

Government Bullies: How Everyday Americans Are Being Harassed, Abused, and Imprisoned by the Feds Study Guide

Government Bullies: How Everyday Americans Are Being Harassed, Abused, and Imprisoned by the Feds by Ron Paul#Family

The following sections of this BookRags Literature Study Guide is offprint from Gale's For Students Series: Presenting Analysis, Context, and Criticism on Commonly Studied Works: Introduction, Author Biography, Plot Summary, Characters, Themes, Style, Historical Context, Critical Overview, Criticism and Critical Essays, Media Adaptations, Topics for Further Study, Compare & Contrast, What Do I Read Next?, For Further Study, and Sources.

(c)1998-2002; (c)2002 by Gale. Gale is an imprint of The Gale Group, Inc., a division of Thomson Learning, Inc. Gale and Design and Thomson Learning are trademarks used herein under license.

The following sections, if they exist, are offprint from Beacham's Encyclopedia of Popular Fiction: "Social Concerns", "Thematic Overview", "Techniques", "Literary Precedents", "Key Questions", "Related Titles", "Adaptations", "Related Web Sites". (c)1994-2005, by Walton Beacham.

The following sections, if they exist, are offprint from Beacham's Guide to Literature for Young Adults: "About the Author", "Overview", "Setting", "Literary Qualities", "Social Sensitivity", "Topics for Discussion", "Ideas for Reports and Papers". (c)1994-2005, by Walton Beacham.

All other sections in this Literature Study Guide are owned and copyrighted by BookRags, Inc.



Contents

[Government Bullies: How Everyday Americans Are Being Harassed, Abused, and Imprisoned by the Feds Study Guide.....](#) 1

[Contents.....](#) 2

[Plot Summary.....](#) 3

[Foreword and Introduction.....](#) 4

[Chapter 1 and Chapter 2.....](#) 5

[Chapter 3 and Chapter 4.....](#) 6

[Chapter 5 and Chapter 6.....](#) 7

[Chapter 7.....](#) 9

[Chapter 8 and Chapter 9.....](#) 10

[Chapter 10 and Chapter 11.....](#) 12

[Chapter 12.....](#) 14

[Chapter 13 and Chapter 14.....](#) 15

[Chapter 15 and Chapter 16.....](#) 16

[Chapter 17 and Chapter 18.....](#) 18

[Chapter 19 - Chapter 20.....](#) 19

[Chapter 21 and Conclusion.....](#) 20

[Characters.....](#) 21

[Objects/Places.....](#) 26

[Themes.....](#) 28

[Style.....](#) 31

[Quotes.....](#) 33

[Topics for Discussion.....](#) 35



Plot Summary

"Government Bullies" by Senator Rand Paul is a non fiction book about the overgrowth of our government programs, and the horror stories of government agencies who have gone out of control. The EPA, the Lacey Act, the TSA, PDA, and USDA, among others, are criticized for their handling of several cases, and for their virtual attack on U.S. citizens and their freedoms. Rand then presents ways in which citizens can fight back against such bullying tactics.

In "Government Bullies" by Senator Rand Paul, a variety of governmental agencies, designed to protect U.S. citizens, are attacked as a result of their bullying tactics against regular, law abiding citizens. The Environmental Protection Agency is examined, and Paul shows that, as a result of badly worded guidelines and laws, homeowners are unknowingly being trapped into violating "wetland" property laws. Its punishments far outweigh the actual crimes, with some unknowing citizens receiving years in prison for merely moving soil from one part of their land to another. The EPA is also criticized for it's overuse of the Lacey Act, which claims to help conservation efforts. In reality, the Lacey Act, again due to vague and nonspecific wording, is used to imprison simple fisherman for packaging products in the wrong materials. The TSA is also examined, as Rand puts forth the idea that the Transportation Security Administration violates our privacy and our rights daily as a matter of course thought illegal searches and scanning. Rand promotes strongly the idea of ousting this group, and replacing them with private security firms. He also advocates pulling foreign aid to any country that detains or holds US citizens. Finally, Rand denounces the FDA and the USDA for punishing people for thinks like choosing to buy and drink raw milk. He points out that these agencies, originally designed to protect consumers, now dictates them, diminishing or eliminating their choices.

