

The Most Dangerous Man on Earth...

George W. Bush

Our modestly gifted, saber rattling, uncompromising, idealistic Texas oilman cowboy leader must exit before he irreversibly endangers us all.

Step-by-step he is constructing a pathway leading us to the greatest period of economic and geo-political risk in the history of our Republic. A man of limited intellectual depth, and blind faith in altruistic principles is at the helm of the most powerful military nation on earth. If there was ever a time to surface a leader willing to “fall on the sword” and shake the morass of leaches, and return to the principles that shaped the foundation of our Republic, now is the time.

Ordinarily, marginal intellect might even be a positive trait in the leader of a free country to minimize legislation enacted in response to the endless voter cries for government intervention into our daily lives. Logically, the more inept the leader, the less growth and associated intervention a government might impose upon its people.

Aside from the unfortunate unbridled growth of government, the greatest risk by far is the George Bush philosophical presumption that others should seek our way of life, along with his willingness to use military power to achieve that end.

How could future judgment of history ever forgive an aggressor nation conducting a preemptive attack on another sovereign nation without investing every means possible to avoid crossing a threshold impossible to reverse?

The world of public opinion as well as common sense would support a measured response to an unprovoked attack. The logic of entry into Afghanistan was sound. The logic of entry in Iraq was not.

Who are we to judge that an oppressive dictatorship is not an appropriate fit for a nation at this time? We can identify a disturbing common thread of violence, disparate wealth distribution, extraordinary levels of poverty, and extreme unemployment in countries led by oppressive regimes, but a democracy imposed upon a nation with sectarian divisions would only further empower the majority sect and embolden them to increase violence attempting to impose their values onto the less popular sect(s). Worse, it would be accomplished under the cloak of a democratic regime. A dictatorship might be the best interim fit for a nation that might eventually gain grass roots exposure via advanced communications technology to a better more peaceful way of life. It is the principles of freedom, property rights, rule of law, and capitalism that should infiltrate the grass roots of a nation before democracy. Democracy should then follow to uphold the principles, not dilute them.

Just remember, there is only one nation on earth who has ever used atomic weaponry intended for the destruction of others. How will other civilized nations view the risks of

an aggressor nation seemingly unafraid to provoke anger and eager to unconditionally exert military power in pursuit of controlling scarce resources (esp. oil)? Unfortunately, our democratic process today has eroded to electing puppets who must make promises that generally move us further away from the principles of freedom that our founding fathers risked everything to establish. This promise-happy mode inevitably spreads to free markets inviting disruptive intervention. We have even evolved to a point where the average Joe-citizen believes government is responsible to cap gas prices at a level that supports Joe's chosen lifestyle regardless of market or geo-political realities.

Wouldn't you be working on re-armament to protect your own interests in case an aggressor nation decided to target you or prevent you from being able to contract scarce resources (oil, natural gas, gold, etc.) in a quasi-free market?

By Russell Randall

12-18-2006

www.austrianenginomics.com (author's Website Home Page)