



THE FUTURE
— of —
FREEDOM FOUNDATION

www.fff.org

Losing Liberty in the War on Terrorism

by Bart Frazier

The following is a transcript of a speech given at The Future of Freedom Foundation's June 2008 conference, "Restoring the Republic: Foreign Policy & Civil Liberties" held in Reston, Virginia.

Jacob Hornberger: Bart Frazier has been program director at the Future of Freedom Foundation for the past seven years. He holds a B.S. degree in economics from George Mason University. In addition to planning and coordinating FFF programs, Bart is also in charge of maintaining our website, as well as putting together our daily FFF e-mail updates, which we have striven to make for many years—as long as Bart has been with FFF—the finest, if not at least one of the finest, daily libertarian e-mail updates on the Internet. Bart is also a great writer. He's a frequent contributor to our journal, *Freedom Daily*. Please welcome Bart Frazier.

Bart Frazier: [As was] said, I'm program director here at the Future of Freedom Foundation. And one of the best parts of being program director is working on FFF e-mail updates. Our free Internet newsletter goes out every day except for Sundays, and I imagine most of you in this room already get it. But if you don't, I highly recommend it. You can sign up for it at the registration table. It's free. But in addition to all of our original work, it also has a collection of articles that we cull from newspapers and other libertarian sites, like LewRockwell.com, Antiwar.com, *Reason*, and others, and we spend our morning, Jacob and I, we arrive at 6:00 in the morning, combing the Internet for these articles. Takes about two hours every morning, a lot of work goes into 'em, so I want to thank all of you. Because of you I get to read newspapers for a living. It's very nice. Thank you.

But because of this job, I've become very familiar with current events, and my job has also coincided with the War on Terrorism. I started as an intern at FFF, in the spring of 2001, and came on full time that fall, right about the time of 9/11. And I have learned through my job that the government has just done some very, very horrible things over the course of the past six, seven years. So consider my talk today kind of a memory test. So much has happened in the past six, seven years since 9/11 that it is almost impossible to retain it all.

You've heard some of it today from Jim Bovard, and Robert Higgs, Lew Rockwell, and Jacob, of course. But so much has happened that you just, it's impossible to remember. So anybody remember terms like "extraordinary rendition," "spider holes," "mission accomplished," "the war will pay for itself"? Yeah. So these are the things that I'm going to go over today.

And of course it all began with the attacks on 9/11 itself. Terrorists attacked the World Trade Center in New York, as well as the Pentagon in Washington, D.C. And the first fact to remember is that we never declared war. The U.S. Congress never declared war on Iraq or Afghanistan. We went into Afghanistan a month after the attacks, and into Iraq about a year and a half later. But we never declared war.

Now this of course is not a big surprise. Congress has not declared war on any country since World War II, yet tens of thousands of American soldiers as well as millions of foreign civilians have died through the actions of the U.S. military since then in Korea, in Vietnam, and Iraq, and a multitude of other smaller skirmishes, and not once have we declared war. We've had police actions, but the power, the President has pretty much had the power to take us to war.

Now the House did pass, a week after 9/11, the authorization for use of military force against terrorists, which read in part, "That the President is authorized to use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11th." Well, this is clearly not a declaration of war, and in fact, it's just simply passing the buck. Congressmen did not want to look weak on terrorism, and they did not want to take on the responsibility of declaring war, so they gave the President all the power he wanted and absolved themselves of all of theirs. So fact to remember, the U.S. Congress never declared war.

So attack we did. We went into Afghanistan with the ostensible goal of finding and perhaps killing Osama bin Laden. So fact to remember number 2, most people don't remember that Osama bin Laden is a former ally of ours. When the Soviets invaded Afghanistan in 1979, the Carter administration, and, in particular, Zbigniew Brzezinski, wanted to give the Soviets their Vietnam, and they did so in spades. Using

the CIA, they funneled monies and weapons to the Afghan Freedom Fighters known as the Mujaheddin, and one of the primary conduits for funneling these monies and weapons was Osama bin Laden. So he was our buddy. He was our pal. We had a common enemy. He was our ally. And, of course, he is now Enemy of the State No. 1. So fact to remember, Osama bin Laden was our ally.

