



THE FUTURE  
— of —  
FREEDOM FOUNDATION

[www.fff.org](http://www.fff.org)

**A Foreign Policy of Freedom**

*by Ron Paul*

*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:** Ron Paul is truly one of those people in life who needs no introduction. As everyone in this room knows, the Republican Congressman from Texas, Ron has absolutely revolutionized American political life, not only with his time in Congress, but especially with this fantastic and exciting presidential race that he's undergone here. Inspiring people from all walks of life, young and old, all career paths, Ron's campaign has succeeded in doing what we've dreamed of in this movement, and that is bringing libertarian ideas to the forefront of American political debate, not just in foreign policy and civil liberties, but things like monetary policies. I mean, when was the last-- the time you'd ever think you'd hear on the mainstream media people debating whether the Fed should be abolished, whether there should be a gold standard, and Ron's campaign, of course, is responsible for that.

He's the author of several books, including *Challenge to Liberty*, *The Case for Gold*, *A Republic If You Can Keep It*, and most recent, is so exciting, this book *The Revolution, A Manifesto*, which is undoubtedly causing all kinds of consternation in Washington among the mainstream press and so forth. And as I'm sure everyone here knows, it was ranked in the top ten on the *New York Times* bestseller list, even reaching the point of number one, and I think most recently it's down to number four.

And it's really exciting to have Ron back. You know, he spoke at last year's conference, which this conference is a follow-up to, and you could sense the rumblings that were starting to take place in his campaign. But it was just sort of getting geared up, and of course we all thought where this is the

rumblings of his supporters and his fans over the years. And little did we know that the rumblings that were going on at that conference were the start of a huge earthquake in American politics. And so it was really exciting when Ron agreed to come back and give us a report on the revolution and let us know what's going on and where we go from here. The title of his talk is "A Foreign Policy of Freedom." Please welcome our hero, Ron Paul.

**Ron Paul:** Thank you very much. Okay. Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you. It's a delight to be here. It's always nice to be among friends. You know, on occasion I give a speech on the House floor; I never get applause like that. So, I know there's a difference. But the truth is, this last year has gained a little bit of attention from other members of the floor. Now, it'd be nice to say, "Well, they're all very interested in our philosophy," but you know what got their attention is what many of you helped do, and that was raise \$6 million in one day. See, money talks over there. And they talk to me, they're friendlier than ever, Republicans and Democrats, and they want me to teach them how to raise money. How do you use the Internet? And they don't have the vaguest idea that it has something to do with the voting record.

There was one day a Congresswoman came up to me, and we were sitting there and she was very, very sincere, and she said, "Oh, I have a lot of your supporters in my district and, you know, I vote the way you do," and all this. And we were in the process of a vote, and the vote up on that screen was like 430 to 1. But she was bragging, and that I had to come to her district and endorse her and help her get reelected, and I didn't have the heart to just say, "You know, maybe there's a reason." I said, you know, just point up and say, "Maybe that's what you're supposed to do on an occasion," but that message didn't quite get through. And they think it's a tactical thing. They think it's a technique.

And let me tell you, we had a great campaign. We did a lot of good things, but we also had some problems and sometimes we were disorganized, but sometimes that was a benefit. You know, it was very laissez-faire. And people did a lot on their own, thank goodness, and it was fantastic. But on the Hill, they think that it's all a technique and a tactic, and how you use the Internet, and how do you rent the list and what do you do and what do you say? And the whole truth is that what happened was, the message got out. You know, our philosophy got out.

The fact that we were able to get on the debates, you know, made a big difference. And then they would go to the website and they would read this and then they would come back and say, "Not only did you say this and we read this and we knew what-- we know what you believe, but then we go and look at your voting record and you actually voted that way." You know, so that was really what helped break us through and get some attention. And so often, even-- I think even this evening already I had one

individual come up and say, "You know, you're the best Congressman that we have on the Hill." And I say, "Yeah, but the competition isn't all that tough." So, someday maybe the competition will be a little tougher and we can brag a little bit more, but I am always careful to talk about our campaign and our message.

