



THE FUTURE
of
FREEDOM FOUNDATION

www.fff.org

Nonintervention: The Original Foreign Policy
by Ron Paul

The following is a transcript of a speech given at The Future of Freedom Foundation's June 2007 conference, "Restoring the Republic: Foreign Policy & Civil Liberties" held in Reston, Virginia.

Jacob Hornberger: Ron Paul is a U.S. Congressman from Texas who is currently vying for the Republican nomination for President where he has shouldered the extremely burdensome, tireless, thankless task of educating other presidential candidates on foreign policy. Dr. Paul is the author of several books including *Challenge to Liberty*, *The Case for Gold*, *A Republic If You Can Keep It*, and *A Foreign Policy of Freedom*. The title of Ron's talk tonight is *Nonintervention, the Original Foreign Policy*. A champion of freedom in the United States Congress, a champion of freedom for people everywhere, please welcome Ron Paul.

Ron Paul: Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you. One thing nice about giving speeches outside of Washington, D.C., and off the Hill is over on the Hill I don't get this kind of response, but it is a real delight to be here and be among so many friends and so much enthusiasm.

The Future of Freedom Foundation deserves a lot of credit for what they have done over the years and the organization they put together tonight. I think a lot about what's happening these last few days and to my surprise we're doing quite well and I'm very pleased. It's not a personal thing as much as it's a reflection of where we are in the freedom movement and nothing can happen with one or two or five or ten or one individual. Even an individual with a lot of money, nothing really happens long term, but I think what's happened in the last month or two has been a reflection that there's been a lot of grassroots work done by the think tanks that endorse the concept of liberty and that's why I think Bumper certainly deserves a big thank-you for his efforts over these many years.

The concept of nonintervention in foreign policy was never difficult for me to reach, although over the years it has grown on me to the point where I'm convinced it is the key, most important issue that we have to deal with right now in a political sense. And it's not like it's something brand new. It's—The information has been available for a long time. I was- heard some advice the other day. It was given to the candidates in general, and it said to be a good candidate and to get anyplace as a candidate for the presidency you have to say that you're going to come up with something new and different and have a change, and that sounds to me like a pretty good idea. How about following the Constitution? That's always a mixed bag because I don't know if anybody had heard there was a little whisper by Chris Matthews about something when I brought up all- the original intent, and he had a big sigh and said, "Oh, no." And this is generally I'm afraid the attitude of so many, that, my goodness, they say, "Oh, you're just going back." And they bring this up especially if I bring up the subject of money, and I am pretty old-fashioned about that.

Six thousand years of history's convinced me that money ought to have real value to it, but they always say, "Oh, yeah. He's the candidate that wants to go back to the gold standard," argument, that that is the automatic elimination of this insane politician who thinks money ought to have real value, but you know what? I'll bet it's a sleeper issue. I really do. Nobody talks about it and yet it's a key issue. Once they come to understand how important that is, I think that we're going to get their attention and who knows what's going to happen in the next 6 or 12 months in the monetary area?

But when I first went into politics, it was in the 1970s. I had studied Austrian economics in the 1960s and I was fascinated with it and fascinated with the predictions that the Bretton Woods Agreement would break down, and when that happened it convinced me that they, the Austrian economists, were on the right track. And that was the reason I first announced to run for Congress back in 1974 after the disastrous results of the wage and price controls and the terrible economic conditions of high unemployment, interest rates being high, and attack on the dollar. Even though at that time it was strictly for economic reasons I went into politics, over the years I have become much more interested, well, in a broader concept, in foreign policy as well. The driving force for me in politics has always been the preservation of individual liberty but the monetary issue can be easily tied into foreign policy.