Throughout the book, Rand makes it clear that his goal is to stop these government agencies from getting even bigger, and to help restore American citizen's ability to make decisions for themselves, without the overreaching arm of government. He points to many legislative bills he himself has pushed forward in an effort to limit these governmental groups, and challenges citizens to take their freedom back from unelected officials that grossly overuse their power. He reminds readers that the foundation of the United States is freedom, and that to give that up is to essentially give up the country. Rand's book, while at times self promoting, does provide some unbelievable examples of government gone astray, and does serve as a call to action.



Foreword and Introduction

Foreword and Introduction Summary and Analysis

"Government Bullies" is a novel by Rand Paul about over zealous government agencies, and the need for those agencies to be reined in. It is a biased book, but one that does introduce a number of concepts that are interesting, and possible to research to discover the truth.

In the Foreword by Ron Paul, Rand's father, Ron discusses many of the topics to be covered in the book. He discusses the abuses of government to the American citizens, and reminds readers that their freedoms are not to be sold for the mere image of safety. He discusses his own district in Texas, showing how his people, too, suffer at the hands of government officials. He urges Congress to do something about the EPA and TSA, explaining to readers how he and Rand have both introduced bills to stop these organizations. He is particularly strong against the TSA, claiming they give no real security, but merely a veil of false security while all the while removing American freedoms. He also argues against the FDA and USDA, particularly in regard to the rules against consumption and sale of unpasteurized milk. He points to a speech he gave, requesting that the people of the US be given back control over their own health. Finally, he points to Rand as a leading voice in the fight against tyrannical government agencies, and urges readers to fight back.

In the "Introduction", Rand Paul reiterates his father's statements from the Foreword, but adds his own concerns to the mix. He too mentions the small ways the US government controls the everyday life of citizens. He bashes Congress for abandoning their role as protectors of the US Constitution, and compares modern reality to the 1985 movie "Brazil". Rand warns about the stories in the book, as they are shocking and somewhat frightening examples of governmental power. He opens an attack on the definition of wetlands by the EPA, but he also defends his bias by noting he is for composting, environmental agencies, and conservation. He admits most governmental acts begin with good intentions, but are merely mismanaged. He also accuses his opponents of using emotion and distortions of truth to confuse issues, and of hastily taking action to quickly respond to emergencies to the detriment of true, long term solutions. He defends against comments that he cares little for environmental issues by noting his own efforts toward conservation. After discussing his own bad experience with the TSA, he closes by urging the readers to continue to fight back against tyrannical government agencies.



Chapter 1 and Chapter 2

Chapter 1 and Chapter 2 Summary and Analysis

In Chapter One, Rand introduces the history of the EPA, or Environmental Protection Agency, and explains the many reasons he believes they are doing more harm than good, including their massive budget, abusive regulations, and vague definitions that result in criminal offenses, such as their vague definition of "wetland". Rand discusses this portion of the Clean Water Act in detail to explain how this vague term causes problems for landowners. He introduces cases he will cover in detail in later chapters, those of John Pozsgai, who was fined over \$200,000 for moving topsoil on his own land, and John Rapanos, who was prosecuted for polluting wetlands, even though his land was twenty miles from any navigable waterway. The Sacketts won their case, but only after fighting all the way to the Supreme Court. Rand also mentions those companies who help EPA targeted individuals, such as the Pacific Legal Foundation. He also notes his own efforts to solve the problem, such as his introduction of the REINS Act, which would force any regulation over \$100 million to be voted on by Congress, and the Defense of the Environment and Property Act, which would define the term "wetland" and other EPA terms.

Chapter Two tells the tale of the fight between the EPA and John Pozsgai. Pozsgai, born in Hungary, fought communism, and escaped to the United States. In 1986, Pozsgai purchased a dump on which to build a large shop. He cleared off the debris, but was soon arrested by armed guards on his property, even though he had the permits needed to build. The EPA claimed he was in violation of the Clean Water Act because he used fill on his property, thereby discharging pollutants into the waters, even though they themselves admitted the fill used was clean dirt and sand. The EPA did not have the property on the national wetland list, and the "navigable" waters they spoke of were a drainage ditch. The "wetland" was a flood site originally caused by debris of tires in the drainage area that Pozsgai cleared out. Despite all this, Pozsgai was fined \$202,000, and sentenced to three years in prison, a punishment more harsh than even those involved in the Exxon oil spill received. The EPA also forced holes to be dug on the land, which blocked the drainage from the site, thereby creating their "wetland". The EPA continued to harass Pozsgai, even after his release, and Rand notes his goal is to stop such cases from ever occurring.