And to me it is and it was really true in the campaign: it was a lot of people came together. So many of you in this room spontaneously sent in money, and I had a couple of rules, and one was to have fun, and so many people had fun raising money and spending it, too. I mean, they would get limousines and airplanes and blimps and all kinds of things and they managed, some of them very-- and this really pleased me-- they were able to manage it without even dealing with the FEC. So, that's pretty good. That's a pretty good achievement and within the law of the land, so I was very happy that there was a lot of this spontaneous activity and a lot of strong endorsement.

But you know, as this went on, I met so many people, and we talk to most of them when we go to rallies. And so many young people, and the crowds are always so diverse. And so often when I get a minute I'll ask you, "What is it? What got your attention and what issue were you interested in?" Sometimes it's general, the issue of freedom. Many, many times the young people say, "It's the Constitution and you voted that way." And sometimes it'll be, "It's the Federal Reserve. We've got to get rid of the Federal Reserve." That always pleases me.

But the night that really got my attention-- early on when we had a debate in Michigan I went over, and I was a little late for it because that debate we went over to the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor. And it was a big crowd and a big turnout, and when I brought up the subject of the Federal Reserve, I couldn't believe it: how many people started yelling and cheering, and they all broke out these Federal Reserve notes and started burning them. So, I knew we were making some inroads, this idea. And they-- the young people especially will have me sign bills, sometimes-- mostly ones, but fives or whatever. You know, they're a little cautious. But they always want me to sign, they taught me this. I used to sign anyplace, but they always want me to sign over and cancel out the Federal Reserve seal on the money. So, interesting things have happened.

But the other day I was watching a video and, you know, occasionally there was a video or two on the Internet, and some of them were just fantastic, creative and entertaining and so much music. And I've always assumed that if a group-- and a campaign gets going you will have music and you won't have to buy it. It'll come, and so that-- now that pleased me a whole lot that there was so much music. But the one thing that I was watching the other day was a new one, and it had to do with poking fun at the others for the way they treated me. You know, the laughing and the ridicule, and a lot of people would come up and

ask me, "How do you put up with that?" The truth is, I could hardly ever see it or hear it when I was up there. But they started-- when I looked at this video, you know, there was a lot. But I think that just shows that they don't have too much in their heads, and that's about all they can do is laugh and ridicule because they don't understand and it's so strange to them. They just can't imagine that an individual could represent a group of people like you and get on a national program and just tell the truth, and that's sort of strange.

And you talk about monetary policy: how long has it been since somebody really talked about monetary policy? Monetary policy was one of the issues that got me involved in politics very early on. I was studying Austrian economics in the 1960s, and there were these predictions, and also financial people dealing with that issue. Yup, they break it down to the Bretton Woods [Agreements]: The gold price is going to be released and the value of that dollar is going to go down. And I believed it, but I was waiting, and, of course, August 15, 1971, it occurred, and shortly thereafter I said, "I got to at least talk about this," because I found it fascinating in running for Congress the first time in 1974.

But it wasn't only the announcement in 1971, and the fact that it was a Republican and it was Nixon and it was wage and price controls and tariffs and closing the gold window. It was the reaction the next day that got my attention. It was a Sunday when they made that announcement, and on Monday the Chamber of Commerce came out and fully endorsed it. And the stock market loved it. The stock market at that time went up a total of 34 or 38 points. It was the historic movement of the Dow in one day. And that's probably, like, 300, 600 points or something today. But it went up 38 points-- 34 points or whatever, and so the markets were ecstatic about this-- and the business people were ecstatic. The banks were loving it.

Of course, you know, I thought, "Well, something is strange." I didn't believe that they were right, but I understood that we will not be saved by those people who are involved and have that type of mentality. The one thing I can assure you from this campaign and spending many years in this business is that our country and our market and our dollar will not be saved by big corporations or international financial people. They are very, very rarely our allies. It doesn't mean that every single one of them won't be on our side, but people who are grassroots individuals-- I mean, the support for no income tax and getting rid of the Federal Reserve comes from common people, working people, minorities, all kinds of people that you would think won't-- don't even understand the issue, and yet they do. But to the individuals who have learned to milk the system, it is quite different.

