this disease if for no other reason because a disproportionate number of homosexuals had it. I

have no doubt that all of my homosexual friends would agree with this.

I can't say I have any clue what "cover-up" this refers to, but I do know that a lot of people in the federal government during the '80s were refusing to even acknowledge the AIDS epidemic. As far as I'm aware, this fact was generally aggravating to many homosexuals.

The thing about the Bohemian Grove and Skulls & Bones sounds to me like hyperbole.

Finally, I know little about what sort of actual lobbying goes on in Congress. I can't say whether or not there are actually people lobbying on behalf of other nations, although I wouldn't be shocked to learn there is. But because I really can't say what sort of lobbying Congresspersons deal with, or if there are people who actually go to Washington so as to lobby for aid for Israel, all I can say is that if such lobbying efforts actually exist, then I would argue there's nothing offensive about addressing it. If no such lobbying efforts exist, then I would definitely have to question the author's intent with that statement.

It might be worth noting that Dr. Paul gave as one of his reasons for opposing the war in Iraq fear that such a war might cause blow-back against Israel. We can thus determine that he cares just as much for the Israeli people as he does for Americans and Iraqis. Writes Dr. Paul, "Number five, an attack on Iraq will not likely be confined to Iraq alone. Spreading the war to Israel and rallying all Arab nations against her may well end up jeopardizing the very existence of Israel. The President has already likened the current international crisis more to that of World War II than the more localized Vietnam war. The law of unintended consequences applies to international affairs every bit as much as to domestic interventions, yet the consequences of such are

much more dangerous.”<sup>10</sup>

A 1989 newsletter compares Salman Rushdie to Ernst Zundel, a Canadian Holocaust-denier.

Anyone who actually reads this can clearly see for her- or himself that this was not the intent of the piece. The intent of the piece is to show the hypocrisy of the media, and more importantly, to defend freedom of speech.

Anyone who reads this can see that the author clearly believes that the Holocaust actually happened. The author of the piece calls the Holocaust “historical reality.” But, the author makes the point that simply because Zündel does not agree with reality doesn’t mean that Zündel should be jailed. One doesn’t have to be a Holocaust denier like Zündel to believe that nobody should ever be jailed for being a Holocaust denier.

The author’s point here is to say that only a hypocrite would defend Rushdie’s freedom of speech but not also defend Zündel’s freedom of speech. The author also defends the freedom of “Moslems” to disagree with Rushdie. In short, the author believes in freedom of speech for everyone. I and the ACLU hold the same stance as the author of this piece.

Writes the author, “I personally am offended by writings advocating fascism, socialism, Communism, and other forms of special-interest big government. Many people understandably find Zundel’s writings offensive. But his case is no different in principle from Rushdie’s, except that Zundel is poor and in jail, and Rushdie is rich and protected.”

It may be worth mentioning that this same page, I noticed, has unkind words for David Duke, calling him “an adherent

---

<sup>10</sup> Rep. Ron Paul (TX), “Why Initiate War on Iraq?,” Antiwar.com, March 25, 2002, <http://antiwar.com/paul/paul27.html> (accessed January 13, 2008).

of the violent philosophy of the KKK."

The March 1987 issue of *The Ron Paul Investment Letter* calls Israel "an aggressive, national socialist state."

What government isn't? There is not a government on Earth that doesn't deserve criticism, and that includes Israel. Big government is bad no matter who is in charge. This article defends the Israeli media for its willingness to go after big government.

Paul has had a long association with the Ludwig von Mises Institute, a libertarian think tank based in Auburn, Alabama. The think tank was founded by Lew Rockwell, who served as Paul's congressional chief of staff from 1978 to 1982.

This March 1995 letter from Lew Rockwell advertises the Mises Institute's upcoming conference on secession (at which Paul spoke): "We'll explore what causes [secession] and how to promote it."

An advertisement for the Mises Institute's 1995 secession conference—to be held in Charleston, "hotbed of America's two great secessions, against Britain and D.C."

First of all, the Ludwig von Mises Institute is not a think tank.

Secondly, there is nothing wrong with secession. The abolitionist lawyer Lysander Spooner had no problem with secession.<sup>11</sup> In fact, many abolitionists wanted to see the Northern states secede from the slavery-supporting union.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> See Lysander Spooner, *The Unconstitutionality of Slavery* (Boston, MA: Bela Marsh, 1860) and *No Treason* (Boston, MA: Lysander Spooner, 1867, 1970). In the latter, Spooner explicitly defends Southern secession.

<sup>12</sup> William Lloyd Garrison, for example, promoted the idea of Northern secession as part of his "No Union With Slaveholders" campaign. See "William Lloyd Garrison," *Encyclopædia Britannica*, <http://britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/226208/William-Lloyd-Garrison> (accessed January 13, 2008).

