
Subject: Bill Maher & Ron Paul

Posted by [FredT](#) on Mon, 28 May 2007 12:25:07 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I had to laugh about this one. Maher, in my opinion, is a lunatic liberal who believes the government should replace private business in solving our major social problems. Apparently he hasn't noticed how well Socialism works in Europe. Presidential candidate Ron Paul is a Libertarian (disguised as a Republican so he could get elected as a congressman) who believes government is inherently inefficient at solving problems, and we should let the free market determine our direction (hope I got that right, that's my understanding of the core value of Libertarianism). In this interview they were AGREEING strongly about American foreign policy: Our foreign policy, they agree, is the cause of many of the problems in the world, and America should just butt out and let other countries run themselves, even if we don't agree with them. Paul pointed out a key reason we are having so many problems in the Arab world is because, in the past, we have supported such characters as the Shah of Iran, Osama Bin Ladin, and Saddam Hussein. Each time we did this it was believed necessary to maintain a power balance in the Middle East (and to protect our business interests and energy supplies), but it backfired every time. He said the CIA has a term to describe this: it's the "blowback effect". Now I doubt either of these polar opposites is naive enough to believe all the terrorists would stop hating us and begin to love and respect us if we butted out of the Middle East. Bin Ladin and his bunch will stop targeting the US only when we become an Islamic theocracy under Sharia law. I agree many obese American women would look better in a Burka than a bikini, but that's not a good reason to adopt Muslim law:) (Linda will pummel me about the head and shoulders when she returns from London and reads this sexist statement). But I do believe they raise a valid point: Every time we support a war or engage in one, even if we achieve the intended objective of removing a bad guy from power, in the process we kill thousands of Muslims, making it much easier for the radical Islamists to recruit young people who are willing to sacrifice their lives in a terror bombing. Currently there probably are a few thousand people who are ready and trained to be suicide bombers, hundreds of thousands who could easily be recruited because of the widespread hatred of America, and millions who wouldn't become terrorists but support terrorism even if it includes the killing of innocents. It's those millions who scare me the most. They also discussed the Republican Party, and Paul simply said it has abandoned the conservative philosophy and has lost its way with huge amounts of deficit spending and programs that violate our constitutional rights and threaten our freedom. It's not uncommon for a sound tactical decision to have the reverse effect in the strategic arena. Big corporations make this mistake regularly, but I would hope our politicians could see this and not make Bin Ladin's job so easy.

Ron Paul

Subject: Re: Bill Maher & Ron Paul

Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Tue, 29 May 2007 21:29:52 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

One of the main Libertarian positions is non-interventionism, so it isn't really surprising that a Libertarian would side with a Democrat on anti-war issues. The thing is, non-interventionism has

its limits, and its hard to know where that limit is until the country is attacked or invaded outright. I think that must be one of the dilemmas of the non-interventionist: How far is too far? Personally, I agree with most Libertarian views and with non-interventionism in general. However, I think nations with Muslim theocracies are especially dangerous and should be watched carefully. Once they've become aggressive, or contain internal organizations that have become aggressive without strict control by the Muslim nations where they reside, I would consider that to be "the limit" and would oppose them with the strongest military might available. I would feel the same way about any other aggressive governments or organizations, be they fascist, socialist, theocratic, monarch, republic or democracy.

Subject: Some reasons why US foreign policy may not be the best

Posted by [akhilesh](#) on Tue, 05 Jun 2007 13:05:27 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I agree, Wayne. Bill MAher is a male Rosie O'Donell and not worth responding to. But I think RON Paul raised a good point: the US foreign policy has not been the best in terms of spreading democracy...instead we have propped dictators wherever we have gone. Most countries that have become friends of ours have totalitarian governments. The nations that are doing well (China, India, Europe) are those that have kept a healthy distance away and tried to build their own economies. Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Nicaragua...one can think of many examples where close friendship with US policy makers led to economic and political basket case syndrome. Now the question is: why is that? After all, the American people are the best meaning people on the planet, and individually, we do more good to each other and to others than anyone else. The reason I think is very simple. Our policy makers have a very naive attitude about other cultures, and the US is very powerful. Think about the average upper middle class kid who goes to an Ivy LEague Univ, and then heads off to DC to work on US policy. Some of these kids go to other countries, and are told what the US interests are: usually oil or prevention of communist expansion). When they reach these other countries, living conditions are so bad, and the culture is so impenetrable, that often they will latch onto the few friends they see therealas often these "friends" are just using the power of the US to get their own ends. THE US is so powerful, that these "friends" then take over power in these countries, and then continue to help the US while at the same time bleeding their populace dry. This is why "our friends" the SAudi Royal Family are so disliked in their own countries, and why Musharraf is a dictator, and so on and so forth. To summarize, it is a combination of lots of power and the temptation to take the easy way out that has led to our foreign policy being so unpopular amongst the poor & downtrodden in other countries. Now, in Iraq, initially, when the US went in, they were misled by their "friends" who were anti Saddam and power hungry themselves. These "friends" talked about WMDs, etc and Saddam;s irrationality didn;t help either. Now that we are in there, everyone is screaming we need to get out. Actually, for the first time, I see us engaging at a local level in another country. WE have a good understanding of who the good guys & the bad guys are, and are engaging in politics at a local level, and trying to help. Will we be successful? Only if we understand that every culture is different. Naively hoping that Iraq will become a democracy is silly, but I think our current executive branch is past that now (Mr. Bush has had a few very painful foreign culture lessons over the last few years, which is ironic given he was one of the most insular presidents we have had in a long time). While it is messy, I hope this low level involvement with multiple players in IRAq will lead to a more

stable Iraq. Just my ramblings....back to work.