Chapter 3 and Chapter 4

Chapter 3 and Chapter 4 Summary and Analysis

In Chapter 3, Rand tells the story of Mike and Chantell Sackett, a couple who dreamed of owning a home on Priest Lake. After receiving the needed permits, they began moving gravel onto the site, only to be told by the EPA they were destroying "wetlands", even though their land was bordered by existing homes on all sides, and was not attached to a waterway. After pushing for answers, they were fined \$75,000 a day, told to restore the site to its original state, plant non-native "wetland" plants, fence the area, and not to build for five years. The Sacketts pressed, and found that no agency had their site listed as a wetland, but the EPA continued to demand they obtain a \$200,000 wetland building permit. They requested a hearing, which the EPA refused. They filed suit, arguing that they were entitled to a hearing, but the lower courts rejected the claim, noting that the EPA was designed to be able to immediately halt actions harmful to the environment without a hearing. Rand denounces this and other governmental actions and excuses, but notes that the Sacketts were able to get the Supreme Court to hear their case. The justices were clear that they were against such governmental tyranny, and chastised the EPA severely. Rand finds this ruling promising, but points out more work needs to be done.

Chapter 4 tells the story of Robbie Wrigley and her father, Robert. A normal, all-American family who worked for many years as land developers, these individuals were persecuted and imprisoned by the EPA. The family was working with a 2,600 acre subdivision, when their engineer, M.E. Thompson, suddenly had 100 of his septic licenses revoked. He had them reinstated, but the overseer was angry, and thus went to the EPA. The EPA claimed Wrigley did not obtain an EPA septic permit, but Rand points out no such permit has ever been issued in the United States. The Wrigley's, Thompson, and two other companies were prosecuted for "conspiring" to violate the Clean Water Act. They weren't ever found in violation of the act, but merely to conspire to violate it. They fought against the ruling, but the court was, according to Rand, biased against them, and found them guilty of conspiracy. Robbie, a mere secretary for her father, was sentenced to eighty seven months in prison. Robbie was eventually granted clemency, but only after serving two years. Her father and the engineer are still in prison.



Chapter 5 and Chapter 6

Chapter 5 and Chapter 6 Summary and Analysis

In Chapter 5, Rand talks of John Rapanos, who has spent two decades fighting the EPA. When Rapanos began developing his land, the EPA attempted to make him obtain an expensive permit, claiming his land was a wetland. He refused, knowing he was not violating any real law. He was criminally prosecuted for violating the Clean Water Act. The first judge to hear the case rejected the overly harsh request for a sixty three month prison sentence, and condemned the EPA for their actions. They appealed, but lost. Rand believes they continued to pursue out of vengeance, and they changed their persecution slightly, allowing them to again take Rapanos to court. They lost again, but won on appeal. The Supreme Court case ruled however that the EPA had to show a link between the "wetland" and navigable water before claiming jurisdiction. Unfortunately, the ruling didn't define either vague term, leaving the situation just as muddled as before. Rand points out his bill, the Defense of Environment and property Act, would define these terms to allow both landowner and government to understand the regulations in question.

In Chapter 6, Rand discusses several other cases briefly that lend to the idea that the EPA and Army Corps of Engineers are out of control. Ocie Mills was originally harassed in the 1970s, when the Department of Environmental Protection insisted on gaining access to his land. He refused, as they didn't have proper identification, and when things began to escalate, he pulled his rifle, and called the police. The DEP sued, but lost, and the judge in the case ended up changing the law of the state, so that even governmental agencies could not trespass without a warrant. A decade later, when he and his son purchased new property, Mills was again harassed, and this time, was sentenced to over a year in prison, and \$5000 in fines, simply for moving gravel onto his land. When he was released, the EPA ordered him to restore the land to its "original" state, but then required that he lower it eleven inches from its original state. He went to court and won, but during that time it was also revealed that his second trial, for which he was imprisoned, was tainted, as the foreman of the jury biased the rest of the group by pointing to Ocie's original run in with the DEP, painting him as a renegade.

Marinus Van Luezen is another example Rand gives as proof of the problem. Van Luezen ignored the EPA's demands when they deemed his property a wetland, and in return, they forced him to publicly apologize by erecting a billboard, laying out his "crimes". They also forced him to "recreate" a wetland that didn't exist, and then move out of his home on the property. Bill Ellen was found in violation due to a wetland designation, and even when he complied with cease and desist orders, he was taken to court when he moved a dump truck of dirt to clean his work site. He served over six months in prison. a land owner in Pacific Grove was denied permits because one of the board members who issued permits claimed she had seen his house in a previous life, and it resembled a seashell. Since his home did not, she refused the permit. Susette Kelo owned land that the New London city wanted for a new company, Pfizer. The city

forced the home owners from their property in the name of "economic development", a case that the Supreme Court upheld, although two justices disagreed. Rand points to his own Protection of Homes, Small Businesses, and Private property Act as a solution, noting that this bill would protect against illegal government search and seizure of property. Rand points to these individuals as heroes, however, as they have fought against a tyrannical government that should not exist in the United States.