So that brings us to Iraq. Not long afterwards, we attacked yet another ally of ours. Fact to remember, in the 1980s Saddam Hussein was our ally. As you heard earlier today, we aided them in their war against Iran. There's a famous picture of Donald Rumsfeld taken in 1983 shaking hands with Saddam Hussein. And I'm sure the government would love to wipe that picture from history if they could, but thanks to the Internet, anybody can find it. Just Google Rumsfeld, Hussein, and photo, and it'll pop up on a multitude of websites.

But excuse me, Rumsfeld then was the special envoy to the Middle East, and of course he wasn't Secretary of Defense then. What this special envoy meant was that he was the liaison between our government and the Iraqi government. And he brought Hussein all kinds of gifts. He brought him a pair of military pistols, brought him a pair of golden boot spurs. So, again, this was our buddy, our friend, who we then, of course, attacked after 9/11.

So the two countries that we attacked were both our former allies. Now, going into Afghanistan, the reason for it was easy for the administration to justify. Osama bin Laden was there, and he was the mastermind behind the 9/11 attacks. But Iraq was a little harder. There were really no connections between the attacks and Iraq. None of the people on the planes were Iraqis. So they needed a rationale for going in. And of course everybody remembers weapons of mass destruction, WMD. The administration provided a multitude of evidence for weapons of mass destruction in Iraq.

The first thing that they claimed was that Iraq had tried to purchase uranium yellow cake from Niger. Now, this later proved to be false. Joseph Wilson, a career diplomat, was sent to Niger by the CIA to investigate these claims. And he found that there was no evidence for these claims whatsoever. And I don't know if anybody remembers Valerie Plame, but that was Joseph Wilson's wife, who was an undercover CIA agent, whose identity the administration leaked to the press and effectively destroyed her career. They also claimed that Iraq had made large purchases of aluminum tubing in 2000 that were claimed to be part of a centrifuge to manufacture enriched uranium. It was later proved that those claims were false. They did make the purchase, but it turns out that the aluminum tubing was used for conventional weapons manufacture, most likely handheld rockets. And the big one that most people would probably remember from Colin Powell's testimony before the UN was the trucks that were

supposed to be for biological weapons manufacturing. But it turns out, as Iraq was claiming all along, that they were using these trucks to manufacture hydrogen for artillery balloons.

Now, while all this was going on, people who would know were disclaiming these facts. Scott Ritter, everybody in this room has probably heard of, was the UN's chief weapon inspector from 1991 to 1998, and he was crying at the top of his voice, in the press, on television, in the newspapers, that he'd been there. He'd been inspecting Iraq for years, and they had no WMDs. Hans Blix, as well. He was the head of the UN Monitoring Verification and Inspection Commission from 2000 to 2003. Again, he said, "We've been inspecting them for a very long time. They don't have any." Now, we did know, as Jacob referred to earlier, that they did previously have weapons of mass destruction, because we did supply them to them. According to Mack Kelly of the Associated Press, "The CDC and the Biological Sample Company, the American Type Culture Collection, sent strains of all the germs Iraq used to make weapons, including anthrax, the bacteria that make botulism toxin, and the germs that cause gas gangrene, the records show." Iraq also got samples of other deadly pathogens, including West Nile virus. These are the roots of some of the weapons that they used against the Iranians in the 1980s. But the WMD rationale fell through. They had these people from the UN disclaiming it, and of course, in 2008, we have yet to find WMDs there. I think we can give up the ghost there.

So they had to find other rationales. The next one they used was that Saddam Hussein had ties to al Qaeda. So fact to remember, Saddam Hussein had no ties to al Qaeda. Like I said, none of the eleven attackers were from Iraq, but he kept on, Bush kept on repeating over and over again, if not explicitly, that al Qaeda was in Baghdad, that by innuendo there was an association. So here's one statement from Bush: "We know that Iraq and the al Qaeda terrorist networks share a common enemy, the United States of America. We know that Iraq and al Qaeda have had high-level contacts that go back a decade. Some al Qaeda leaders who fled Afghanistan went to Iraq." Again, we know he's got ties with al Qaeda. A nightmare scenario, of course, is that he becomes the arsenal for a terrorist network, where they could attack America and leave no fingerprints behind.

Well, no link was ever established. If you want a really good sample of some research done on this, I highly recommend Jim Bovard's work, his books, and also his article, "Saddam as the Twentieth Hijacker," which you can find in *Freedom Daily*. Now, they tried other rationales when this fell through. Bring democracy to Iraq, which we have now. They have democracy. And the most laughable one, better to fight the terrorist over there than to fight them here. But as the rationales changed, just remember there were no WMD there, and we really had no reason for invading Iraq. But invade we did. There are still, I'm sure, many Joseph Sixpacks out there that think that Saddam Hussein attacked the World Trade Center, and so they were able to take the country to war.