Now, one thing that I think happened in this campaign, I think the attention-getter was foreign policy. I think that was the big issue; I heard that the most. And the great thing about foreign policy is it

invited a lot of different people into our organization. It wasn't just the conservatives, it was across the board independents, liberal Democrats, Green Party people, and whatever.

But you know, one of the most disappointing events, even though we achieved something in spite of it: early on in the campaign, there was a debate being held in Iowa, a crucial state. We wanted to have a presence there and so we were waiting and waiting for the invitation, and all of a sudden we'd call: "Well, no, we don't want you there. You can't come." But to me the strange thing was-- and is-- there's a message in this too, that the debate was being held by a fundamentalist Christian group, right to life group, and I have pretty good credentials in that area-- and an anti-tax group. You know, here I have the best Congressional record against taxes and I strongly respect life, I also respect the Constitution and deal with that maybe in a different way than some might want, but nevertheless, those two groups excluded me from that. So, that is interesting; that describes what kind of problems that we have to deal with.

But you know, they had six or seven hundred people show up to that rally, so we went next door, literally next door, and started our rally, not to disrupt or boycott or anything like that on their rally. As their rally broke up we started ours, and we had 1,200 people show up. So-- but the foreign policy was the issue that so many have come to us about. And I think that this has opened up the door because my position was believable-- it was crystal clear and it was crisp, and they knew what it was.

And as a matter of fact, I sort of like the one that I-- when they tried to have me describe what I wanted to do about Iraq during one of the debates-- and, you know, they all say, "Well, on the one hand we'll do this, on the other hand we'll do this. We'll expand this and we'll alter this. And yes, we'll come home." You know, all that junk. And so my answer for my-- our foreign policy, to make the point, was, "We just marched in, why don't we just march home?" And you'd be surprised how many young people remembered that and would come to me and say, "When you said that, I knew where you stood."

And then another-- several others-- would also mention in the foreign policy area that they sort of had a light bulb go on when I would talk about, and so many of you have talked about and you understand this argument, and that is, you know, why don't we-- what would it be like if we-- somebody else treated us like we treat them? And I use the example, what if another country looked different than us and they were stronger economically and militarily?

It's like the Chinese, and they have a different language, they have different religions, they have different political values, but they might want our oil in the Gulf of Mexico. I said, "What if they came and put bases on-- you know, in our country, how would we react?" Now, that registered with a lot of people, and they could say, "Well, I don't think we would like that." Of course we wouldn't like it, but it would

unify this country and I bet you everybody would believe in the Second Amendment once again, you know, if the Chinese-- if somebody invaded us like that. But it's-- it was a real attention-getter and it has given me tremendous opportunity.

There's a lot in the book about foreign policy. I would say in the '70s, I concentrated much more on economic policy and monetary policy. Ever since —the first day I went to Congress, I've always been on Banking, or what is called now the Financial Services [Committee], and to deal with the monetary issue, and now I'm a ranking member on the Domestic Monetary Policy Subcommittee, and surprisingly enough I get along with Democrats probably a little bit better than I get along with the Republicans. So, I'm in a good position. But one thing that I certainly wouldn't hold my breath for or say is, "You know, as soon as the Republicans take over the Congress, I'll get to be a subcommittee chairman." Not going to happen.

Two reasons it's not going to happen soon: that the Republicans are ever going to take over, and besides, they might change their attitude about me being a ranking member or whatever. But anyway, it gives me a chance. That offer-- that position offers me a little more time when Bernanke comes before the committee, and I'm also on the Joint Economic Committee, and he and the Secretary of the Treasury frequently come before that committee, so that gives me a little more activity.

But after I went back to Congress in '97-- I was out for 12 years-- a lot had happened in foreign policy, and I became much more interested and I asked to be on, you know, International Relations at the time. And they said, "That shouldn't be difficult. Nobody really wants that. You can't raise that much money from that committee." Everybody wants to be on Ways and Means and these committees where you have access to the lobbyists and you get to raise all this money. But they came back to me and said, "You can be on Banking, but you can't be on International Relations."

And I said, "Well, why is that? You told me last week it wouldn't be any problem at all." And they raised-- one of the political action groups that is well known, and I wouldn't dare mention the name, but they have some influence on our foreign policy now and then. And I may mention the name of that country a little bit later on. But anyway, they literally admitted that I was blackballed. But I persisted, and two or four years later I finally did get on that committee. And I certainly took it very seriously because I was there when the resolution came up in 2002 dealing with the authority to go to war.