If you study all the wars of history, you can barely if ever find any war of significance that didn't bring about inflation. That is because governments are never honest with the people. They always say that it's important, they're going to attack us and if you don't support us you're unpatriotic, so the people go along out of fear and then they don't have the money. They can't tax the people. The people don't have enough money and if you fully taxed them for the war then there would be a declaration, "Well, we can't afford this war." Well, they can borrow to a certain degree but they never can borrow enough, so they always have to resort to the inflation to support the wars, and just think of what's happened since 1913. Not only have we developed a

war- a welfare state, but we've developed a warfare state as well that's been going on almost 100 years now. And it is connected to the- a monetary policy because the people would object if they had to pay for the wars that would be going on, and someday the people will have to wake up. Matter of fact, everybody in the country's going to have to wake up to realize that we can't afford this war. The--

We can't afford it for a lot of reasons. I remember before we went into Iraq I had given quite a few speeches about why I didn't think we should go. It really started in an intense manner in 1998, shortly after I went back to Congress. They brought up the Iraq Liberation Act, and that was an act signed by Clinton that said it will be the policy of the United States to have regime change in Iraq. Now they brought that under- up under suspension, and when they did- when they bring something up under suspension, if the two leaders [on] of both parties are for the bill, if you object you can get the time against it. So they were so convinced that there would be no talking against it that I sought and got the time in opposition in 1998 on changing this overall policy, and it turned out that I ended up with 20 minutes and the rest of the Congress had 20 minutes also. **But** I did my best but it failed. We had a few votes that opposed it but it passed overwhelmingly. The point being- though is this- [that] as bad as the conditions are under this administration, interventionism has been around for a long time and it certainly was- existed in the previous administration.

Matter of fact, if you want to seek out and find out where modern intervention started for our country, it was in Woodrow Wilson. So to analyze this we ought to analyze Woodrow Wilson and condemn his efforts to get us involved in World War I. But the intervention has continued for a long, long time and now we're suffering the consequences. But before the war started, by 2002 I had gone through the moral arguments against getting involved in a war, the Constitution arguments about why we should fully debate this and make a decision and not give this permission to the President to go to war, and the military arguments that it wasn't necessary and it could lead to trouble. And finally I sort of threw up my hands and said, "What you ought to look at is the politics of it. If you won't look at the morality of it and the constitution of it and the military aspects of it, why don't you just look at the pure politics of it?" And I said, "It may turn out that it will be popular at the beginning but in time war becomes unpopular. It's an economic burden and the people turn on it and it's bad politics."

So I advised them strongly that they ought to not [to] get involved just for that reason. Of course, there weren't too many people listening to that speech either, and they proceeded onward to do what they have done. But just look at [it] from my viewpoint as a member of the Republican party and needling a few people in the Republican party now about a better policy that I can seek out and find Republicans in times when Republicans benefited by taking this position. Some of us have heard over the past that Democrats start wars and Republicans get out of it- get us out of them, and there's some truth to that.

Just think of the recent history. We had Eisenhower come, I'm going to get you out of Korea. Of course, Nixon was elected because we were so upset with Viet Nam and that was a lousy result because although he was elected to do it he didn't do it. And then 30,000 more men were killed and here again of course there was an election last year and look at the effort to close this war down. It's not happening. But Republicans have a tradition. There was Senator Robert Taft, who took a position of nonintervention. I think one of his best statements was that it made no sense to him after World War II to get into NATO. Just think how many dollars we could have saved if we had not been in NATO, plenty. We might have had our troops home by now but of course we have troops in now [in] because of this intervention idea that we have had them in Europe since then and we have troops in Korea.

And it's amazing that we can afford it, but I think we're lucky on that because we can afford it only because we get to print the gold, we get to print the dollars. And they're willing to take the take these dollars and do the production overseas that we can't and won't do here. But ultimately though this will come back to haunt us and we will have to pay the price, and already I think this may be happening. I think that the loaners, the lenders to us to finance our extravagance, [is] are slowly coming to an end. It blows my mind when we- I talk to conservatives and I try to emphasize to them, "Do you realize that you can't even fight your war without borrowing from your good friends, the Red Chinese?" And that's essentially it and yet they pay no attention so my effort now will be—

Although I've emphasized these other reasons to stay out of war and come home, I'm going to emphasize with many conservatives just the cost of it, the literal cost that brings countries to their knees, and it reminded me of a story. Today I read a couple articles about how the dollar is being under attack and how it may bring our extravagant spending to an end. But many years ago I served on the Gold Commission, in the early 1980s, and that was right after we had finished the 1979, 1980 episode with gold soaring and the dollar under attack, So we had a Gold Commission set up to study the role of gold in the financial markets. And there was a time—there was a day that I was finishing at the Gold Commission at Treasury and I was supposed to fly with President Reagan to Texas. And I didn't want to miss the Gold Commission meeting so my staff at the time had made arrangements that I could fly with the President from the White House, just cross the street, get on the helicopter, fly in the helicopter and go out to Andrews Air Force Base. So I took him up on that wonderful offer and it was the time I probably had with Ronald Reagan more than any other. And when he knew I was coming from the Gold Commission he made a statement and I think it was a rather profound statement. He says, "Any great nation that has ever gone off the gold standard ends up- ends being a great nation."