I wish we abolitionists had.

In the same way one does not have to support Hussein to oppose the U.S.-led invasion of Iraq, in the same way one does not have to support socialism to oppose the U.S.-led invasion of Vietnam, one does not need to support slavery to oppose the U.S.-led invasion of the C.S.A. or the forced annexation thereof into the Union. War is rarely the answer to any woe, and should only ever be used as a means of defence. This is the position of the Ludwig von Mises Institute, and I share it.

This is all that *The New Republic* provides us.

Also see my post on Why the Old Ron Paul Newsletters Have Nothing to Do with the “Ron Paul Revolution” (the title of which comes from a blog post by Brian Doherty). It contains quotes from various persons on this whole fiasco.<sup>13</sup>

Before I end this long discussion, I wish to also respond to a comment I came across. One blogger writes,

Mr. Paul says that one reason he can't be a racist is that he opposes the war on drugs. Well, does he? Or does he merely oppose a federal war on drugs?

In the past Mr. Paul has disassociated himself from drug decriminalization by saying that he merely wanted to leave the matter up to the individual states. In other words, he is not favoring decriminalization he just wants to change who does the criminalizing. That is a far cry from opposing the war on drugs itself.

Texas Monthly, in 2001, did an in-depth look at Paul and noted that his opponents frequently tried to beat him up for want to legalize drugs. But the magazine clarified that Paul's “office position was (and is) that federal drug laws ought to

---

<sup>13</sup> Alexander S. Peak, “Why the Old Ron Paul Newsletters Have Nothing to Do with the ‘Ron Paul Revolution’,” *Last Free Voice*, January 8, 2008, <http://tinyurl.com/worpnhndrpr>.

be repealed: Let the states handle all drug laws."

So if the state of Texas wants to arrest people for drugs Paul has nothing to say about it. He is not an advocate of drug legalization at all. At best he wants to redistribute those sorts of control to the state level.

This blogger appears to be unfamiliar with Dr. Paul's stance. So, allow me to clear things up.

Paul is opposed to the entire war on drugs, at all levels of government. He wants to see all states voluntarily decriminalise drugs. However, he realises that the federal government has no constitutional authority to *force* states to decriminalise drugs against their will. So when this writer says that Paul "is not an advocate of drug legalization at all," she or he is completely wrong.

Similarly, Paul opposes government control over marriage at all levels of government. He wants to see all states voluntarily deregulate marriage. However, he realises that the federal government has no constitutional authority to *force* states to deregulate marriage.

One final example for this unnamed blogger: Paul opposes minimum wage at all levels of government. He wants to see all states voluntarily do away with their minimum wage requirements. However, he realises that the federal government has no authority to force states to do away with their minimum wage requirements.

It *does*, however, have the authority (and responsibility) to do away with the *federal* minimum wage requirements, *federal* regulations on marriage, and the *federal* war on drugs. But the fact that he will not use the power of big government to *force* states to do the same in no way implies that he does not *advocate* that states do the same. In summation, Ron Paul *does* advocate drug decriminalisation, marriage deregulation, and doing away with minimum wage.

Still, this leaves one window still open for criticism.

According to *The Economist*,

Mr Paul is probably not himself a racist, and many of the sentiments he expresses in his CNN interview are admirable. It is equally plausible that the hateful items published in his newsletter, so different in style from the congressman's own speech and writing, are not his handiwork. But his protestations of ignorance, both about what was being disseminated on his behalf and who was responsible, are much harder to credit.<sup>14</sup>

As much as I admire Dr. Paul for his near consistency in voting against big government measures, I must admit that I am displeased that he dropped the ball and failed to edit, or even read, what was being published under his name. Personal responsibility is very important to us libertarians. Whereas I'm certainly pleased that Paul, upon discovery in 1996 of racist and heterosexist diatribes published under his name, took the responsibility of publicly disavowing its content and making it clear that he did not write or condone such small-minded thoughts, I can understand the complaint of those who wonder why he didn't discover it *until* 1996. Insofar as Dr. Paul failed to monitor what was being published, he was failing to take personal responsibility. As much as I admire, and continue to admire, Dr. Paul, reason compels me to chastise him for this failing.

As for the ghost-writers who published their own anti-libertarian bigotry under Ron Paul's name, I call on you to step forward, out yourselves, and exonerate the good doctor. If you care at all about Liberty and Justice for all, you will do so.

---

<sup>14</sup> "The Rockwell files," *Democracy in America*, January 11, 2008, [http://economist.com/blogs/democracyinamerica/2008/01/the\\_rockwell\\_files.cfm](http://economist.com/blogs/democracyinamerica/2008/01/the_rockwell_files.cfm) (accessed January 13, 2008).