Chapter 7

Chapter 7 Summary and Analysis

In Chapter 7, Rand introduces several ideas for making changes that can help solve the over zealous behavior of the EPA, but first, he mentions several more cases which serve to prove the EPA is out of control. He tells of Matt Toebben, a farmer who confronted agents on his land as he was restoring a farm pond, proving to them that the Clean Water Bill they were touting actually exempted farm ponds. He also tells of Jim Starr, a farmer who wanted to begin growing mushrooms. When the EPA deemed his land a "wetland", Starr pointed out it was only a "wetland" because of improperly functioning drainage ditches, but he lost the fight. Rand suggests these government agencies must be controlled, and their terminology must be better defined. He explains his Defense of Environment and Property Act will serve to help define these terms, and will stop federal agents from illegally trespassing. He thanks other organizations who have stood behind his Act, such as the Pacific Legal Foundation, FreedomWorks, Americans For Prosperity, American Land Rights Association, and the Kentucky Farm Bureau.

Rand then proceeds to denounce the "Beseechers", or the special interest lobbyists who swarm on Capital Hill. Rand promotes that he does not like these individuals nor does he meet with them, but he does note his door is always open to those who need help getting the government out of the way, or who need help due to overzealous government agencies. He also points out that while some were in favor of his bill, these Beseechers and those who listen to them were against it. He notes that he became frustrated, and forced the issue, but was pulled into a meeting where he was told to stop his actions by lobbyists and others involved in the wetlands issue. He pressed on, however, knowing he was right, and he promises to continue to fight for the passage of the bill.



Chapter 8 and Chapter 9

Chapter 8 and Chapter 9 Summary and Analysis

In Chapter 8, Rand introduces his next topic of complaint, a government act known as the Lacey Act. Originally put into place in 1900, the act was intended as a conservation law to help prevent illegal trafficking in wildlife, fish, and plants. However, it was amended in 1935, 1969, 1981, 1988, and 2008, and is now a broad, nonsensical, over-encompassing act that gives extremely harsh criminal penalties for extremely vague reasons. He notes that Gibson guitars was attacked under this Act, but that this Act has been mauled over the years. He points out that although Republicans want to blame Democrats for the bill, the issue is much bigger, as many of the problems with it have come from parts of other bills, where leaders choose to "tack on" unrelated issues, in the hopes of getting them passed. The 2008 adjustments to the Lacey Act, for example, were passed as part of a gigantic farm bill. Rand notes that his two proposals, "Read the Bills" and "One Subject at a Time", would have stopped these additions from getting through. He also notes the 2008 additions were done in an effort to help stop deforestation, not in the US, but in Malaysia. Rand notes that rosewood and ebony, the two woods in question, are used primarily in Chinese furniture, but five percent of the wood is used in guitar fret boards, which is why the government targeted Gibson. He also notes these amendments were made not under Democrats, but Republicans.

Chapter 9 discusses the Gibson guitar case in more detail. Rand points out Gibson is synonymous with American culture, and has been vital in the music industry. He even points out that when CEO Henry Juskiewicz came to speak on Capital Hill about his ordeal with the government, even the men and women in the meeting couldn't help but admire the guitar he brought with him. But the Gibson story, Rand believes, is a perfect example of the Lacey Act gone awry. In 2009, Juskiewicz was phoned in a meeting, informing him that one of Gibson's factories was being raided by the Department of Homeland Security. Thirty armed agents, sent as a SWAT team, raided the plant wielding automatic weapons, and seized hundreds of thousands of dollars in merchandise, including wood from Madagascar and India. However, the government did not file charges. After several months, Gibson finally sued the government, and was finally told they were investigating the source of the wood. Gibson proved they obtained the wood legally, and even provided lists of sales of the guitars in question, and documents showing the legality of the wood. However, armed Fish and Wildlife agents also swarmed the Nashville and Memphis offices as well. According to the Lacey Act, Indian wood must be "improved" before exporting. The Justice Department then, according to Rand, was forcing Gibson to move the jobs of working with the Indian wood to India instead of the US. This would cost US workers their positions, but would make Gibson in line with the Lacey Act provisions. Juskiewicz points out he is an avid conservationist, working with the Forest Stewardship Council, Rainforest Alliance, and Greenpeace to ensure the wood used in Gibson guitars supports sustainability. Juskiewicz nor Gibson were ever charged with a crime, and both the Madagascar and Indian governments have come out in support of Gibson guitars. Rand points out that

Fender Guitar, a competitor of Gibson, is a major Democratic campaign contribute, and he suggests that perhaps this is the reason for the focused attention on Gibson.