But before that occurred, something happened in 1998, which is a very important event and generally ignored and not too many people talk about it, and that was the Iraq Liberation Act of 1998. And I found out about it, that it was going to be on the floor very late and it's under suspension.

Suspension, no controversies, the leadership in both parties love it, endorse it, and that's it. But there's a neat little rule that's still on the books that if both parties are trying to railroad something through on suspension, and if you, as an independent-- they protect the minority-- if you as one individual say, "Look, it's only fair that my position in opposition to this, I get time in opposition." So, there was 20 minutes on each side. And so everybody else, of course, was for that, which literally was endorsing the principle that we would get rid of Saddam Hussein-- regime change.

And so I took the 20 minutes in opposition, so I thought that wasn't all that bad. The rest of the Congress had 20 minutes and I had 20 minutes to argue our case. But at that time I said, "You know, this is literally an act of war. I mean, you're preparing to go to war." But that wasn't under Bush; that was under Clinton. And that, you know, proves our point so often that there's not that much difference between the parties when it comes-- oh, there's a difference in who gets the-- who controls the power, but I think sometimes that is a façade just to make us think that we're having competition. You know, but where is the difference between the two candidates now on foreign policy? I mean, they totally ignore domestic policy, do you think one of them has the least question about the Federal Reserve? Do you think that they have the least desire to cut spending enough to get rid of the income tax? I mean, domestic policy, monetary policy, foreign policy, all this is exactly, exactly the same, and yet we so often expect our people to believe that there's a real contest going on between the two parties.

But by the time that march to war came in 19--, in the year 2002, in that one book that I put my speeches together, and somebody says, "Boy, this is a great book. When did you get time to do that?" I said, "Well, that one took me 30 years," because it took the speeches from back to 1976. And yet, in 2002 and in-- between '98 and 2002, I mean, you can look at the record and I was just doing my very best, you know, to try to prevent this because I thought for sure it would come, and surely it did.

So, when it finally came to our committee, I said, "To make a point, I'm going to offer a substitute resolution. I'm not going to vote for it, but this is what you should do if you want to go to war. This is a declaration of war, and this means that we're serious. You're going to explain it. The people need to be behind it. If it's a serious threat, we should all be behind it and fight it and win it and get it over with, but no more political wars. No more Koreas and no more Vietnams and no more persistent intervention willy-nilly any old time a president of either party wants to do it."

And boy, I'll tell you what, there was pretty loud shouting and innuendos there. I mean, the chairman of the committee immediately said, "Ron," and he didn't use my name. And he went, "Congressman Paul, we know you're the champion of the Constitution and all this, but don't you know that part of the Constitution is anachronistic? We don't follow it anymore." And then the Democratic side

said, "Oh, I don't know why you bring this up. This is frivolous to bring this up." And I mean, that is the amount of respect that they have.

But I always wondered whether maybe there was a plan to always-- you know, to go to war because of the political gamesmanship that is played, because I do believe there's some honest desire to have power. But I think the kingmakers, the people up on top, sort of influence both sides. And they said, "You know the kingmakers here, who knows what?" And they wanted to make sure that they had control. And surely they did. So, we had this vote, but I think the motivation behind this is that when things don't go well the opposition can go, you know, and blame the administration. But here it is, the contrivance was with both parties all these years to plan for this and support it and if they really wanted to end the war they could.

The Democrats finally win the election in 19-- or 2006 and it was a mandate in Con-- the House-- the Republicans get thrown out. What's the first act that Pelosi does? There was a supplemental bill that had a bill of ours in it, and we had gotten it put in, and the bill said-- you know, you shouldn't even need a bill like this. It said, "You can't go to war with Iran without getting approval from Congress." You know, something-- and she removed it. She removed it deliberately, and then the astounding thing is they ask her why, and she said the leadership in Israel asked her to. I mean, that is how amazing it is that-- that was in the newspaper and that was in the *Washington Post*, that she was asked by APAC and others not to do that, and yet, you know, we continue this process over and over again. But now things aren't going well and it's still politicized, so you know, Scott McClellan--too bad he didn't see the light a little sooner. But he's seen the light and it can't hurt our side because at least-- even though he's saying everything we've known for a long time, you know, people have lied and cheated and contrived and fudged the records and everything else, and in some ways I think I gave every single person in the CIA a black eye.