# INDEX

- Abernathy, Ralph David, 3  
Abolitionism, 16–17  
Adultery, 3, 6  
Affirmative action, 3–5  
AIDS, 13–14  
American Civil Liberties Union, 15  
Bohemian Grove, 13–14  
Bretton Woods agreement, 12  
Bush, George H. W., 13  
Business, 2, 5  
Campaigns, *see* Political campaigns  
Canada, 15  
Cato Institute, 11  
Carter, Jimmy, 12  
CBS Broadcasting Inc., 9  
Civil disobedience, 4  
Civil War, *see* Secessionism  
Collectivism, 5–6, 10  
Communism, 3, 15  
Confederate States of America, 17  
Conspiracies, 12  
Constitution, 18  
Crime, 2–3, 6–7, 9–11  
Deceit, 4  
Defence, *see* Self-defence  
Denny, Reginald, 3  
Doherty, Brian, 17  
Drugs, 6–7  
    *See also* War on drugs  
Duke, David, 3, 15–16  
Economics, 5–6  
*Economist, The*, 19  
*Eliot in the Morning*, 9  
Equality, 3–5  
Fascism, 15–16  
Fiat currency, *see* Sound money  
Firearms, 11  
Force, 2–11, 15–16  
Foreign policy, 13  
    *See also* War  
Free speech, 15  
Garrison, William Lloyd, 16  
Gay marriage, *see* Marriage  
Gold standard, *see* Sound money  
    money  
Guns, *see* Firearms  
Hard money, *see* Sound money  
Heterosexism, 7–10  
Holocaust deniers, 15  
Hussein, Saddam, 16  
Individualism, 4–6, 10  
International Monetary Fund, 12  
Iraq war, 14, 16  
Israel, 13–14  
Jim Crow laws, *see* Segregation  
Justice, 19  
Kerry, John, 13  
King, Martin Luther, Jr., iii, 3–6  
King, Rodney, 2–3  
Kirkpatrick, Jeane, 12  
Libertarianism, 4–6, 8–11, 19  
Lobbying, 13–14  
Looting, *see* Los Angeles riots of 1992  
Los Angeles riots of 1992, 2–3  
Ludwig von Mises Institute, 16–17  
Marriage, 7–10, 18  
McVeigh, Timothy, 11  
Money, *see* Sound money  
Militias, 10–11  
Minimum wage, 18  
Natural law, 7–9  
Natural rights, *see* Natural law  
Neoconservatism, 3

- New York City, 6–7  
*No Treason*, *see* Spooner, Lysander  
 Non-aggression axiom, 11  
 Non-interventionism, *see* Foreign policy  
 Nonviolence, 4–6  
 North, the, *see* Secessionism  
 Oklahoma City bombing, 10  
 Palæoconservatism, 5  
 Parks, Rosa, 4  
 Pædophilia, 3, 9  
 Peace, *see* Foreign policy  
 Personal responsibility, 1, 19  
 Plagiarism, 4  
 Police, 11  
 Political campaigns, 3, 6  
 Politicians, 12  
 Poverty, 15  
 Racial quotas, *see* Affirmative action  
 Racism, 1–7, 13, 15–17, 19  
 Rand, Ayn, 10  
 Rape, *see* Crime  
 Religion, 9  
 Republican Party, 9  
 Responsibility, *see* Personal responsibility  
 Rockwell, Llewellyn, Jr, 16  
 Rooney, Andy, 7, 9  
 Rothbard, Murray N., 10  
 Rushdie, Salman, 15  
 Same-sex marriage, *see* Marriage  
 San Francisco, 10  
 Schragen, Elliot, 8  
 Secessionism, 16–17  
 Segregation, 3  
 Self-defence, 11  
 Sexism, *see* Heterosexism  
 Sharpton, Al, 6–7  
 Skull & Bones, 13–14  
 Slavery, *see* Abolitionism  
 Socialism, 4–5, 15–16  
 Solicitation letters, 13  
 Sound money, 13  
 South, the, *see* Secessionism  
 Spooner, Lysander, 16  
 State sovereignty, 7, 17–18  
 Statue of Liberty, 6  
 Stossel, John, 8–9  
 Tax-payers, 2  
 Terrorism, *see* Oklahoma City bombing  
 Torture, 2–3  
 Trilateral Commission, 11–13  
*Unconstitutionality of Slavery*, *The*, *see* Spooner, Lysander  
 Union, the, *see* Secessionism  
 United Nations, 12  
 Vietnam war, 14, 17  
 Violence, 16  
     *See also* Nonviolence or Force  
 War, 11, 13–14, 16  
 War on drugs, 17–18  
 Welfare, 2, 6–7  
 Wilde, Oscar, i  
 Will, George, 12  
 World Trade Organization, 12  
 World War II, 14  
 Zündel, Ernst, 15