Chapter 10 and Chapter 11

Chapter 10 and Chapter 11 Summary and Analysis

In Chapter 10, Rand points out that the government of Honduras has a host of laws that govern the packaging, harvesting, and size of lobsters. In 1999, the National Marine Fisheries Service received a tip that David McNab, a Honduras businessman, was shipping undersized lobsters illegally into the United States. Rand notes the Fish and Wildlife Service that persecuted Gibson is a different agency entirely. He continues, noting that the NMFS confiscated a shipment of over seventy thousand pounds of lobster, without explanation to McNab or his American buyers. Eventually, the NMFS prosecuted under three provisions. The first was in relation to a 1993 regulation stemming from a 1973 statute which mentioned shipping lobster in cardboard boxes. The second prohibits harvesting lobsters with tails smaller than 5.5 inches. The third prohibits destroying or harvesting eggs of fish for profit. However when inspected, only three percent of the lobsters were undersized, and under seven percent showed any evidence of being egg bearing lobsters, showing that McNab and his team were not intentionally breaking regulation. However, they then found the entire shipment illegal because they were packed in plastic bags, as opposed to cardboard boxes. The NMFS filed criminal charges against McNab and his three American associates, even though Honduras never filed any charges. Further the NMFS filed not only for violations of the Lacey Act, but for conspiracy, smuggling, and money laundering, all stemming from the three original allegations. In court, it was revealed that the size limit was actually never signed into law in Honduras, and even the former Honduran Minister of Justice testified that the egg law was never intended to apply to animals who happened to be caught while bearing eggs, but instead was intended to protect harvesting of the eggs themselves. The court ignored the vast amount of McNab's evidence, and instead allowed only a single prosecuting witness' testimony, a mid-level Honduran bureaucrat, who claimed the laws were valid. In the end, the defendants were sentenced to two to eight years in prison. The four even lost on appeal, when the U.S. government determined that Honduran officials could not be trusted, and the country was unfit to construe its own laws. Afterward, McNab's attorney's showed the cardboard packing law was actually repealed in 1995, and the government of Honduras even appealed to the U.S. government to free McNab and his associates, but to no avail. All four are waiting to see if the Supreme Court will hear their case.

Chapter 11 tells the story of Steven and Cornelia Kinder, owners of two caviar companies, who pled guilty in January of 2012 to illegally harvesting paddlefish. Both companies must pay \$5000 in fines, and are prevented from applying for a CITES export permit, thereby not allowing them to export their goods. Additionally, both defendants must serve three years probation. Rand points out, however, that these individuals harvested legal fish from the Ohio river using legal nets, and this process is legal on the Kentucky side of the river. Unfortunately, the defendants were on the Ohio side. Rand points out the Lacey Act prosecutes these individuals for harvesting fish on the wrong side of the river, when we don't have the manpower to fight illegal immigrants

and terrorists. Rand also points out he had difficulty finding the Kinders, primarily because they are afraid of their government.



Chapter 12

Chapter 12 Summary and Analysis

Rand discusses his solutions to the problem in Chapter 12. He points out first that it is the overcriminalization of commerce and businesses that he is primarily concerned with. He mentions that his Freedom from Overcriminalization and Unjust Seizures Act (FOCUS Act) would solve many of these issues. He recaps his notes from when he introduced the Act, mentioning his belief that the Lacey Act is dangerous. He points to the cases previously mentioned as proof, and recaps the original intentions of the Act, as well as the illegitimate amendments. He points to the original Lacey Act's penalty of \$200, and compares it with current penalties including huge fines and criminal conviction. He also points out the Lacey act is unconstitutional, as it chooses to enforce foreign law, thereby removing the constitutionally guaranteed law of Congress alone. Secondly, he notes the Lacey Act is vague, and thereby fails to satisfy the basic due process guarantees. He also points out that to expect Americans to track foreign laws is "lunacy". The FOCUS Act, he notes, would remove all references to foreign law, would remove criminal penalties, and would make maximum penalties more logical and fair. He continues by reiterating his deeper issue with overcriminalization, and out of control government bureaucracies. He assures readers he will continue to fight for their rights.