And I'm not very happy with the CIA. I don't think that much of that organization, but I know some people who have been in it and they're sincere good Americans and that they get painted and they take that and they change this information and feed it to the Congress and say, "Oh, yeah." So, now the lies are coming out and the Democrats are playing on this, and you know, to me I think it's because this is what they hold in store. But they're not going to prosecute or do anything. This is just all demagoguery. If they were serious, they would immediately remove the funding or do something, you know, to end the war. But it's just a gamesmanship, how to get one up on the opposition to get reelected and throw one group out versus the other. And the American people are saying, "Oh, boy, this is the most important election in our lifetime and if we have Obama instead of McCain or McCain instead of Obama, you know, the world's coming to an end." Well, unfortunately the country's going to come to an end unless we do something.

And now, of course, that's where the good news is. A lot is being done. This year has been fantastic. I mean, it is true-- and I've said this very many times to so many of our rallies, that many have signs and they say that I've removed their apathy. And they've been apathetic, they didn't care, and we've gotten them excited and finally they get interested in politics. And I tell them, I said, "Well, you have removed my skepticism," because I was a skeptic for years. Two, three, four years, strong supporters would come and I figured they were just as dizzy as anybody. "Oh, yeah, you have to run for president." Yeah, sure, I need to run for president, like that's a serious job, running for president. But actually, they worked on me and worked on me, and finally on the-- the final decision was made because I felt so strongly about the war and foreign policy. I thought that was the issue and figured if I did go out there, maybe it could do some good. So, I made that decision to run.

And yet today I come away not being a skeptic. I am so much more encouraged for two reasons, the work that Bumper and the Future of Freedom Foundation and the other good libertarian organizations have done now for 20 years, you are much further along than I ever dreamed. There are more people out there-- the Remnant\* is big and we can't count the Remnant that we know, we know that, but it is big and it's gigantic. And not only that, we have the young people, the young people joining in droves, and it's so delightful to see people coming into the office now.

I have a lot of visitors, and mostly young people bringing their parents. And I always ask him, "Kid," I say, "All right, now, who's the true believer? Who started it? Is it you or is it you?" You know, is it the parent or the kid? It's so often it's the teenager, not even of voting age, and they're totally excited. And you think, "Oh yeah, maybe he saw some musical and liked this video and it's just all superficial stuff." It isn't. They can answer the questions. They know about-- they said-- they'll bring up the subject of money-- monetary policy all the time. They'll say, "How is it that the people in Washington think that they can just print money all the time and not have, you know, its value go down?" And, "Where do they get this authority to have the Federal Reserve?" They go on and on, and really, we get their attention. We get their attention on foreign policy.

This week I had four students come in and they just happened to be Jewish, which always delights me also because, you know, we stereotype too easy and figure that APAC is the only group that can speak for our relationship with Israel, and yet just think of all our many mentors, you know, in this movement. They happen to have that same faith and religious belief. So, I have learned not to do this. One time I had, oh, probably about 16 Jewish students in and a very conservative Jewish group. And they were very delightful and I spent about 45 minutes with them and laid it on the line exactly what our policy would be, friendship and trade but no support and no weapons and, you know, the whole works. And it pleased me so much because it's the first time I ever talked to a group of students in my office that when we got up to

leave they applauded. And you know, free students in your office don't get up and applaud, so this is-- I mean, this foreign policy, it's open. It's failing, so people are looking at this.

And we do reach the minorities: the Hispanics and the blacks, they don't like this war, they always suffer more. And I talk to these young people and talk about the coming-- possible coming of the draft, and even today, what happened today? Has anybody had enough time to watch the markets today? Well, I think Lew was talking-- his speech was on the value of the dollar related to foreign policy, and today it was a pretty good example.