And it isn't so much that there's magic about gold. It's just that there is evil about the inflation and the printing of the minion and the harm that it does. So here we are 25 years later. We're still spending, we're still trying to protect our empire, and we're barely challenging what's happening. But I think today, though, what is happening in this political campaign, there's

probably reason to be hopeful, not so much that I am the greatest messenger and I do my very best, but I'll tell you what. We have a great message. I've never worked with the- on the idea of being overly confident with my abilities, but I do work with the complete confidence that the message of liberty is a very, very positive message and it is the most humanitarian message of the world. They turn us as libertarians and conservatives into [as] being inhumane and lacking compassion, but if anybody has any compassion for their fellow man it has to be in the ideas of liberty, and they have been ingrained in our system for so long.

The founders were geniuses. Even with the imperfect document that we had, it was better than any other one and we have had great traditions. And yet today we are failing to present the case. But the case for nonintervention, whether it's in foreign policy or individual liberties or in foreign affairs or economics, it all makes so much sense and there's no reason why we can't sell this message. The fact that we have received so many inquiries and interest in the campaign to me is a sign that a lot of hard work has been done over the years. In the 1950s when I first got interested in this subject, I went looking for books to read. Of course, there was no Internet. You surely couldn't get it off the television. I didn't get it out of my public school education. I wasn't getting it from my government. And that is when I discovered the Foundation for Economic Education and that was a blessing. Leonard Read was the one that provided the information that I needed and that was early on but just think of what has happened in those years. There are dozens, the Future of Freedom Foundation and others. These are great organizations. I am absolutely convinced politicians don't amount to much but ideas do and what we do—

So I think there's a lot of people out there right now wanting to hear this message. They've heard about it and they know a little bit about it and they're excited about it. But I'll tell you one thing that has really excited me about this campaign is that it seems like we don't have to give up on the next generation. The largest number of people that are coming in to our campaign are young people and this is fantastic, but you know what? It might [be] just be very logical. Maybe they are waking up and figuring what kind of bills we're giving them. Maybe they're figuring out how much they're going to owe, and maybe they are figuring out that it is young people who have to go off and fight these wars. They also know that the Selective Service still exists, and they also know that everybody in the government and anybody running for President except yours truly won't take anything off the table when it comes to intimidating Iran. And maybe they get a little bit annoyed with that and maybe they like their privacy. Maybe they like their Internet and they don't want to be taxed. So I think there is a- really a fertile field with this generation right now. [so] We are really excited about the number of people coming into the campaign, so I think there's every reason in the world to be hopeful. That's not that I go to bed saying we have won and there's nothing to worry about. I think there are many, many great problems, but I am also convinced that Washington, D.C., is many, many years behind the people it's- themselves because they just don't seem to wake up, whether it's on foreign policy or economic policy or on personal liberties.

I had an interview the other day, it was in Houston, and it was done by a person I consider an ultraconservative, not libertarian. So we did a little interview on TV, and his biggest beef and one of the things he really wanted to talk about was the stupidity of the drug war, and I thought well, this is great he all of a sudden realized. And it used to be that oh, if you're a conservative you can't suggest that there has been some intimidation with the drug war and yet all of a sudden people were starting to talk about this. If the people weren't way ahead of the Congress and Washington on this, I couldn't possibly have been elected because both Republicans and Democrats each spent over a million dollars apiece when I was trying to run for Congress in 1996 when I came back. They spent the money and the main attack was he doesn't even believe in the federal war on drugs, but you know what? The people listened to my explanation and I said, "Well, I can't stand the drugs and I don't like this, but I care about civil liberties and I think the war on drugs is a lot worse than the drugs themselves." But people responded in a positive way and I think that's what's happening today. I think they're going to respond and are currently responding to finally hear somebody say, "We don't have to go to war continuously and we don't have to bleed. There are other options. We can actually talk to people and we can actually say to the world, 'You know what? We don't have to threaten Iran with a nuclear first strike.'"