Chapter 13 and Chapter 14

Chapter 13 and Chapter 14 Summary and Analysis

In Chapter 13, Rand moves to another government agency he disagrees with, that of the TSA, or Transportation Security Administration. Rand begins his attack by noting that the creation of the TSA, the brain child after 9/11, has gone further to achieve the Islamic terrorist goals of a less free America than almost anything else. He points out their original conception, that of a trained security force, was acceptable, and even desired. But as the agency grew, it grew out of control. He points out that all the TSA attempts to create security, using body scanners, are not supported by other major country's airlines, as they believe these scanners are not useful. Rand blames our use of them on corrupt officials buying the scanners, and then retiring to work as lobbyists for those same companies. The scanners have several issues, including questions of safety and of privacy. Additionally, Rand complains of the TSA's pat-downs of small children, and discusses his own letters of anger toward the head of the TSA's defense of such pat downs. Rand points out there is a constitutional right to travel freely, and the TSA is violating that right. He himself has been detained by the TSA, he notes, when he refused a pat down. He suggests that although the TSA and US government claims to not want to "target" individuals, they should do exactly that in an honest effort to stop terrorism. He also pushes that the TSA should not have such invasive search rights, and should be privatized, to avoid government involvement.

In Chapter 14, Rand discusses several cases involving abuses by the TSA. In 2010, the TSA introduced more invasive searches, including putting their hands inside of any baggy clothing worn by travelers. Radio host Owen Stone notes that a TSA agent placed his hands inside his pants, and searched his groin area, in full view of the public, simply because Stone was wearing baggy sweatpants. An ABC anchorwoman had a similar experience. Many woman, Rand reports, claim they have been irrationally pulled from the scanner line to be "randomly" hand searched by male TSA agents. Actresses and beauty pageant winners have both come out in protest, claiming to have been embarrassed, harassed, and felt up by TSA agents. Others have complained of broken urostomy bags or other embarrassing health issues due to careless TSA agents. A ninety five year old leukemia patient was pulled out and searched, and told to remove her Depends undergarment. She then had to finish her travel without undergarments. others complain of being forced to remove nipple rings in front of agents, or being forced from wheelchairs in order to be searched. Another woman was forced to pump breast milk into bottles to "prove" the milking device was as she claimed.



Chapter 15 and Chapter 16

Chapter 15 and Chapter 16 Summary and Analysis

In Chapter 15, Rand notes that he believes the TSA is merely a symbol for the underlying problem in government, that of the urge to "do something" when tragedy happens, often time in a way that benefits the politician, journalist, and corporate America far more than the average citizen. He points out that the tragedy of 9/11 led to several good concepts, such as air marshals on planes, better security in the cockpit, more training, and better understanding. Additionally, he hails the passengers on Flight 93 who, instead of killing many, fought back and took down their own plane in an effort to save thousands. Rand notes he believes the TSA is merely security theater, in that it pretends to make everything more secure, but in reality, does nothing. Instead, Rand pushes that we first privatize the TSA, making them hired instead of governmental. In this way, he points out, they have a monetary need to make flying safer, while still maintaining customer satisfaction. Knowing, however, that the government will likely refuse this, he also introduces the Air Traveler's Bill of Rights, which lays out seventeen rights for flyers. Those include the right for airports to refuse TSA assistance, instead choosing to join the Screening Partnership Program (SPP), using private screeners. It also includes the right for those who fail the metal detector to be re-screened, use of canine dogs as screeners, the elimination of pat downs for those under age twelve, patdowns using only the back of the hand, the right to object to mistreatment, the right to have an attorney present, and the right to refuse the back scatter scan, which can cause health problems. He also strongly promotes the use of profiling as a better means to keeping America safe.