So, they opened up this morning, and I think gold was down, as usual, five bucks or so, and the dollar was up a little bit and the market's pre-opening was sort of flat and then some bad statistics come out. The market went down. But then there was an announcement by, you know, a high official in Israel that flat out said, "It looks like it's going to be necessary for us to bomb Iran." Very, very clear hostile declaration, and that started it off. The dollar reversed. It was down significantly. Gold was up \$25.00. The market, last time I looked, was down 300 points and foreign policy-- I don't know if anybody remembers this, but in the debates, Tim Russert was in charge of one of the debates and he sort of made an announcement at the beginning, and he said, "Now," he says, "foreign policy has been the top issue, but now it has changed. They finally figured out there was a recession going on." I remember in Michigan I was the one-- they were always saying none of the Republicans could blame-- say that the economy was weak, because that would be the Republicans' fault because it's the administration. So, he said, "Now, it's the economy, it's not foreign policy that is the important issue." But later on I got my chance to sort of dig at him a little bit. I said, "You can't talk about economy-- the economy without talking about foreign policy. I mean, they're connected."

And that, of course, reminded me of what motivated me to get involved in politics, and that was the guns and butter of the '60s, me being drafted in 1962, spending eventually five years in the Air Force active duty and on reserve duty. But guns and butter, the introduction of the Medicaid system, massive increase in expenditures here at home and never holding back on the military industrial complex, and said, "Don't sweat it. We can handle it." And you know, that was what led to the breakdown of Bretton Woods and that led to stagflation, a serious decade that we have. And we're doing the same thing again but probably worse.

You know, not as many of our men are being killed, but we have so many tragic injuries and sickness of hundreds of thousands. Our Veterans' Hospitals are flooded and so many people waiting for care, suicide rates higher than ever, our troops spread around the world. Our mor-- the morale is down, and now we have to pay for the guns and butter, but this time we're much poorer. We are in big debt,

bigger debt than ever before--what we owe foreigners, our national debt, the entitlement obligation, and this is one of the issues that I could get young people to look at carefully. You're getting stuck with a war and you're getting stuck with a lot of debt and a bad economy.

And no matter where I went on the campuses, I said, "We can get ourselves out of this." And I believe we can. I'm not optimistic we will shortly, but we could. And that is to take upon ourselves the whole principle of the foreign policy of interventionism. One trillion dollars we spend a year to maintain over 700 bases in 130 countries, and there's room there. And I argue, not exactly the perfect libertarian position, but I argue, "Don't cut medical care. Don't cut any benefits here, at home. Quit blowing up bridges in Iraq and rebuilding bridges in Iraq. Build bridges here at home before you do that." And they-- I said, "You can save this money and young people, we ought to offer you a chance to get out of the system. Take care of your medical benefits and get out of social security." They understand it and they know that they'll do it.

And young people were very receptive to the idea of self-reliance and making their own decisions. And when I talk to them about making their own decisions about their personal life and how did it ever come that we have allowed our government to deal with our personal lives, what we ingest in our bodies, our drugs and food and everything else, and at the same time we still, to a degree, allow most of us to ingest what we put into our brain and into our soul. But all of a sudden somewhere along the way we decided that the government is going to tell you what to do with your life and what to do with your money.

And they responded very well to the whole idea that we need to put freedom back together again. We need to take that group of people who think they're better on defending economic liberty and even those who claim they aren't very good and others who say, "Yes, I'll defend personal liberty and personal social choices." And this is one issue, this is one thing, because you have a natural God-given right to your life and to your liberty, and it's up to you how to spend your life and you have a right to spend the money, the fruits of your labor, and it's up to you. And the young people are responding.

The biggest challenge our movement has today between now and the election is whether or not we can peel off some of that youth support for Obama, because he has the same appeal, something new and different, but no specifics, no specifics whatsoever. And of course, that lack of specifics that he has will never be pointed out by McCain because he endorses everything, you know, that Obama supports. It's just a matter of phrasing it and who's going to get the power and all that. So, as I say, there's reason to be optimistic. There is so much enthusiasm there. The work has been done. The Remnant is larger, but the

young people are joining. And so instead of being discouraged, what we need to do is be really encouraged.