Now, fact to remember again, Many people in the Bush administration wanted to invade Iraq before 9/11. There is a think tank called the Project for a New American Century, co-founded by Bill Kristol and Robert Kagan, who in January 1998, posted an open letter to Bill Clinton asking for the forcible removal of Saddam Hussein. That letter reads in part, “The policy of containment of Saddam Hussein has been steadily eroding over the past several months. As the recent events have demonstrated, we can no longer depend on our partners in the Gulf War Coalition to continue to uphold sanctions or to punish Saddam when he blocks or invades UN inspections. We urge you to articulate this aim, and to turn your administration’s attention to implementing a strategy for removing Saddam’s regime from power.”

And here’s the important part: “This will require a full complement of diplomatic, political, and military efforts.” So back in ’98, three years before 9/11, they were calling for Bill Clinton to send the military into Iraq to get rid of Saddam. Of the 18 people who signed this open letter, see if you recognize some of these names: Elliott Abrams, Richard Armitage, John Bolton, Paula Dobriansky, Zalmay Khalilzad, Richard Pearl, Peter Rodman, Donald Rumsfeld, Paul Wolfowitz, and Robert Zoellick. All these 10 people were in the Bush administration three years later, more than half the signers asking for the invasion of Iraq. So they got us to go in, and we’re still there today.

But once we got in there, debate started as to what we’re going to do once we’re in there. The decision had been made. The military was starting to invade. How would we pay for it? How many people are we going to need? So fact to remember, we were told this war would pay for itself. Iraq is filled with oil, and we could use the revenues from the sales of this oil. It’s hardly going to cost us a thing. A *New York Times* article talking about Paul Wolfowitz testifying before Congress said, “Mr. Wolfowitz spent much of the hearing knocking down published estimates of the cost of war and rebuilding, saying the upper range of \$95 billion was too high, and that the estimates were almost meaningless because of the variables. Moreover, he said such estimates and speculation that post-war reconstruction costs could climb even higher ignored the fact that Iraq is a wealthy country with annual oil exports worth \$15 to 20 billion.”

So assuming we’re going to pay for it all is just wrong. I would give anything if this war only cost us \$95 billion right now. But according to a book by a Nobel Prize-winning economist, Joseph Stiglitz, and his co-author, Linda Bilmes, “The Iraq war is now, and the whole War on Terrorism, running us \$12 1/2 billion per month, and the long-run costs, including macroeconomic effects, could be well over \$3 trillion,” which is a far cry from \$95 billion.

Fact to remember, we have sent over a million troops to the Middle East, which, again, is a tad over the estimates. Four-star General Eric Shinseki was admonished by Donald Rumsfeld for testifying

before Congress that a war in Iraq would need “something on the order of several hundred thousand soldiers.” Rumsfeld testified, “The idea that it would take several thousand U.S. forces I think is far off the mark.” It was far off the mark. Since 2001, according to a recent Rand study, approximately 1.64 million U.S. troops have been deployed in Iraq and Afghanistan.

We also are a country that hires mercenaries. Blackwater, which is a self-described private military company, now trains 40,000 people per year as private security. But honestly they’re mercenaries. So fact to remember, the U.S. hires mercenaries. We have killed untold thousands of civilians in Iraq and Afghanistan. You don’t see it discussed too often because people just don’t really know how many people we’re killing over there. The military doesn’t seem to care, because they don’t keep a count. They don’t think it’s important. But the group IraqBodyCount.org has tried to make the best scientific estimates that they can. They cross-check media reports and hospital morgue reports, and try to get the best estimate. And they estimate that somewhere between 84,000 and 91,000 civilians have been killed in Iraq, tens of thousands of Iraqis killed.

Right now, we do know that it’s common knowledge that over 4,000 American soldiers have been killed in the War on Terrorism. But another fact to remember is that many more are coming home maimed and injured. Battlefield medicine technology has improved to such a great extent that we are able to save soldiers that decades ago it would just have been an impossibility, which is good. I mean, you know, who wouldn’t want to live, but they are coming home with horrible injuries. It is estimated right now that approximately 30,000 soldiers have been physically disabled in the war, and that as many as 300,000 now suffer from post-traumatic stress syndrome. And you can see this popping up in the country now. The suicide rate among soldiers is skyrocketing, as are the incidences of domestic abuse.