There's opportunity because in the near future we may face more problems in the close sense, and that is if financially we get into difficulties much more so than we are today. I think the underpinnings of our economic system have been eroded, but let's say we do have a dollar crisis and we can't afford our empire. That's usually the way empires end. It wasn't us forcing the Soviets to build missiles that brought them to their knees. It was the fact that socialism doesn't work. Well, our system doesn't work much better because we have a welfare system that's verging on a socialist system and we're spending beyond our means, so it will end. So, when and if that comes, if we continue to do the work that we are doing and be in place so that these young people will be in position to have an influence on our government. By then the government [then] will reflect our views, and our views are becoming more popular. I don't believe you will ever get to the point where you will gradually educate the congressmen and/or get enough people in there to exactly reflect these views and then change the country. I don't think it works that way. It has to work by changing people's attitudes. The government we get is the government that we ask for. And right now I see a tremendous opportunity for the views of liberty and to restore the Constitution, to restore the ideas of limited government, to restore the notion that markets work well, and that's how we can take care of people.

How many candidates now are jumping on the bandwagon about national healthcare? In the last 30 years essentially, government's been involved- or even longer, the government's been involved in national healthcare and it keeps going downhill. It costs more money, less people have access to it, and the costs are skyrocketing, so every time this is noticed they say, "Well, we need more government." Has it ever dawned on them that possibly we have some flaws in our medical system because the government's involved in the medical system and we need to get the government out of the medical care system?

Same way in education. We have a public school system that worked rather well when it was local and local school boards took care of it. It was not unconstitutional to do that and local governments handled that and we sort of survived it all, but now what do we do? We— Even in the Republican party they used to have presidents run and say, “We want to get rid of the Department of Education.” Oh, but now what we do— We get Republicans in, we get control of the House, we get control of the Senate, and we double the size of the Department of Education, and then they wonder why the quality of education goes down.

To me the most important thing in our efforts is to understand how important individual liberty is. So many people come up and we’ll get questions and quite possibly even on Tuesday we’ll get questions that’ll say, “Well, what do you think about this group’s rights, minority rights, gay rights, gay marriage, all these things?” And as far as I’m concerned and as far as all of us should be concerned is we don’t have to worry about that. What we should worry about is individual rights. Everybody has a right to their life and a right to their liberty and we should recognize that the purpose of government not only is to protect liberty but it ought to really emphasize the protection of your individual privacy. Unfortunately, today government is designed to invade your privacy and protect the secrecy of government and we need to turn that around. I’m convinced if we’re to have a noninterventionist foreign policy, a noninterventionist policy on our personal liberties and one in economics, we first have to get the majority of the people to endorse these views as they- as their being in their best interest to do so. That I believe is coming. There’s every reason to recognize that individual liberty is something that we cherish, something that we have had a taste of, something our country has benefited from, and something that we may lose if we’re not careful.

But our numbers are growing. There’s reasons not to be despondent. I think we are so much better off than the Soviet system and the Russians and other countries. When they collapsed they did not have the same traditions about private property ownership and limited government. We have at least a history of that and this is the reason that I’m more optimistic that even in the midst of a crisis we should come out of that this much better. But in the meantime if we want to do a good job I think the immediate thing that we ought to do is have a President that—probably the day after he’s sworn in—that he would say, at least in Iraq, no more patrolling the streets of Iraq, no more playing policeman. And probably on that very same day that President could send out an order to turn the navy around, get them out of the Persian Gulf, bring them away from Iran. And then tell the American people that they ought to think about everything that we have done around the world over these many, many decades, we ought to look at it as if somebody else had done it to us. What if the Chinese had their navy in the Gulf of Mexico and what if they had troops on our soil? How would we react? Do you think we would take advantage of our Second Amendment and do a little shooting? But it’s only with that understanding that the American people will realize the reason that we came home.