Some people say, "Well yeah, you should be encouraged and you should still be doing this and you should still be running on third party and all that." Nope, it's something else. There's going to be other things. We're going to have a grand rally and a celebration on what we did on September 2 up in Minneapolis, and we're not going to crash their party, but we may well have a bigger party than they had up there. So, you know, we can creep along. There'll be a few of us in hundreds and maybe thousands, but now we have millions. We literally have millions. In this primary, we got people in the roughest primary you could talk about to take on the warmongers and have people vote in a Republican primary and get essentially 1.2 million voters to commit in a Republican primary. But I'm convinced also that for everyone there, there are two or three or four. If we have one solid million there, we may have three. And like I said, we all know we can't count them, but we might have three or four or five million people out there.

And when I go through the airports, let me tell you, they don't look like Republicans. They are bag hops, and at one time-- I've never had my shoes shined at the airport, but now the shoeshine guys are always waving to me and cheering me on. But the other one that is so strange, and I feel guilty about this, and that is because I don't like-- I voted against the TSA, you know. And-- but you know what, there are people-- it's sort of like if we can criticize the CIA but there are some good people in the CIA, and so yet the TSA, I go through there-- I can't imagine. So many of them would come up, "Wow, I really love what you're doing." So, they're people and they took a job, so, I mean, the field is wide open and it's big, and if we can go from hundreds of thousands of individuals who knew about it to others who knew about it and said nothing and didn't know there were other people, to the point now where we literally have millions, we just have to keep this momentum going and I'm going to do my best.

People say, "What are you going to do?" Well, I do what I have to do. And other people in the audience say, "Well, what should I do?" Well, do what you have to do. Bumper does what he has to do. Bumper does what he has to do and our meet-up groups are going to continue and our Facebook and they're all going to continue, but they will not be talked down. There will be no marching orders other than the fact of trying to bring together those with the same viewpoints. We're coming together for the defense of liberty, which means, you know, a sound economy and sound money, personal liberty, and very importantly, a foreign policy that makes a lot of sense, it would make this world a lot more peaceful. Thank you very much.

Q: We have about 10 minutes for questions. So, if you would, does anybody have any questions right now?

Q: You know, Congressman, I'm interested in what happened to Rudy Giuliani, and some people say that he didn't campaign when he should have, but I think it has something to do with the debate that you challenged him to on 9/11 and he failed to respond to, and I'm wondering if you can comment on that?

**Ron Paul:** Well, I don't know. That might have had a little bit to do with it. I don't think that was it. I think he just didn't have the votes. But, you know, he was rather challenging in one of the debates and that was one of those moments of ridicule that took me a few minutes-- took me about five minutes later, and I remember my staff came up and said, "You're winning the postdebate polls," so, it didn't turn out so bad. But you know, and I talk about the mayor on occasion, I said, "You know, he was a front runner, for what? For six months." Well, it turned out that we had probably four or five times more votes in the primary than he got. And also he has debt. He's paying off debt right now. And I'll bet his T-shirts aren't selling all that well, either.

Q: Yes, you mentioned the word change, and when I bought your book, I mean, that was the question I have, I mean, we've been hearing change from Obama. If you could confront Mr. Obama tomorrow, how would you pin him down when he uses that word, change?

**Ron Paul:** Well, I probably wouldn't do it directly as much as I would go to his supporters, if I was addressing supporters in the audience-- that change means nothing. It's just a word and it's a cliché and just to repeat it has no meaning. You have to say, "What are you going to change?" And I would argue, "You offer no change. You have the same foreign policy. You want more troops in Afghanistan. You're not talking about only going to war with a declaration. You don't want to deal with the monetary financial crises in this country. You want to keep the system together for the benefit of the banks and the big corporations and the politicians," you know, that argument. "And what kind of change do you have on social policy? Do you care about sick people using marijuana? I mean, have you come out for that?" You know, and I would just hit them hard on the fact that he doesn't want change. He wants the status quo. And just saying it means nothing, but he has a lot of supporters.

And the one time I was asked about-- to comment about him I actually tried to be, you know, fairly soft on him but concluded that we have a lot of differences. But I tried to acknowledge that his supporters and my supporters have a lot of overlap, and they do. So, in declaring what I just said, I think it has to be done in somewhat of a diplomatic manner and then to appeal to reason and say, "Look, if you want change, what you need is somebody that's going to make sure you're never going to have a draft and that we're going to be-- bring our troops home. We're going to balance the budget. We're going to have sound money." He never talks about any of that.