Now, a completely different aspect of the war: this has been mainly the military and the government’s buildup to it. It is the CIA involvement. The CIA operates on a completely different paradigm. They have no rules. They can pretty much do as they please, as you’ve heard earlier this morning. And just to give you a few examples, most people probably don’t remember Abu Ali al-Harithi, who was the mastermind behind the bombing of the USS Cole. Well, the CIA got him and the way they did it is they sent an unmanned predator drone into Yemen, which was an ally of ours at the time, and just launched a missile at his car, and blew him to smithereens, right on the highways of Yemen. Along with al-Harithi, six others died, including an American citizen. So the CIA killed, murdered an American citizen by firing a rocket at him from the air. So fact to remember, the CIA has killed U.S. citizens, murdered U.S. citizens.

Fact to remember, the first American killed in the war in Afghanistan was a CIA agent. Most people probably don't remember the name, Mike Span, but he was a CIA agent. He was actually from Northern Virginia here, not far from here. And he was killed in a riot, a prison riot, right at the beginning of the war, where 214 out of 300 prisoners were killed. He was killed the day he arrived, and he had just started interrogating the detainees there when the riot broke out. And as an interesting aside, two of the people who survived, which there weren't that many, were John Walker Lind and Yaser Esam Hamdi.

John Walker Lind, if you remember, was the American Taliban. He was an American citizen. He had converted to Islam at a very young age, had traveled to Pakistan to study Islam, and had ended up with the Taliban. Now, whether or not he did anything wrong by being with the Taliban is immaterial. What really counts is how he was treated by the CIA once he was captured. He was drugged. His clothes were cut off of his body. He was blindfolded. He was duct-taped to a stretcher, and he was put inside a metal shipping container. And prior to his capture, he'd been injured in battle. He still had a bullet in his leg that they did not remove, and when the CIA finally interrogated him, he was still drugged. He was still naked, and they left the bullet in his leg. And he's now serving 20 years in a supermax prison. He agreed to a plea deal, which Jim was referring to earlier, which prevents him from talking about his captivity and treatment, and to drop any claims that he has been tortured.

The CIA has also kidnapped reported terrorists from countries all over the world, extraordinary rendition. Dana Priest is the one who broke this story, who did the real legwork on this, and the piece in the *Washington Post*. And this is from that piece: "Members of the rendition group follow a simple but standard procedure. Dressed head to toe in black, including masks, they blindfold and cut the clothes off of new captives, then administer an enema and sleeping drugs. They outfit detainees in a diaper and a jumpsuit for what can be a daylong trip. Their destination's either a detention facility operated by cooperative countries in the Middle East and Central Asia, including Afghanistan, or one of the CIA's own covert prisons, referred to in classified documents as black sites, which at various times have been operated in eight countries, including several in eastern Europe."

So the CIA, a branch of our government, is yanking people off the streets in countries all over the world, blindfolding them, stuffing them into jets, and flying them off to get tortured and interrogated, disappearing them without a trace. Now, it's not known exactly how many people they've done this to, but it's thought to be at least 100 people, and at least two, Khalid El-Masri and Maher Arar, seem to have been completely innocent. It was just a case of mistaken identity, but as Jim said, they were unlucky.

And as one of the questioners just pointed out, the *Guardian* just had a piece last week that it is possible now that detainees are being kept on secret vessels, up to 17 U.S. naval vessels, that are anchored

in countries throughout the world. So what's happened to these people? Well, what's happened to them is Abu Ghraib, Guantanamo, and torture. So one of the most important facts to remember is that the U.S. government systematically tortured people. It's infuriating. According to a *New York Times* piece in January 2005, the tactics include urinating on detainees, jumping on one detainee's leg, which had already been wounded by gunfire, with such force that it could not thereafter heal, and continue by pounding on that detainee's leg with a collapsible metal baton, pouring phosphoric acid on detainees, sodomization of detainees with a baton, tying ropes to the detainee's legs or penises and dragging them across the floor. Our government.

And, of course, we've seen pictures of other tactics they use. You've seen the man up on a box, hooded, with electric wires attached to his body. You've seen the stack of naked bodies in front of American servicemen, water boarding, of course, which everybody has heard of. So very important fact to remember, our government tortures people.

