

US Libertarian Party Protests Against Censorship of Iraqi TV

The **Libertarian Party of America**, which has voiced its principled **opposition** to the liberation of Iraq has now protested against the **latest atrocity** committed by the US government:

BAGHDAD (Reuters) – Iraq's domestic state television has gone off the air in Baghdad as US troops advance into the city.

"This disgraceful censorship of free speech cannot be allowed to go unchallenged," stated a Libertarian Party spokesman. "It is typical of this entire war which is an unjustified violation of the sovereignty of the state of Iraq. Libertarian Party policy has always been that states should be revered and respected at all costs. Regardless of how many innocent Iraqis the Iraqi state **slaughters**, regardless of how much terrorism it **sponsors**, regardless of how blatantly it is planning further acts of aggression and regardless of how **bellicose** its rhetoric becomes, it is wrong to take any action against it until a nuclear bomb is detonated in New York with 'This is from Saddam Hussein, may you all rot in hell, Zionist infidels,' written on it in Saddam Hussein's handwriting verified by an international panel of handwriting experts." The US government is said to be 'studying' the statement.

Tue, 04/08/2003 - 15:24 | [digg](#) | [del.icio.us](#) | [permalink](#)

Bad Satire

Was this supposed to be funny?

We can disagree with the position expressed by the Libertarian Party about when US forces should be deployed, but these false quotes should seem hysterical and ridiculous to anybody familiar with the subjects.

by [Gil](#) on Tue, 04/08/2003 - 16:25 | [reply](#)

Bad Satire continued...

I should have added that I meant hysterical and ridiculous in a way that doesn't criticize a real problem with the theories involved in the Libertarian position. I understand that they were intentionally

hysterical and ridiculous. But they make the author seem hysterical and ridiculous, not the Libertarians.

by **Gil** on Tue, 04/08/2003 - 16:38 | [reply](#)

It *is* funny. The bit abo...

It *is* funny.

The bit about the nuclear bomb kinda blows it, imo, but there really are lots of people: "Oh, they kill their own citizens....that's not force.....no NAP violation.....nothing to see here.....weeeeeeeeeeeeeee"

-- Elliot Temple
<http://curi.blogspot.com/>

by **Elliot Temple** on Tue, 04/08/2003 - 17:28 | [reply](#)

No it isn't!

No, there really isn't anybody who says "that's not force". Particularly not a spokesman for the Libertarian Party.

What they (the Libertarians) say is that the US military should only be used to defend the US. This isn't a stupid or immoral position. The extent to which the Iraqi regime posed (I love using the past tense about this!) a threat to the US is controversial. I agree with this campaign, but I can understand why some serious, smart, moral people thought it was a bad idea.

by **Gil** on Tue, 04/08/2003 - 18:13 | [reply](#)

sweatdrop

"the US military should only be used to defend the US"

Because this position is divergent from "the US military should do what is right" it *is* immoral. And people trying to use it to oppose fighting against Iraq *are* stupid (the solution to terrorism is not more people patrolling our borders).

-- Elliot Temple
<http://curi.blogspot.com/>

by **Elliot Temple** on Wed, 04/09/2003 - 02:29 | [reply](#)

Good Satire but lets LP off too lightly

I don't understand the objection to this satire.

The LP harps on about the violation of Iraq's national sovereignty, completely ignoring the effect of this sovereignty on the liberty of the Iraqi people. **The World** satirizes this by saying "Libertarian

Party policy has always been that states should be revered and

respected at all costs." How is that anything other than fair satire?

The LP harps on endlessly in their barrack-room-lawyer way, not about facts or morality, but about whether the US has obeyed legal technicalities or treated different states equally or not. **The World** satirizes this as the LP complaining that the war is disgraceful censorship. That too is a perfectly legitimate use of satire.

"Libertarians say: Saddam has not committed an act of aggression against the United States." **The World** satirizes this as "it is wrong to take any action against it until a nuclear bomb is detonated in New York." Well that's hardly even satire, it is almost exactly what the LP is saying.

And **The World** doesn't even bother to satirize IMO the worst thing in the LP press release, which is the barking moonbat conspiracy theory on which the whole thing is based. "Since Bush has no legitimate reason for waging war on Iraq, he has cobbled together a list of accusations."

I think the LP got off too lightly.

by a reader on Wed, 04/09/2003 - 10:47 | [reply](#)

Right and rights

Elliot,

The Libertarian Party **do** think that their position is moral, obviously. Not everybody agrees about what is right and wrong. They think taking armies abroad is wrong. This doesn't make them complete idiots. Unless you think all but four or five people in the world are total idiots, which is an extremely pessimistic position, which is immoral.

by a reader on Wed, 04/09/2003 - 10:49 | [reply](#)

The LP are idiotarians

Alan Forrester

Sorry Gil, but it's true. So the question becomes if it had been any other idiotarian group would you have objected to the piece above being written about them. If this piece had lampooned the Green Party say would you still be angry?