Today we are taught—our people are taught that if we leave that means we are giving up, surrendering, and that this is a sign of weakness. Well, I don't know. It seems to me that a sign of strength might be the willingness to admit a mistake, that we went in the wrong direction and that we change our direction and do the right thing. The efforts that we make here in the next few months in the campaign I think can be very critical. We can rally a lot of troops. What will come of it? I do not know. All I know is that things are going well, better than I ever dreamed of, and it is to me very encouraging to know that the numbers are out there, the remnant is much bigger than I ever dreamed. And this is wonderful and this is very encouraging and it should encourage all of us to continue our work and effort. And there are some and some of my best friends think that politics aren't worth the effort, but education as far as I'm concerned is the most important. Some will work just in education, some will work in politics—and some will work in both, and some will always make the effort. But ultimately the true test is changing the people's mind, to be convinced that America has been a great nation, we can be a great nation, but the emphasis always has to be on the protection and the emphasis on individual liberty. Thank you very much. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. I think that I was told that if—I could take a few questions.

Announcer: Yes, Sir, about 15 minutes.

Q: This is not necessarily for you, Congressman Paul. How many of you folks want Congressman Paul to be elected President? How many of you all realize that money is the mother's milk of politics? If everybody here left \$10, we'd have \$2,000 for him. That's not much. If everybody tonight gave him \$100, he'd leave here with \$20,000. Now we're talking, but if everybody here gave him \$1,000, he'd leave here with how much? Two hundred thousand dollars. If everybody gave him \$2,000—There's \$1,000. Okay. If everybody gave him \$2,000, that'd be \$400,000 and I believe that's the arbitrary limit that the government has sent—has set for a primary. Is that correct? Twenty-six hundred.

Ron Paul: Twenty-three hundred.

Q: Okay. Well, they get way up there so here's my suggestion. Pull out your checkbook. If you don't have a checkbook, pledge, but give Ron Paul some money tonight.

Ron Paul: Thank you.

Q: A very quick suggestion which I think might help Ron and this audience very, very quickly and very effectively. Carry in your pocket, folks, a- an American silver eagle and every chance that you get pull it out and say, "Hey, have you seen any real money lately?" And there's a real conversation opener for you and you can then say, "This is your ticket to independence and freedom and it's sure as heck a good way to elect Ron Paul at the same time." So carry the

American eagle, one-ounce coin, only costs you 13 bucks, a little more, not much. It'll work, folks.

Ron Paul: I'll take the silver dollars.

Q: No, you won't. Dr. Paul, what do you think it'll take to get enough delegates at the Republican nomination- nominating convention next year—What do you think it'll take to get enough of those people to nominate you President?

Ron Paul: I'm sorry. Would you paraphrase that again for me?

Q: Well, how do you go about—

Ron Paul: How do you get them?

Q: How do you get—What do you think it'll take to get enough delegates to vote you the nomination?

Ron Paul: Well, it's an ominous task and we started off very slowly, targeting five states, figuring that if we just do well in one or two we can move on and upward, and a couple things has happened and the campaign has sort of exploded. In some ways it's out of our control, which is good in that there is so much spontaneity to it. But the other thing that has happened is they've moved all these primaries up to February 5th, which makes it very difficult for us with a couple million to compete with somebody that has 50, 70 or \$100 million, and that's what's happening. We were strong in the grassroots but it does take a lot of money. I don't—It's going to take a lot more of what we're doing. We are sort of on an exponential curve on the number of people that are calling in and sending money, but it probably depends on Giuliani, depends on how he does this week. Maybe he'll help me out again.

Q: Dr. Paul, could you comment on the Secretary of Defense's recent comment on how Iraq is going to go along on the Korean model?

Ron Paul: On the Korea—

Q: Right. He was—

Ron Paul: Fifty years?

Q: Right, yes, what he was saying in Congress—He was saying, “Well, our new model is—It’s going to be like Korea.” It seems to me that that’s really a wide-open shot for you. Could you sort of comment on that?