Now, the Bush administration wants us to believe that this is just a bunch of bad apples, some sergeants and privates who got carried away. But important fact to remember, it's not just a bunch of bad apples. Sergeant Ivan Frederick, one of the soldiers who was posted to Abu Ghraib, stated in his video diary, "Military intelligence has been present and witnessed such activity. Military intelligence has encouraged and told us 'great job,' and that they were now getting positive results and information." And in a recent ABC news report, in dozens of top secret talks and meetings in the White House, the most senior Bush administration officials discussed and approved specific details of how high value al-Qaeda suspects would be interrogated by the CIA. Highly placed sources said a handful of top advisors signed off on how the CIA would interrogate top al-Qaeda suspects, whether they would be slapped, pushed, deprived of sleep, or subjected to simulated drowning called water boarding. So important fact, people knew about this.

In addition to the torturing, people were also murdered at Abu Ghraib and other places. According to the Associated Press, at least 108 prisoners have died in U.S. custody in Iraq and Afghanistan. Now at least 26 of those detainees have been investigated as potential homicides, but there is no doubt that homicides occurred. The same Sergeant Frederick said of one prisoner, "They stressed him out so bad that the man passed away. The next day the medics came in and put his body on a stretcher, placed a fake IV in his arm to suggest that he had died under medical care and took him away." In another case, 56-year-old Iraqi Major General Abed Hamed Mowhoush was asked to come in for questioning, which he did voluntarily. And for his compliance, they stuffed him in a green sleeping bag, wrapped that sleeping bag in electrical cord, laid him on the floor, and beat him until he died. So fact to remember, we have murdered people over there.

So while all this was going on in the War on Terrorism in Iraq and Afghanistan, and we were doing horrible things to detainees, Iraqis and Afghans, the Bush administration started doing horrible things to us and our civil liberties. Fact to remember, President Bush has issued over 750 executive signing statements. And again, I praise Jim Bovard's great work on the signing statements. He's written some great pieces on it. But what a signing statement is, is a footnote. Everybody knows that the way a law is passed is that Congress passes a bill and the President signs it into law. Well, when Bush signs something into law, he takes what is an executive signing statement and says, "Well, I don't like this part, and this part doesn't pertain to me because I'm commander of war and I don't need to pay attention." Nothing but a clear power grab, and clearly a violation of the Constitution's requirement that he faithfully execute the law. So fact to remember, Bush has issued over 750 executive signing statements.

Fact to remember, the government is spying on us. Jim Bovard was just telling you some of the various programs, so I won't go over the details. But one thing that he didn't talk about, which I think is just hilarious, is the logo of the Total Information Awareness Program, which came out with John Poindexter. It didn't last long because it was scary looking. It was a pyramid with an all-seeing eye on top, and out of this all-seeing eye was this yellow, piercing beam that then encompassed the entire globe. Straight out of 1984, it looked good. George Orwell would have loved it, so if you want to see that again, thanks to the Internet it's never going away. You can go find that.

But the worst violation of our civil liberties has been the abolition of habeas corpus. And we have some great speakers this weekend who are going to be speaking to that: Jesselyn Radack, who was involved with the John Walker Lind case, the American Taliban, and Joanne Mariner and Joseph Margulies, both involved with Guantanamo cases. Don't miss any speeches this weekend, of course, but their speeches are going to be very good. But fact to remember, habeas corpus has been abolished in many instances. There are still 355 men in Guantanamo Bay. I believe it was over 600 at one point in time. But we're coming up on six years now where this government has held these men without a trial, six years. I mean, that is a big portion of one's life, and they have not been able to have any remedy whatsoever for their detention.

Two of the cases deserve quick mention. One is Shafiq Rasul. Joseph Margulies was the lead counsel in *Rasul v. Bush*, which was one of the first habeas cases to come out of Guantanamo. Rasul was designated an enemy combatant by Bush, and it went all the way to the Supreme Court. In June 2004, the Supreme Court ruled that it had jurisdiction on detainees, which was in question at that time, and that they had the right to challenge their detention.

