

[The following article was written in 2008. At that time I was a delegate for Ron Paul in my congressional district. I wrote this article and published it on the Kennedy Twins web site after being confronted by a co-worker who thought that Ron Paul was too radical and Obama would be a better choice than Paul. The message of this article is needed in 2011 and 2012 just as it was needed back then. By-the-way, Mikey has seen the light about Obama!]

RON PAUL IS TOO RADICAL

Recently I was talking with a friend at work about the current crop of contenders for the 2008 presidential election. During the conversation I noted that as a Southern conservative I could not find anything in the front running Republicans that appealed to me. At that point my friend glibly remarked that he figured that I would be a Ron Paul man because Paul and I shared a rather radical view of America. Letting that thought pass, we proceeded to discuss the downfalls of the four leading Republicans, where upon the only choice that was left was Ron Paul but my friend stated that he would rather vote for Obama than Paul because, as he put it, Ron Paul is too radical. Having to get back to work, the conversation was ended on that note but the thought of that well educated middle class family man's statement that Ron Paul was too radical for him, never left me for the rest of the day.

Driving home that day the thought of Ron Paul being too radical for my friend to vote for just would not leave me alone. Then it hit me, he was right, Ron Paul is too radical for most modern Americans to vote for. But surprisingly this man found Obama to be a poor but an acceptable choice. Thanks to the not so stellar education system and liberal political correctness, most Americans do not understand the "radical" nature of our founding fathers. Yes, my friend was very correct, judging by what is normal today Ron Paul is very radical. But is he and those of us who hold such views really radical when compared to what our founding fathers believed?

Talk about radical! The establishment of this nation was announced by one of the most radical documents ever written by free men, the Declaration of Independence. Now remember that when this document was adopted there were no nations on earth that held to the ideas embodied in the Declaration. In an age where nations were ruled by kings most of who held near absolute power, our founding fathers announced to the world that governments existed not for the benefit of the rulers but existed for the benefit of free men. The first radical concept announced by the men of 1776 stated that our rights do not come from a king, emperor or any government but were given to man by God. Not only were our rights a gift from God but these rights were unalienable, that is, government cannot destroy our rights. Yes, they understood that governments can trample upon our rights but those rights remained a living fact of nature. Our founding fathers noted that the only JUST government was that government that existed by the CONSENT of the governed. Here we see an absolute attack upon the long held view of kings ruling by divine right, that is, God grants kings the right to rule the people. In 1776 our founding fathers of this nation put the shoe on the other foot, it is now we the people who rule ourselves according to God's ordained purposes. Here for the first time in the

history of man we see free men declaring that they had the right to rule themselves and not some king or emperor—how much more radical can you get? Well for your information Mikey (my Obama friend), a lot more radical! You see our founding fathers believed that we the people had every right to alter or **abolish** any government that did not rule us according to our will. Now this is not a revolutionary right, it is an intrinsic right of free man. If our government does not do as we think proper then we can alter, that is, change the nature of that government or in an even more radical action, we can abolish that government and establish a new government more to our liking—note here that it is the people and not the government that has the right to make those decisions.

The key point of the Declaration of Independence is that government is now going to be the servant of we the people and not our master—it is the rights and liberty of we the people that is of paramount importance and not the life of a king, emperor, or some government. Government exists only to serve and protect the liberty and freedom of we the people. This love for liberty was so pronounced that one Virginian, Patrick Henry, electrified his and many other generations of Americans when he declared, “give me liberty or give me death!” Now that is some kind of radical—I am sure my good friend at work would not vote for anyone like that. Henry’s love for liberty was similarly displayed while debating the adoption of the new government under the Constitution, when he stated, “The first thing I have at heart is American liberty, the second is American Union.” Once again Henry points us to the very reason government exists, that is, to promote and protect the liberty of we the people. In the more radical day of Patrick Henry liberty always trumps kings, emperors, unions, or government—now that is a radical concept, just try and get a modern politician to say that.

Yes, our founding fathers did indeed have some radical ideas. In the Kentucky and Virginia Resolves of 1798, Thomas Jefferson, the virtual author of the Declaration of Independence and James Madison, who was often referred to as the Father of the Constitution, made quite a few radical statements. For example they noted that the Federal government was not a government that has anything close to absolute power and it is we the people of the sovereign states who had the right to judge for ourselves if the Federal government was acting beyond the power granted by the Constitution. In other words, we the people of the sovereign states could and must be the final judge as to whether the Federal government was acting as our servant or our master—not the Federal government itself. Today, the Federal government is the only one who can say what the Constitution allows or does not allow—in essence it has become its own judge—a surer formula for the establishment of tyranny cannot be found. In the Kentucky and Virginia Resolves Jefferson and Madison declare that the final choice of how a people are to be govern is held by we the people of each sovereign state—that is where we get the idea of real State’s Rights. Under the radical system of real state’s right the Federal government is not the master but it is the servant of the people of the States. If the Federal government taxes more than it should or refuses to defend the borders of these United States or any number of other transgression of the Constitution, we the people of the sovereign states have every right to in the words of the Declaration of Independence to “alter or abolish” that government and establish a new government more to our liking. Again, find me a modern politician who is radical enough to embrace that idea.