Ron Paul: Since I don’t think a real Iraqi government exists and they are just puppets of ours so I don’t think it means anything, I think the people, the- Saudi and these others, realize and most of the Sunnis as well as the Kurds know that we’re going to be there a long time at the rate we’re going unless we have a new foreign policy. They assume that we’re building permanent bases there and that we have a- an embassy bigger than the Vatican, 100 acres or so, it’s huge, and it’s not going to change. And then our administration tells us, “Well, if they vote in the assembly to have us go, we’ll leave.” Who believes that? They’re not going to allow them to make the vote and then we’re not going to leave anyway. The whole foolishness of this whole thing—That’s why nonintervention is much easier to defend. Just leave instead of this tinkering around, should we be in this country but not the other one? Even Wolfowitz admitted—We dug up that quote on Wolfowitz that said that one of the main reasons why it’s great to be in Iraq and have bases there is now we can leave Saudi Arabia because that was the reason Osama bin Laden hated us because we were in Saudi Arabia. He said this seriously as if being over- taking two- taking over two Muslim countries, Afghanistan and Iraq, and occupying them is going to satisfy the Muslims of the world and we close down one base in Saudi Arabia? It makes no sense but he actually said that seriously. So no, I think the 50-year plan is there except we can’t afford it. The empire’s coming to an end and we just may well get a different foreign policy one of these days.

Q: So first of all, I think it’s safe to say that most libertarians have a worse track record of voting than most college students or whatever that we keep getting called out for. So more importantly than money I would say is first libertarians and Republicans actually leading by example and talking with their mouths because without that all the money isn’t going to go anywhere. Now my question for you is with our current economic issues we would probably like to see you follow up on some of these issues with the gold standard and with price fixes and subsidies. These would all be very good things but something we’ve talked about at the conference a lot is how powerful the executive has become today, more powerful than it was ever supposed to be. So how would you reconcile the changes you need to make to make this a more free society with the actual defined role of the executive today?

Ron Paul: Well, I’m not quite sure. I’m sorry but I didn’t get all the words and I didn’t quite get that. I’m sorry.

Q: Okay. Sorry. In our—In the conference this weekend, we’ve talked about how powerful the executive has become—

Ron Paul: The executive. Oh. Okay.

Q: Yes. And how would you basically reconcile wanting to make these changes for a freer society with the actually very limited role the executive was supposed to have in the Constitution?

Ron Paul: Oh. Okay. Well, that goes back to my point that nothing happens unless you change the prevailing opinion of the people and if the people still want us to run a welfare state and a warfare state nothing happens even if you have one new President. So you have to get a consensus and—but when the people speak out and they want it, then the Congress will reflect on that, but there's a lot of difficulties ahead because everybody admires a strong President. I don't think anybody wants a weak President. Even I wouldn't want to be a weak President but I want to use my strength to do the right thing. It's resist the temptation to regulate your life and resist the temptation to think I know how to run the economy and resist the temptation of seeking power to run the world. That's what you use your strength for, but we have a long way to go to that point to get the American people to understand that fully.

Q: So would you say then, Dr. Paul, that along with your reputation as being Dr. No that basically you would use your veto power to its logical conclusion?

Ron Paul: Yeah. I think that would be assumed, yes, and I think it would be also assumed that I would recognize the responsibility of the Congress, and even though these laws that they're sending, I would never use signing statements. And that means that it should be vetoed and not have signing statements. I wouldn't use the executive orders. But I'm really working hard because I'm pretty well convinced that I might want- not want to legislate with executive orders, but maybe we could repeal all the executive orders we don't like.

Q: I'd like to just say one thing to everyone here. Our first task is to get you nominated but once you're nominated we have to be sure that the Republican Party does not do to you what they did to Goldwater. That was they did not mount a campaign for him. You're our immediate hope for the future and we wish you well.

Ron Paul: Well, I think the assumption has to be made that you can't depend on the organized Republican Party to come to our rescue. The—I recognized that just running as- for a congressional seat because not only did they not help but they worked very hard to keep me from getting back into Congress. So no, I think that should go without saying, which means that you have to have alternative ways of campaigning and raising money and compensating, but that's what is available to us this time around, which has not been available before. Even today it's much more available, the Internet and the activity on the Web pages and all much greater than it

was just two or three years ago, so this can compensate for the lack of support by the official party, but no, that is a real problem too.

Q: Since you brought up about the—Paul Wolfowitz—So what's your position on the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund?

Ron Paul: I don't know whether that would be the first day or the second day we'd get rid of those. Actually, I'll have to qualify that. We wouldn't get rid of them because we might not have the entire authority because other countries are involved. We would just get the United States out of it and no more tax dollars going to them.

Q: Congressman, one thing you can depend on the Republican Party to do—and I used to be part of that machine—will be to smear you when they think you're gaining too much traction, and you're making them too uncomfortable in forcing them to talk about the issues that you know need to be talked about. And I just want you to address that 'cause you know the Karl Roves and people of this world. As soon as your numbers start going up and you distract them, they're going to want to distract you so I'd like you to address that.