Another one is Jose Padilla, an important name to remember because he is a bit unique in that he was an American citizen, detained on American soil. He was arrested in Chicago in May 2002, accused of various terrorist crimes, and he was being detained for weeks on end, and he was challenging his detention in court. And two days before the judge was to issue a ruling on his detention, Bush designated him an enemy combatant. And if you don't remember, being designated an enemy combatant makes you *persona non grata*. You have no legal rights. Your citizenship is essentially stripped. And that's what all these people in Guantanamo are. They are enemy combatants.

Well, he eventually did get his trial in May 2007. But that is five years from the time of detention to the time of trial. An American citizen arrested on American soil sat in jail for five years with no remedy whatsoever. And these are things that we cannot forget. Another thing about Padilla is how he was treated there. I don't know if anybody remembers the photos that came out of him, because you didn't hear much of him. But he had to go get some dental work done, so somebody managed to snap a photo of him while he was being taken to the dentist, and when he was leaving his detention facility, he had guards all around him, and his hands were shackled. His feet were shackled. He had earmuffs on his head to block out all sound, and he had blackened-out goggles put on his face to block out all light. Complete sensory deprivation. And it drove him nuts. He was treated that way for a good portion of his detention, and his lawyers found him almost useless for defense.

Well, Congress passed the Military Commissions Act of 2006, to try and address the problem of enemy combatants. The courts finally said that we've got to provide some remedy for these people. And as Connolly has described, it's a kangaroo proceeding. No civilian attorneys are allowed unless they're approved by the government. A finding of guilty only requires a two-thirds majority by a commission that's overseeing the trial. And in general, no person may invoke the Geneva Conventions or any protocols thereto in habeas corpus or other civil action. So extremely important point to remember, is the government is taking away habeas corpus from us, and it must be watched diligently.

So this brings me to what I consider the most important point of this conference that should be addressed and thought of by everyone here. Why were we attacked? Why were we attacked? Why did they do it to us? Why did they fly into those towers? Why did they steal those planes? Well, the Bush administration would have us believe that's because we're free. Well, extremely important point to remember, we were not attacked because of our freedoms. But he repeated it over and over again.

The day of 9/11, Bush released a statement, "America was targeted for attack because we're the brightest beacon of freedom and opportunity in the world." And that is just foolish on its face. I mean, who doesn't want to be free? I mean, it's inherent in everybody. Nobody wants to be told what to do. Later

in April of 2002, at a Connecticut Republican committee meeting, he stated, “They hate us because we’re free. They hate the thought that Americans welcome all religions. They can’t stand that thought. They hate the thought that we educate everybody. They hate our freedom. They hate the fact that we hold each individual. We dignify each individual. We believe in the dignity of every person. They can’t stand that.”

Well, that’s foolish. We were not attacked because of our freedoms. And I will tell you why we were attacked. There’s three main reasons.

One is the trade sanctions against Iraq. After Iraq’s invasion of Kuwait, and at the behest of the U.S. government, the UN passed sanctions on Iraq with a full trade embargo, excluding medical supplies, food, and other items. And at the same time, during the first Gulf War the U.S. military intentionally bombed the infrastructure of the country, and particularly the water treatment facilities, causing widespread disease. So with the combination of no infrastructure and limited food and medicines from the embargo, it was estimated that upwards of 600,000 Iraqi children died as a result.

Now, there was an uproar over this. The UN Oil for Food Program administrator, Denis Halliday, resigned in protest. He said, “We are in the process of destroying an entire nation.” And he denounced the sanctions as nothing less than genocide. As a sidebar, the man who bombed the World Trade Center in 1993 also mentioned the sanctions in his testimony when he was tried. In 1996, then-UN Ambassador Madeleine Albright was asked, “We have heard that half a million children have died. I mean, that is more children than died in Hiroshima. And, you know, is the price worth it?” Albright responds, “I think that is a very hard choice, but the price, we think the price is worth it.” Enough to make your blood boil. I mean, every person in the Middle East heard that answer. We think it’s worth it. Half a million children die. Well, you know, it’s worth it.

Second reason, U.S. economic and military aid to Israel. Since the 1970s, Israel has been one of the top recipients of U.S. aid. Total aid to Israel since 1949 is over \$84 billion. In addition, we have sold them multitudes of our best weapons, 50 F-15’s, a couple hundred F-16’s, dozens of transport planes, dozens of attack helicopters, 6,000 personnel carriers. In 2007 we’ve increased our military aid to Israel by over 25% to an average of \$3 billion per year. So there Israel is essentially an extension of our military. They have all of our best weapons. They have our training. Now, regardless of which way you lay in regards to your position with Israel, you cannot deny the fact that Muslims in the Middle East aren’t going to care for this policy too much. I mean, this is the sworn enemy of many of them, and they are the biggest recipient of money and weapons from us.