Oh, and about the reader who thinks that the peice didn't point out the gaping holes in their logic, it was kinda implicit in the links that went with the piece.

by [Alan Forrester](#) on Wed, 04/09/2003 - 13:15 | [reply](#)

Hawks Are Morons (just kidding)

Alan,

While it might give you emotional comfort, it's neither accurate nor

useful to lump the LP along with all other war opponents, call them names, and pretend that their reasons are equally invalid.

I would prefer the the Green Party be lampooned because I think they oppose the war for bad reasons.

I think the LP opposes the war because they consider the policy of limiting the US military actions to those that defend Americans from more direct foreign threats to be wise. This comes from a (well-deserved) distrust of politicians and how they behave when they have power and wide discretion about how to use it. This does not mean that they don't consider liberating Iraq to be a noble, moral project. They just don't think that it's good policy to have the US military do it, now, under these circumstances. I'm sure they'd be quite happy if you created and funded your own institution to pursue projects like this (that limited the use of force to moral causes).

And I don't think it's fair to use the LP's indication that the fact that Iraq is internationally recognized as a sovereign nation is a relevant consideration when complating invasion to accuse them of hypocrisy about reverence for states. It *is* a relevant consideration. I think it's a cheap shot.

Again, *I* have been in favor of this campaign. But that doesn't mean I think everybody who has opposed it has been equally foolish. I recognize that the decision involves a great deal of judgement, and that I might be wrong about it.

by [Gil](#) on Wed, 04/09/2003 - 17:03 | [reply](#)

The LP are badly wrong

The reasons why the LP are better than the greens has nothing to do with their stance on the war. They are right that free markets are better than government intervention and so on while the greens use the fabricated excuse of the environment to push for a government controlled economy. But on this issue I'm not convinced they're really any better than the Greens - they don't have WMDs and anyway they're not going to give them to terrorists and Saddam isn't hostile to the US. You'll note in [this document](#) for example that they simply pay no attention to the wider issue of Islamofascist terrorism. They also attribute far too much good sense to Saddam Hussein. SH's worldview is a cobbled together bunch of crackpot conspiracy theories and any policy that relies on him being sensible is a bad policy, see Kenneth Pollack's book 'The Threatening Storm'. Either the LP are ignoring the truth or they are not doing their research properly. In either case I think they are a driven by a utopian wish to deal with everyone by the medium of free trade, even those who despise the very principle of free trade and would like nothing better than to see it crushed and utterly destroyed, such as SH.

by [Alan Forrester](#) on Wed, 04/09/2003 - 20:21 | [reply](#)

The Idiotarians' big tent

The libertarians quite often are moral people.
It's the the apparatchicks in the Libertarian Party USA
that refuse to acknowledge that their fantasies of
what the world ought to be do not agree with the
world as it exists, full as it is of dangerous mass-murderers
and their followers and supporters.
There is nothing more despicable than the comfortable
deriding the efforts of those whose efforts and
sacrificies keep the peace and freedom of the deriders.

by a reader on Wed, 04/09/2003 - 22:27 | [reply](#)

Despicable

Somebody wrote:

There is nothing more despicable than the comfortable
deriding the efforts of those whose efforts and
sacrificies keep the peace and freedom of the deriders.

What a lack of imagination! There are lots of things more despicable
than that!!!

Here's one:

Attacking anybody who criticizes those who sacrifice in the name of
"Keeping the peace and fredom of the deriders" without reference
to the merits to any actual arguments (or with just some vague
accusation of being unrealistic); as if all sacrifices or military
campaigns are beyond criticism, and anybody who is guilty of being
comfortable should blindly praise them or shut the fuck up.

by [Gil](#) on Thu, 04/10/2003 - 16:35 | [reply](#)

Some Libertarians really are that stupid.

No, there really isn't anybody who says "that's not
force". Particularly not a spokesman for the Libertarian
Party.

What they (the Libertarians) say is that the US military
should only be used to defend the US. This isn't a stupid
or immoral position. The extent to which the Iraqi regime
posed (I love using the past tense about this!) a threat
to the US is controversial. I agree with this campaign,
but I can understand why some serious, smart, moral
people thought it was a bad idea.