In Chapter 16, Rand introduces Nancy Okail, an Egyptian mother and wife who is also a political activist in Egypt. In 2011, she and other activists were detained by the ruling factions of an unstable Egyptian government for running an unauthorized protest. Americans and Egyptians were both arrested, and Rand sought to find immediate assistance, but his associates urged caution. Rand suggested withholding U.S. foreign aid, but when he found little backing, he attached an amendment to the U.S. Postal Act at the time in order to force a vote on the matter. He proposed to end all foreign aid to Egypt, including money and military aid, unless the American prisoners were freed. Rand points out we send billions in foreign aid to countries that hate us, abuse our people, and threaten us. The Senate shut down for the weekend, and several ambassadors went to Egypt, telling of the upcoming vote that could threaten their aid. Meanwhile, Rand took to the Senate floor and denounced his colleagues for refusing to vote on his bill in a timely manner. However, before the vote was even taken, Egypt released the American prisoners. Rand notes that he hopes his actions were a part of their decision. Yet even after their release, Rand notes, the Egyptians were still held and treated poorly, and Rand hails those individuals as heroes, noting we should have helped them, as well. Sherif Mansour, an Egyptian born US citizen, has gone to Egypt to fight with those like Nancy, and Rand supports his efforts. He notes that America can no longer afford to be the champion of foreign aid to those that hate us, and he

denounces that in one breath, the US Government gives aid to help others, but passes the National Defense Authorization Act in another breath, which takes away rights of US citizens.



Chapter 17 and Chapter 18

Chapter 17 and Chapter 18 Summary and Analysis

In Chapter 17, Rand explains the origins of the next out of control agency, the FDA (Food and Drug Administration) and USDA (US Department of Agriculture). He points out that original food storage abilities were limited, and that, following the highly sensationalized "The Jungle", which depicted horrific food safety issues, Roosevelt created the Food and Drug Acts, creating the FDA to ensure food safety inspections were done. This was later expanded to include cosmetics and anything else one could consume or apply to the body or hair. Prescription drugs also became regulated, and over time, the FDA continued to grow. It now has a budget of over four billion dollars. The food administration portion of the regulations soon came under the USDA, which has also grown, and has a budget of nearly 450 billion dollars. Rand points out that this huge conglomeration soon began hunting down even the smallest infractions, and seemed to focus on raw milk producers. He notes that his office partnered with the Raw Milk Freedom Riders in 2011 to protest the governmental crackdown on the sale and ingestion of raw milk products. Raw milk advocates note the unaltered milk can reduce allergies, and complain that the government allows such items as Twinkies and Mountain Dew to be consumed, but bans raw milk.

In Chapter 18, Rand tells the story of Daniel Allgyer, an Amish farmer who produces and sells raw milk. However, in 1987, the USDA banned the sale of raw milk across state lines. To "capture" Allgyer, the USDA set up a sting, and negotiated for Allgyer to sell his milk to a man living just across state lines. Once the milk was delivered, the USDA agents went to the farm to demand access, but without necessary documentation, Allgyer turned them away. They returned two months later, armed, with a SWAT team. They confiscated the milk marked to be delivered, and ordered Allgyer to cease his sales. In turn, Allgyer created a club, in which members purchased "shares" of the cow. Legally, the USDA cannot stop individuals from drinking their own cow's raw milk. However, the court system ruled that Allgyer couldn't ship across state lines, and as most of his customers were from out of state, his farm went under. Rand points out that the USDA essentially was on crusade to put a farm out of business whose only "crime" was to provide consumers with a milk they choose to drink.



Chapter 19 - Chapter 20

Chapter 19 - Chapter 20 Summary and Analysis

In Chapter 19, Rand points out it is not just the federal government that is at fault for these atrocities. He tells the story of John Moody, who founded a buying club in 2004, in order to allow consumers to obtain raw milk and other fresh, non processed produce. Again, the idea in this case is to sell "shares" in the animals and plants, thereby preventing interference from the US government, as the merchandise is deemed already owned by the shareholder. In 2007, the buying club was issued a cease and desist order by the Louisville Department of Public Health and the Cabinet for Health and Family Services. Members of the club voluntarily continued business, citing the Kentucky constitution as protecting their rights. As a result of public pressure, the case was dropped. Rand notes Moody hailed Rand and his team for their own efforts in stopping such abuses by the U.S government, and also points out Moody lives in fear of government retaliation.