Third reason, military bases in Saudi Arabia and other Middle Eastern countries as well. Saudi Arabia contains two of Islam's holiest sites, Mecca and Medina, which our U.S. presence there-- we had bases in Saudi Arabia until 2003. But many Muslims considered our presence there blasphemous. In addition to Saudi Arabia, we had bases in Kuwait, Bahrain, Qatar, Oman, the United Arab Emirates, Turkey, Egypt, Israel, Djibuti, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Kirghizstan, Uzbekistan, and of course, Iraq. Well, again, why wouldn't they be upset? I mean, we have military bases across their entire region. I mean, how would we feel?

But I am just not speculating about the reasons for their hatred of us, and why they attacked us. There's proof. Osama bin Laden in his 1996 fatwa, Declaration of War Against the Americans Occupying the Land of Two Holy Places, said, "The people of Islam awakened and realized that they are the main target for the aggression of the Zionist Crusaders Alliance. The latest and the greatest of these aggressions incurred by the Muslims since the death of the prophet, is the occupation of the land of the two holy places by the armies of the American crusaders and their allies." Talking about bases in Saudi Arabia. "The youths hold you responsible for all the killings and evictions of the Muslims and the violation of the sanctities carried out by your Zionist brothers in Lebanon. You openly supplied them with arms and finance." Our aid to Israel. "More than 600,000 Iraqi children have died due to lack of food and medicine, and as a result of an unjustifiable aggression imposed on Iraq and this nation. The children of Iraq are our children. You, the USA, together with the Saudi regime, are responsible for the shedding of the blood of these innocent children. Due to all of that, whatever treaty you have with our country, is now null and void."

Now, Osama bin Laden made similar statements in tape releases after 9/11, but where in any of these statements do you hear something about hating our freedoms? I mean, you hear nothing in there about our freedom of opportunity, or our freedom of religion, our freedom of speech. No. Freedom is not mentioned once. It's because of the things that we have done to them.

So what do we do? What is the answer? Well, it's really simple. End imperial foreign policy. It's as easy as that. Nation building is immoral and it doesn't work. It blows up in your face, what the CIA calls blowback. We have to take the attitude of Ron Paul, take his advice, and think about what it would be like to be treated like those people are treated. Think of what it would be like if Mexico was operating drones across the Rio Grande, and launching missiles at our interstates. Think of how you would feel if China was conducting naval exercises off the coast of Florida. Think about what it would feel like if Iran was constructing military bases in California and New York. Think about what it would feel like if North Korea was kidnapping U.S. citizens off the streets, throwing them on planes, and shipping them off to east Asia or South America or wherever else. There's only one answer. End all this now. Embrace the foreign

policy of the Founders. Go not in search of monsters to destroy. Have entangling alliances with none, and have peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations. Thank you.

Q: So what is your opinion of all the things we've heard today? What is this leading to in the future?

Bart Frazier: Well, personally, I don't like the way things are going.

Q: I don't either.

Bart Frazier: Yeah. I mean.

Q: What's the reason?

Bart Frazier: Well, people have asked me what we should do, and I am of the opinion of Ayn Rand that you're not going to be able to do anything until you change the minds of people. And that is what we do here at the Foundation. I mean, we're not really a policy tank so much. Our idea, our mission is to change peoples' minds. We want to influence people. We want to influence Joe Sixpack, and until Joe Sixpack cares for his liberties, I don't think we're going to get very far.

Q: That's true.

Bart Frazier: Yeah.

Q: This country seems to be totally oblivious to what's going on.

Bart Frazier: I agree. Nobody cares.

Q: As far as spiritual tough, you just don't exist in this country, deep spiritual, that is. Now, I'm not talking about religious. Deep spiritual values. Anybody with any deep spiritual values would not allow this to go on. Just a comment. The notion that they hate us because we're free. Think about the rationale for why that statement is made. It's because, like, what do you do with that?

Bart Frazier: Oh, absolutely.

Q: And it leads to enormous frustration. And what do you do with enormous frustration? You lash out.

Bart Frazier: Oh, absolutely.

Q: You support war. If they told the truth, which is they hate us because of our policies, you can do something with that. Change the policies. But that, of course, is not part of the plan.