At least two people who call themselves Libertarians have told me
that if they had a magic button which they could push to end
Saddam Hussein's regime, they wouldn't push it, because we have
no right to intervene in that sovereign nation. I was surprised to
hear this, because I *thought* that their objection was using the U.S.

military for this purpose, not *any willing U.S. citizens* doing it

themselves.

David Schneider-Joseph

President, **Americans for a Society Free from Age Restrictions**
Chief, **Tewata**

by **DavidSJ** on Sat, 04/12/2003 - 01:34 | [reply](#)

Ok, some Libertarians are that stupid

But I still don't think that's the official position of the Libertarian Party or that of a substantial percentage of its members.

by **Gil** on Sun, 04/13/2003 - 07:54 | [reply](#)

Ok, some are that stupid...

"But I still don't think that's the official position of the Libertarian Party or that of a substantial percentage of its members." - Gil

Speaking as a voting libertarian [since 1983], Gil, it's not the position of a substantial percentage of libertarians. Definately not that of the ones I correspond with. "Official position"? Hmmm... officially, the Libertarian Party does contain a few idiotarians, just as the Democratic and Republican Parties do.

My understanding of libertarian principles encompasses an appreciation that totalitarianism is antithetical to libertarianism, and an awareness that dedication to libertarianism and liberty involves a responsibility to support and encourage liberty wherever it is lacking - else it's only hollow words, not a "principle".

by a reader on Tue, 06/17/2003 - 03:14 | [reply](#)

Whoulps. ;]

Sorry 'bout that - didn't mean to post anonymously. Brief moment of idiotarianism: I missed the create account on the sidebar. Used to blogs where you input usernick/name as you comment. ;]

That was me just above.

Sherman Barnes - Ironbear

by **Ironbear** on Tue, 06/17/2003 - 03:27 | [reply](#)

From a Libertarian

As far as Saddam goes, I for one was against invading because it was under false premiss and by a group who had personal biases and motives in his expulsion. The second reason is that I felt he was of no threat to anyone outside of Iraq, as he was having enough trouble keeping the peace between these rival bands that we now call "insurgents", to keep him bussy for decadedes. He was a very paranoid man, because his nation was falling apart into a multiple party civil war, that only his style of brutal dictatorship

could hold together. His massive killing and rape rooms, produces the Fear necessary to keep Iraq together, and this prevent mass chaos. That nation was a powder Keg, and it's now blowing up all over young american soldiers.

The world as a whole should have sent soliders in on a mission of peace, something like the Natural law party suggesed but less hokey and mystical. Once Iraq was healed from the inside, Saddams fear would have been eased and a less oppressive governement could have basically transcended the need for a sovergn like Saddam, while preserving his honour in the eyes of the people. Thus a sort of representational monarchy could have left the Husseins as respected figure heads, while the people themselves were given more control over the government, without interference from Saddam of the US in Iraq's policy.

As it stands, the US is obviosuly out to take control over Iraq and make it into a co-operative puppet, it has no altruistic motive in seeing the people rule themselves, but instead wants to install Iraq as another handle by which the US can attatch a string and be the puppet master of the world. That is why the "insurgents" are still fighting the US military after Saddam has been captured.

by Froclown on Thu, 11/18/2004 - 07:11 | [reply](#)

Er, what?

Froclown wrote

'As it stands, the US is obviosuly out to take control over Iraq and make it into a co-operative puppet, it has no altruistic motive in seeing the people rule themselves, but instead wants to install Iraq as another handle by which the US can attatch a string and be the puppet master of the world. That is why the "insurgents" are still fighting the US military after Saddam has been captured.'

Do you have an argument for that? Also, you probably ought to read this:

<http://www.settingtheworldtorights.com/node/202>

by [Alan Forrester](#) on Sat, 11/20/2004 - 01:56 | [reply](#)

Proof

I am basing this on much study of how the US has acted in the past as well as the essays and books by such notable persons as Noam Chomsky and Howard Zinn to name a few.

Also, from my personal experince that the US is itself far from a "free democracy". The US is run my all kinds of generally unwritten, moral codes, dress codes, race codes, behavioral codes, thought codes, etc. Failure to obey these codes, leads to social, political and economic alienation. Corporations and "privite" entities can fire anyone for any reason. I recently was fired frommy job, because I was talking about the Church of the Subgenius on my break time. It

is my understanding that absolute freedom and speech, expression and a life which does not restrict one's experiences was granted in the constitution of the United States, it seems this is a lie.