Lest you think that these radical ideas only pertain to the functions of government and means nothing to your day to day life as a provider for you family, let's look at what some radical real State's Rights men in early America had to say about big banks and big government. Early in the history of these United States, the advocates of big government who were first known as Federalists, later Whigs, and ultimately Republicans, pushed for the establishment of a Federal banking system that could produce paper money. The State's Rights men such as Henry, Jefferson, Madison, and Jackson among many others fought against the effort to establish a Federal bank for two reasons: First, the Constitution does not empower the Federal government to establish such a system, and secondly, such a system would tend to pull money and power into the great cities, New York, Boston, Philadelphia and away from the more rural agrarian parts of the nation. Also, by issuing paper money that was not backed by something of great value such as gold or silver, the government and its bank could increase its revenue flow while devaluing the money held by the common man. Until the advent of the election of Lincoln and the Republican Party, for the most part the evils of a National banking system and Fiat money—money that is not backed by a precious commodity—had been stifled. With the defeat of the State's Rights party at the end of the so-called Civil War, America now lives with a national banking system and continual inflation caused by the issuing of more and more Fiat currency—the warnings of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, both very strong State's Rights men—has become a reality for modern Americans. Remember the warnings about banks pulling money and wealth out of the small towns and cities and into the large centers of banking—do the words Wall Street ring a bell? Did all that wealth just get up and walk to New York City on it own accord? Now, how about the loss of wealth every citizen has to put up with because the Federal Reserve System determines that it needs to print up a few billion more dollars? Please remember, these fiat dollars are not backed by any precious commodity—its just paper. What happens to the value of the money you have in your bank account, C.D.s, your retirement account or just sitting in your pocket? The value of your money is reduced by the actions of a Federal government that cannot be called into account by we the people of the sovereign states—you lose because the radical folks like Jefferson and Jackson ultimately lost their struggle against big banking and big government.

One of the things that many of those so-called radical founding fathers desired was to be able to live their lives unmolested by government—another radical idea. John Randolph of Roanoke, Virginia often stated that he did not desire to have government do for him what he should be doing for himself. He would often say that free men are those people who understood that they should paddle their own canoe. Both Randolph and St. George Tucker of Virginia noted that when government—any government, did not allow a person to live as a free man, unmolested upon his own homestead, that government was reducing the individual to the state of civil slavery. In other words if while not disturbing others, you cannot live on your own land without paying the government for that right you are not really free. Today no American lives free on his own land. You never own your home or land, you only lease it from the government—refuse to pay your lease payment and the government will take it away from you—just like any slave master would do if a slave refused to work for the master. Yes, these men understood that some

form of minimal taxes had to be paid but at some point a free man should have refuge from the eternal tax bite of government or else he is not a free man but a tax slave of the government. Now with that thought in mind, let's look at that radical Ron Paul.

Ron Paul is often criticized for his radical libertarian views. Libertarians view liberty as having greater importance than government. During his tenure as a Congressman Ron Paul has been an active advocate of liberty over governmental power. Just like that radical, Patrick Henry, those of us who love liberty more than government believe that in a free society liberty trumps government every time and yes in today's world that is a rather radical concept. Ron Paul has gotten into some trouble with many conservatives because he has dared to question the logic of Lincoln's war against the South. After all if the Declaration of Independence means what it says, that is, people have the unalienable right to abolish their government and establish a new one more to their liking and if as Patrick Henry noted that in America liberty trumps union, then one has to admit that Lincoln was wrong and The South Was Right! Just one more radical view that Congressman Paul clings to, just like our founding fathers in 1776.