Bart Frazier: Well, plus, if you accept the rationale that they attack us for our freedom, you have to be thinking these people are insane. Of course, we have to go to war with them. I mean, who doesn't like freedom? So, yeah, I think it feeds right into the whole rationale for going to war. You can't answer it.

Q: Just one other observation. As you were going through what's happened over the last six or seven years, there's just one thing after another. Ever single day in the *New York Times*, which is the paper that I read, it's just like here it is again, some new outrage. And after awhile, you become numb to it. What do you do?

Bart Frazier: Well, you try not to become numb, for one thing.

Q: Yeah. You know, people are like, you know, it wouldn't surprise me at all. I mean, somebody asked you about what's going to happen next. I don't know. Cancel the election maybe. Wouldn't be the most outrageous thing.

Bart Frazier: No. Well, speaking of one thing after another coming. One of the games that Jacob and I play at work, we get in at 6:00 and we read the newspapers for about two hours in the morning. And on Monday mornings, it is always his fun game to read me the most depressing news that he can find. So that's our fun. Yes, sir.

Q: Just another comment. We all want to see change. We want people to see the light. I don't think it's going to happen until the government school system is dismantled. Sheldon Richman's wonderful book, *Separating School and State*. It's that simple. It tells you in there what the purpose of the schools is. The purpose is not to educate the children, so we have a populace today of non-critical thinkers. You can't talk to them about constitutional rights. You can't talk to them about the balance of trade. You can't talk to them about what's going on now, because they haven't been trained to think critically.

Bart Frazier: Well, I have to say in terms of public schooling, the most incisive and intelligent children I've come across are home-schooled children. Our compatriot, Scott McPherson, his wife, Charlotte, he's a contributor to *Freedom Daily*. And they actually have their two children here today, Megan and Alexandra. I highly recommend everybody talk to them. Some of the most intelligent children you've ever met, and I don't know that they've ever seen the inside of a public school before. I highly recommend [talking with]them.

Q: To comment further about them hating us for our freedoms, if that was a real rationale, I would think Hong Kong, Switzerland, and Singapore would be in flames, too. At the beginning of your talk, you were mentioning some catch phrases, and I remember most of them. But one, what did you say, spider holes?

Bart Frazier: Spider holes. That's where we found Saddam Hussein when we finally captured him.

Q: Do you think one of the reasons for that nonsensical idea that they hate us because of our freedom was to justify Bush and his gang as they consistently totally dismantle our freedoms?

Bart Frazier: People don't realize that. I mean, you talk to anybody outside this room and they're going to tell you we're free-- we're the freest people in the world. So, again, it gets back to the education. People don't realize that their freedoms are being abridged. Nobody knows, and nobody wants to hear about what's going on in Guantanamo, or in Iraq, or extraordinary renditions. I mean, nobody knows who Jose Padilla is. So, yeah, as far as I am concerned, the Bush administration really has nothing to worry about because nobody's paying attention.

W1: I'm one of those home schooling moms. And as I admitted to Mr. Vance, I have read none of the books by any of the speakers here, because I've been raising kids for the last 16 years. But I do have a foundation in Biblical principle, as well as objectivist theory. And I am well schooled in the Constitution. And so I absolutely know what I believe, and I absolutely know how to define the things I believe in. But as I campaigned for Dr. Paul in California, Oregon, Nevada, Alabama, Tennessee, and Pennsylvania, I found...

Bart Frazier: You've been busy.

W1: Yes. I found something that surprised me actually, and that was that people have no understanding of what natural rights are. They have no understanding of negative rights. They are so busy

trying to feed themselves and clothe themselves and consume things, and they don't have someone paying them to read newspapers and disseminate information for two hours a day, that they don't know what they believe in. So I would encourage everyone when you get in conversations with people, to extract from people their beliefs so that you can educate them on freedom and the Constitution, and the foundational principles that this country is based upon, because the average American really has no idea. So when you said, I'm sure you know who, you've heard these names before when you rattled off your list there of people who had signed the request for an invasion of Iraq, I don't think that I've spoken to anyone outside of this kind of environment who knows of any of those names, including Donald Rumsfeld.

Bart Frazier: Or their Congressmen, or for many people the President. But I think that also gets back to the education question, you know. Most people have been through a public school, and I think everybody in this room has a responsibility to educate the people that they run into on individual rights.