Certain drugs are prohibited from use under the notion that the "class" knows better than individuals and their doctors what substances are good for people. These drugs are obviously restricted because of their association with dissident groups. The class system only allows certain rich families access to the upper echelon of the government, and those are well trained in certain social disciplines. You will never see a Goth or a Punk in the White House, Howard Dean was dropped from the race because he was too enthusiastic. It seems only yuppie rich boys who spent their youth as drunken jocks, who most likely engaged in forceful beatings of other subculture types, are allowed to represent this nation.

With this nation so twisted against the individual and over run with consumerism and for profit bottom lines rather than for promotion of individual happiness and well being, I can only imagine what sort of system they have in store for Iraq. You know that country where all them "brown skin, towel-head sand niggers live, all hooting and plotting the death of mothers, baseball and apple pie, are sitting on all that oil" as the yuppie jocks in the White House call them in private",

by froclown on Sat, 11/20/2004 - 09:04 | [reply](#)

True Freedom

DO WHAT THOU WILT SHALL BE THE WHOLE OF THE LAW.

True freedom means that every individual is given maximum allowance and support to utilize his own mind, body and "soul" to its greatest extent, for the purpose of exploring and experiencing everything that is possible to the individual without restriction or limitation placed on the individual by any outside mandates, Gods, states, organizations or other such ideals.

We are as incarnate beings cast forth into the living world in bodies of flesh, just as an astronaut who awakens in command of a powerful space exploration vessel, we have every right and duty to push that vessel to its limits and explore the universe unhindered by the Goals and Ideals of others.

Man has the right to eat, drink, walk, sculpt, love, fuck, read, say, and in general DO what he or she wills, which is towards the ultimate goal; to push one's own body and mind even to the point of self destruction if he so will. Any and all restriction placed on any individual by any external agency, is a sin against that individual's True Will or "divine plan" if you want to view it in a religious/fate sense.

The US is such an external agency as much as Iraq is, and both must be considered equally as enemies of individual rights and

Liberty as set forth by the Divine/natural law as put forth here, also

known as THELEMA.

ANYONE WHO RESTRICTS THIS RIGHTS OF THE INDIVIDUAL HAS DENIED THESE RIGHT FOR HIMSELF AND HAS SET HIMSELF UP AS THE ENEMY OF LIBERTY, AS SUCH THOSE OVER WHOM THE TRANSGRESSION HAS EFFECTED HAVE EVERY MORAL RIGHT TO KILL, PUNISH, CORRECT OR PARDON THE WRONG DOING AS IS NECESSARY TO THE EXPRESSION OF THE WILL OF THE INDIVIDUAL INVOLVED.

LOVE IS THE LAW, LOVE UNDER WILL.

by Froclown on Sat, 11/20/2004 - 11:15 | [reply](#)

Noam Chomsky, Yawn

Oh, right, Froclown is a Chomsky zombie. Read this:

<http://www.frontpagemag.com/Articles/ReadArticle.asp?ID=1020>

by [Alan Forrester](#) on Wed, 12/01/2004 - 01:50 | [reply](#)

That article is hogwash

I do enjoy hogwash and this article is a great example of it, but I also like truth.

Chomsky is an anarchist, he doesn't not claim that america is the root of all evils, but that as not only a state, but the most powerful State, America is a danger to the world.

All states are dangerous because their existince is dependant on the control and subjection of individuals to the States goals. Those closest to the State, the political and economic elites, benefit on the backs of the common people. Any attempt at cetralized control, is leads to this problem. Certianly leaders like Sadaam and Ossama, are example of this same structure, where some people are used as cannon fodder for others, is the US millitaty any less of a suicide attacker than the terrorists who hit 9-11?

Neither the US as a state not Ossama as a leader, have the interests of Freedom and indivudalism at heart, both use individuals as pawn in their chess game for control over the world. The US seeks economic dominion over the whole world, judeo-christians are seeking religious dominion over the world. The islamics, if they had the power would also seek religious, cultural and econmic rule, however, they have been pushed back for hundereds of years and now only seek to defend what is left of their, culture, religion, economy, from the US.

The US is at war with Islam, and all that it stands for, because they stubbornly hold on to that last tiny remaining piece of power that, which is to say the oil supply. The islamic nations are no different that the US indian reservations. If we found oil or something valuable on one of those reservations, the US would try to pay the

indians, or failing that just take their land again. This would

endanger the native american way of life, their spiritual and traditional culture, and we would probably have native american suicide bombers.

Freedom, can not never co-exist with centralized power. Where there is a State, there is no freedom. Wherever men have dreams bigger than thier personal grasp, they will use fear, lies, signs, symbols, pychological tricks and physical threats to ensure that other are working towards the ends of the state, and benefit of the elite class.

by froclown on Thu, 12/02/2004 - 23:40 | [reply](#)

Copyright © 2007 Setting The World To Rights