Radical Ron Paul believes in a Federal government that only exercises those powers that have been delegated to it in the Constitution, you know, just like Madison, Jefferson, Henry, and a world of other founding fathers of these United States. You see, Ron Paul does not believe in an all-powerful omnipotent government. Mr. Paul has some very good radical company when he stresses that the Constitution should be followed if we are to be a free people. Now, just like Mr. Paul is doing, let us ask some Constitutional questions. Where in the Constitution is the Federal government authorized to give American taxpayers money to foreign nations in the form of foreign aid? You can look but there is no authorization for such an authorization. Any good Constitutionalist, like Mr. Paul, would have to be against giving away our tax dollars to foreign nations. Where in the Constitution is the Federal government authorized to take money away from taxpayers and give it to people who only consume tax dollars in the form of social welfare. And we won't stop there, where in the Constitution is the federal government authorized to take tax dollars from working people and give it to various businesses in the form of corporate welfare? Once again it's not in the Constitution. Where is the Federal government authorized to send our military to foreign nations to fight their wars and defend their borders—especially considering that our borders are under defended? How often have we heard stories of jobs being lost to foreign companies in Japan, Germany, South Korea, Taiwan and the list could go on. Yet each of these foreign nations has one thing in common, they are defended by American troops at the expense of the working tax paying citizens of this nation. Has anyone ever wondered how much more competitive those nation's factories are because they don't have to pay the taxes to defend their own country? No, it is the American worker who is having to shoulder that burden and his factory's output is less competitive and his job more likely to be lost as a result of those taxes. All of this because no one can or will force the Federal government to live by the Constitution like our more radical founding fathers intended. And one other thought is appropriate here. Where in the Constitution is the president given the authority to wage a protracted foreign war without a Congressional declaration of war? In the past 60 years more young Americans have died fighting undeclared wars than died

fighting the declared War for American Independence, War of 1812, the Mexican War, the Spanish American War, and WWI combined. Our radical founding fathers knew what they were doing when they limited the war making capacity of this nation by a Congressional declaration of war. Here again we see that the radical Ron Paul is more in line with our founding fathers than he is with America's modern conservatives.

Yes, that ole radical Ron Paul does not like the Federal Reserve System and it's printing of fiat paper money either. Here again Mr. Paul stands right next to those radical founding fathers such as Madison and Jefferson. As a matter of fact President Andrew Jackson was just as radically opposed to fiat currency and a national banking system as Ron Paul. Remember, it was the State's Rights party that was the main stumbling block to the formation of a national banking system and the issuing of fiat currency. After the failure of the Federalist Party and then the Whig Party, both of which championed the idea of big government and national banking, it was Mr. Lincoln and his Republican Party that pushed through the concept of fiat currency and national banking. Today as you listen to these words, your money is being devalued by the actions of the Federal Reserve System, a system made possible by the defeat of the State's Rights party at Appomattox. Yes, big government, big taxes, and fiat currency are the legacy of the Republican Party, Mr. Lincoln, and the defeat of the South at Appomattox. Unfortunately most Americans have no idea of what I am talking about, they think real State's Rights have nothing to do with their jobs and bank account and they are wrong. With the death of real State's Rights all of the previously mentioned ills that have been visited upon America has been made not only possible but it was made inevitable.

So, Mikey, I suppose you are right after all. Ron Paul is too radical. He is too radical for modern Americans who have been fed upon the illusion that it is the job of government to take care of us, that this same government therefore has the authority to limit the exercise of our rights so as to safe guard society. In modern America government is a near god. Anyone who holds views to the contrary, such as Ron Paul or any of us neo-Confederates are easily labeled as extremists, radicals, or for us neo-Confederates, secessionists. The very thought that anyone would think that people have the unalienable right to secede from the protective care of nanny government is outrageously shocking to modern effeminate milk-toast Americans. Like Patrick Henry, who could never be reasonably described as an effeminate milk-toast person, those of us who love liberty more than we love the heavy handed care given by big brother government, we are viewed as radicals. But when one thinks about it, the shame is not upon those of us who must bear that label, the shame is upon a society, which does not fully understand and appreciate the God given blessings of real American liberty. How many people in the 20th century swapped their liberty for the elusion of governmental security and comfort—this is the path traveled by the people of post-WWI Germany as they embraced Der Furer Adolph Hitler. Likewise in Italy El Duche, Benito Mussolini persuaded the people of a once free republic to surrender a portion of their freedom and follow his fascist's legions. Lenin and Stalin also offered the people a workers paradise if only they would allow the government to become their all-providing big brother. Cannot it be said that in each of these nations there were men and women who decried

the growth of big government and the loss of liberty? Surely this is true and surely they were labeled as radicals or unpatriotic to the government.

The weak-kneed milk-toast attitude of letting the government take care of us is surely an attitude that will sound the death-knell of real American liberty. It is the attitude that fosters all forms of big government; socialism, fascism, communism, and our own homegrown variety of conservative/liberal socialism. They all see government as preeminent in the life of a society, which is a radical departure from the form of government envisioned by our founding fathers in 1776 and defended for us by our Confederate forefathers in 1861. If a future generation of Americans will ever live to see a land where they are not slaves to their governmental masters, then surely we must unite and that effectually to fight for the day when real American liberty is once again celebrated and not scorned as being “too radical.”