Q: Maybe you could convert him.

**Ron Paul:** Well no, he'll be-- he probably doesn't have real solid beliefs. He'll be converted when we convert his young people. That's what will convert him. The politicians in Washington don't have much philosophy, probably never will. But that's all right. That's why we have a chance by converting people's hearts and minds, and that's where we have made our progress.

Q: Hey Dr. Paul, I was wondering if you could comment on your reception internationally, especially in the Arabic world?

**Ron Paul:** A little closer and a lot—

Q: Oh sorry, I was wondering if you could comment on your reception internationally, especially in the Arabic world.

**Ron Paul:** Especially where?

Q: In the Arab world.

**Ron Paul:** Arab?

Q: Yeah.

**Ron Paul:** There may be some people who are on the Internet more than I am, might even have better, more positive answers. All I think is it's been very good. And indirectly I know it's pretty good because I guess there were a lot of groups around the world. I got an invitation just recently from a group that wanted me to do a tour of Eastern Europe, and because there was a group of meet-up groups, and will you come and make six or seven stops in Eastern Europe. I mean, what's going on? You know, and in the middle-- no, I guess right before this campaign started-- you know, I don't travel much because one thing is I don't do junkets and I don't like airplanes for 15 hours either. But when I had the invitation to go over to Prague to celebrate the translation of *Human Action* into Czech, you know, I went there. And, of course, Klaus, the president there, was on the podium as well. So, things are happening in Eastern Europe and around the world.

And I've seen some very good things in-- the Arab community here has been-- and the Muslim community here in this country has spoken out strongly for me. I don't know, maybe others would know

more details about exactly what's going on in the Arab countries. But I do know, back to the issue of Israel, I think we had a meet-up group in Israel, too. And to me that's always so sad because here we're not allowed to say some things, but even in Israel they allow a little bit of debate. You know, liberals are allowed to say, but not here. You know, you don't say anything. But maybe J Street will help us on that, you know, to balance that argument. But the whole thing is, our argument on that is absolutely right. We don't discriminate against anybody and we don't want to discriminate against our people, and that is we treat everybody the same way as we treat our people here at home, by giving them national defense but not getting ourselves into wars that we don't need.

Q: We have time for one more question.

**Ron Paul:** Okay.

Q: Dr. Paul, just a very simple question: how do we get 535 Dr. Pauls in Congress?

**Ron Paul:** Well, you're not going to. You know what would make me ecstatic is if we had three or four. But we could turn-- we could really have an impact. Just like I told you about the time that I took the 20 minutes and I was alert to what was happening on the Iraqi Liberation Act, but if we had three or four of us, we could sit down there on days of suspensions and all the junk that they bring up that they don't fully debate. And then I get over there and I look at it and, you know, it's always sounding good, but the last line says, "Well, if you don't do what we tell you, we're going to bomb you." You know, that kind of stuff.

So no, I think to get more people in Congress, I mean, I think the time is right for more people running. And this is one outcome that was never planned, never thought of: the precinct organizations are blooming and growing. The meet-up groups are there and they're deciding who they're going to support, and I think that's going to continue. Whether it will get you a bunch this year, I don't know. But I think we're a lot further along now than we have been in a long time. People are noticing us, and, like I pointed out, it's not the typical Republican, it's across the board.

I was entertained yesterday. I was talking to John Conyers. I don't think he has a Republican district, you know, like the inner city of Michi-- of Detroit or something like that. He came up to me, and he was-- and I've known him since when I was in before 20 years or so. We probably haven't said anything-- he probably didn't know my name before a year ago. But he comes up and he's been talking to me, he came over and he was chatting with me, and he says, "Ron," he says, "I don't know what's going

on. You have more darn signs in my district than anybody.” And-- but he followed up, he says, “It’s almost like a movement.” Join the movement. Thank you.

---

\*For more on the Remnant (“the ones who will come back and build up a new society”), see Albert Jay Nock’s essay “Isaiah’s Job” at <http://www.lewrockwell.com/orig3/nock3b.html>.