Ron Paul: Well, my first way of addressing that is that I have already warned my wife because she is getting excited about campaigning and is—and actually likes campaigning and is enjoying it very much—I told her, “You'd better be prepared.” No. You have to be prepared because if we do continue to grow and- in strength and have an impact, yes. I don't know exactly how you handle each incident because it turned out that on the night of that debate in South Carolina I thought the whole thing was over. You can't imagine how lonely of a feeling that is when you think the entire country is opposed to you and that you just blew the whole thing, but it was only ten minutes later that my staff came and told me that “Hey, you're winning in the polls.” So we'll handle it the best way we can as we meet the problems.

Q: Dr. Paul, it's Mao Mata from New Jersey. I have a question about campaign tactics. The first meeting I went to in Philadelphia for the Philadelphia Ron Paul meeting I was pretty passionate about the monetary policy and returning the United States to sound money, having heard you talk about the same thing. And pretty much the consensus amongst the people who were at the meeting was oh, don't talk about that stuff, it's too complicated, the average IQ of the average American it appears people can't understand it. So I'd like to hear it from you directly as to A, should we be talking about this from- as a campaign item, and B, how do we best communicate the message?

Ron Paul: Well, I did get to bring up the monetary issue in the first debate and I didn't mention the word “gold” but I merely—They talked about what taxes would we get rid of. I had already

said we were going to get rid of the IRS and the income tax, so I went after the inflation tax. And in 60 seconds I thought I was able to explain it pretty well that when you spend too much and you print too much the value of the money goes down and prices go up and it goes up unfairly on the poor and the middle class. The middle class gets wiped out and Wall Street makes a lot of money. I can—I've explained this and talk about it all the time, but I don't think I have any trouble in a classroom of 12-year-olds, eighth-graders. I can talk to them and I think it's so much—it makes so much sense that if you just print a lot of money how is it going to have any value to it? Do you know—You won't believe this story, but there was a hearing that we had and I brought up the subject of gold. And later on we were at a luncheon and another member of—from the committee, the banking committee, came over and said, "Well, that was very interesting, asking questions about gold and different things." She said, "Well, is—aren't we still—isn't our dollar still backed up by gold?", A member of the banking committee, but you can teach it to kids. It's not that difficult. And when the prices soar you have to just tell them where the culprit is. The Federal Reserve System can't—We can't have inflation without the Federal Reserve creating money out of thin air.

Q: So Congressman Paul, what are your three biggest challenges between now and the convention, and, assuming money is one of them, what is your monetary goal to raise by December 31 and then the balance for the rest of the primary season?

Ron Paul: The answer is as much as we can. There are some that think we can raise 20. I don't know. We're probably over 2 now, which is ahead of what I thought we could have done a few months ago, and if it keeps growing we would raise 20, but this is too hard for me to predict. We haven't been through this often so—but our money—The one thing is our money goes a lot further than their money goes. They have just—I tell people that the campaigns of these other candidates, they're run like government. They're so ingrained in government they waste most of their money. They have spent tens of millions of dollars. We actually take people in our campaign and we hardly even pay them.

Q: Congressman, this is a congressional question. I've heard about the Military Commissions Act getting passed last year suspending the writ of habeas corpus, and I'm just wondering how did that get through, and with the Democrats in control in this session is there any hope of appealing that?

Ron Paul: Not too much. We need a new President. No. A lot of them don't care and they think it's necessary. Hardly any of them know that we—that in the DOD budget last year the Insurrection Act was changed, which makes it very, very easy to declare martial law—that's on the books—which essentially has eliminated posse comitatus. We've eliminated for American citizens the ideas of habeas corpus. A lot of those individual liberties have been destroyed, but I tell you what. We have a real expert tonight [Andrew Napolitano] and he's going to be talking

later on. He knows this subject a lot better than I do and he—matter of fact he's so famous he came and talked to my small group of libertarian-leaning colleagues and we had a fantastic evening. So I am looking forward to our after-dinner speech by the famous judge. Thank you very much.

Jacob Hornberger: Thank you very much, Ron. It's a tremendous, tremendous honor to have you here with us this evening and thank you for that great talk.