



Ron Paul: Record Trailer Trash Support From Crackers & Honkies

Toddy Littman, Thursday 29 December 2011 - 11:24:24

Who would have thunk Ron Paul would go to all this trouble to help the Progressive left

<http://thinkprogress.org/politics/2011/12/27/395391/fact-check-ron-paul-personally-defended-racist-newsletters/> (and warm a NAZI skinhead's heart at the same time), while assuring Obama a second term? If you've made it passed the not-politically-correct-speech this far, please read on to see just how easily Ron Paul is disqualified from ever being able to beat Barack Obama due an apparently not profitable Dr. Paul's need to sell an investment and political newsletter for an annual fee to supplement his income. Please note the article cited in their piece, <http://www.tnr.com/article/politics/98883/ron-paul-incendiary-newsletters-exclusive>, which, I'll make more brief to aid those who just want to get to the meat of the net effect and likely truth regarding Ron Paul: **Ron Paul From His Newsletter -- Regarding Race** 1989 Cited regarding gays, apparently finding the first paragraph with a focus on racism ignorable, <http://www.tnr.com/sites/default/files/December1989.pdf>. I do find the second paragraph exaggerated but accurate to a degree. 1990

May, in visual scanning, I didn't find the citation mentioned in the article, but instead at the bottom, warnings of the coming race war, <http://www.tnr.com/sites/default/files/May1990.pdf>. 1990 October issue of Ron Paul Political Report re: Martin Luther King (highlighted) and disparaging conservative Jack Kemp (unhighlighted below)

http://www.tnr.com/sites/default/files/PR_Oct90_p4.pdf. 1990 re: proudly signing an ad by Jews and Christians against another Mideast war (unhighlighted) and complementing David Duke (highlighted)

http://www.tnr.com/sites/default/files/PR_Nov90_p3.pdf. 1991 re: race riots (un-highlighted) prior to taking credit for discoveries about Martin Luther King claim announced in the Ron Paul newsletter previously (highlighted)

http://www.tnr.com/sites/default/files/PR_Feb91_p7.pdf. **Ron Paul From His Newsletter Regarding Gays** January 1990 This, to me, is an illustration of needless commentary, saying exactly what the article says. The story about Dan Rather that followed was likely set aside due to the rantings in AIDSomania before it, <http://www.tnr.com/sites/default/files/January1990.pdf>. Jan 1994

Ron Paul claims he is citing a New York Times article, though without any reference to date nor the author's name, etc., http://www.tnr.com/sites/default/files/SR_Jan94_p5.pdf. September 1994 Ron Paul Survival Report where he sets forth the circumstances to avoid getting AIDS, claiming it only exists in heterosexuals via a malicious gay, relying on a false sense of security in being a heterosexual, which many people erroneously assumed was the way to be immune from getting AIDS, <http://www.tnr.com/sites/default/files/September1994.pdf>. You will note that Mr. Paul mentions the AIDS conference in Japan, couching the cited paragraph as though it was a conclusion and result of the AIDS conference, of which Mr. Paul fails to give any proof of the admission he claims was made by AIDS scientists at the conference, that they lied about heterosexual cases for financial reasons. Though this could be true, I would need some proof. **Conclusion General Reasons These Disqualify Ron Paul and Impeach his Credibility Entirely: 1) Ron Paul would have to be a complete incompetent to allow these newsletters** to be written in his name over almost a 5 year period of time (if he didn't write them himself to play on people's fears etc., never thinking he'd ever run for President, which I believe may be the case in this matter). **2) The focus and persistent attention to race is an attribute we already have in the White House**, and I do not wish to experience it from an opposing or other racial perspective, nor do we need this to be played upon in 2012 to gin up the Progressive democrat, ignore the Dixiecrat history, base. **3) When you look at the January 1990 article regarding gays, do you see a libertarian** who believes government shouldn't be involved, or an anti-gay person who is making every effort to be involved through his commentary, to use his newsletter as a bully pulpit? I am not gay, nor do I advocate or think such behavior is right, however, I do not believe that holding to AIDS as being only in the gay community, as well as assuming sodomy is merely an act of male homosexuality, is responsible, particularly as a means to share a libertarian statement made by someone else, and, is definitely a sign of the kind of person we do not need in the White House. **4) A Tea Partier**



cannot vote for Ron Paul for this simple reason: it wasn't that long ago that the Tea Party was called racist. The Tea Party, the Constitutional Conservative movement of Founders' Style Patriotic Americans standing up for Individual Liberty, would be crushed. If the Tea Party does not wish to be branded racist as an earned neutralization of their entire political clout that showed itself in 2010, does not wish to have all notions of Sovereignty and Constitutional Conservatism buried under a relentless propaganda campaign of how these relate to the bigotry demonstrated by Ron Paul and by our voting for this man, or bigotry expressed by these newsletters of almost 5 years duration, including a portion of the time when he was a Congressman, then we cannot vote for Ron Paul. Then again, maybe Americans no longer care about the Constitution, Our Founders, Individual Liberty, nor the reality that all men and women are created equal, that by each Individual's use of their unalienable Rights we rise in our respective sphere of talent and capability, some lucrative, some merely a desire to serve irrespective of recompense, some dishonorable/corrupted (as exist in all systems), and will be more likely a larger segment of society in genuine Freedom. Yes, we might actually have to go to the trouble of monitoring our government, assuming it will not take care of itself, and that we must be engaged; engaged to enforce a term limit with our vote; engaged to file any legal action necessary to mandate or prohibit government from acting inconsistent to how we chartered them by Our Written Constitution, enumerating specific, and not general, powers of a compound republic to serve the Citizens of this nation. Our Citizenship is vast today, embracing many more than it did when the nation was founded of many different walks of life by culture, color, religious belief and even by lack thereof. Individual Liberty is expressed in these differences, it is these differences that testify to the value of our God-Given Freedom, and that is the whole point, isn't it? We already have a divisive Socialist in the White House, one who uses the differences to divide the People at every opportunity he can -- to divide the Sovereign, a people whose lives are each enjoyed as they see fit, not as government has corralled them to believe. If we wish another 4 years of Barack Hussein Obama and a completely divided America, please, vote for Ron Paul to be the GOP nominee. Thank you for reading, Toddy Littman P.S. I never thought I'd be posting a link to ThinkProgress. However, if you think this is bad, nominate Paul and watch the left expand this further to say Ron Paul, or whoever he hired and let write letters under his name for 5 years, clearly was writing to his market, to express and infer that it is the American People who are racist, bigoted, etc., and that voting for Ron Paul is voting for what the republicans and conservatives have done to non-whites since the beginning, look at the Indians. Re-run of 2008 all over again. By the way, Glenn Beck might want to take back the endorsement of Ron Paul over Newt Gingrich too, <http://www.mediaite.com/online/glenn-beck-id-vote-for-a-ron-paul-third-party-candidacy-over-newt-gingrich/>.