In Chapter 20, Rand points out that often, people assume in these cases that the government is involved with big business, or major enterprises. He notes, however, that the government often tries to control even very small enterprises, and small, family businesses. He tells the story of the Dollarhite family, a farming family who chose to allow their young teenage son to breed and sell rabbits. They contacted the USDA to determine if permits were needed, and were told they were not, as rabbits were deemed poultry. The Dollarhites were well known for their excellent rabbits, and they made around \$4000 a year. In 2009, the Dollarhites reduced their operation, and a USDA agent arrived to inspect the property. She said all was well, but offered information on becoming USDA certified. The Dollarhites declined. In 2010, they were again approached by the USDA, this time being told they were to immediately stop their rabbit operation to avoid more than \$1000 in fines. They agreed, and immediately shut down. A year later, the family received a notice from the USDA, claiming they owed 3.9 million dollars in fines, as they had violated a law that one can only sell \$500of rabbits in a single year. After much public pressure, the USDA backed down, claiming they only needed to agree to an inspection to avoid the fine. The Dollarhite's agreed, only to then be told by phone they had to agree not to own farm animals or pets for five years. When asked for the request in writing, the USDA backed down again, never providing the written request. Rand points out he has introduced bills such as the REINS Act to reign in the regulatory agencies, and he urges Americans to fight back.



Chapter 21 and Conclusion

Chapter 21 and Conclusion Summary and Analysis

Chapter 21 shows Rand giving high priority to the fight for food and health freedom. He points out people want solutions that do not involve pesticides and processed foods. Although he understands some regulations are needed, he notes the overabundance of regulations against consumers choosing what to ingest. Rand points to the USDA and FDA's inflated sense of jurisdiction as part of the problem, and their use of armed agents as a second problem. He has introduced a bill to allow the sale of raw milk, he notes, even though he himself doesn't choose to drink it. He has also introduced the Health Freedom Act, which would allow vitamin and mineral supplement manufacturers to promote their own health claims, without fear of governmental interference. He notes that he also forced a vote on an amendment that would stop the FDA's over zealous regulation of vitamins, foods, and supplements, and stop them from censoring these companies advertisements for health benefits. He laughingly points out the FDA even tried to strong arm General Mills, as they sought to have the manufacturer remove claims that Cheerios could help cholesterol, claiming that such claims made the cereal a drug. Obviously, General Mills fought back and won, but Rand asks, what about the small business without funds to fight? The FDA also stops prune juice manufacturers from claiming their product helps constipation, again because this would make it a drug, and Rand notes his bill would stop the FDA from being able to regulate such claims. Further, his amendment would take away the ability for these regulatory agencies to carry firearms when executing warrants. Finally, his act would decriminalize minor food and drug offenses. He points out that the US now has over 4000 federal criminal laws, and no one can even keep up with them all. Further, he notes that the original requirement of criminal intent to pursue a criminal charge has been ignored for years, as those making simple mistakes are prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law. His amendment would bring the criminal intent portion of federal crimes back into play. Finally, Rand promises to continue to fight back, and urges readers to do the same.

In the Conclusion, Rand mentions that those who proofread his book found themselves furious at the stories within it. He points out that these stories should anger readers, but that the most important thing is what they choose to do with that anger. He pushes readers to get involved, joining the groups who fight against government tyranny, and he lists those groups on his web page. He urges readers to write about these groups, and spread the word. He also promotes running for office, and making a difference by joining the governmental effort to combat regulatory agencies. He promises to do his part in speaking out, and fighting back against the EPA, Army Corps of Engineers, the TSA, the FDA, and the USDA. In closing, he promotes that freedom is guaranteed by the Constitution, and that we should seek to return to the laws our founding fathers intended.



Characters

Rand Paul

Rand Paul is the author of the book. As junior United States Senator for Kentucky, and as the son of Ron Paul, U.S. Representative of Texas's 14th congressional district, Rand Paul has grown up within the political world. Rand is Republican, but strongly supports the Tea Party movement and considers himself a libertarian. Rand firmly believes that many government agencies are too large, too confusing, and far too overreaching. His criticisms of the FDA, USDA, TSA, EPA, and other agencies all revolve around their completely vague laws, too severe punishments, and their complete disregard for American rights and freedoms. Further, he points out, many of these agencies receive more funding than others we might consider more vital, and these individuals, who are not elected, are making regulations and laws. In his senate position, Rand has put forth a number of bills and legislative measures designed to halt these agencies from continuing to terrorize Americans. Rand repeatedly points out in the book that he has fought for American civil liberties, and that Americans should continue to rebel against the loss of liberty, and the increases of criminal punishments for small or nonexistent crime. He strongly advocates fighting any outrageous government law, and offers readers his own time if they find themselves in troubling circumstances as a result of these "government bullies".

Ron Paul

Ron Paul is the writer of the introduction of the book, and Rand Paul's father. Ron Paul, U.S. Representative of Texas's 14th congressional district, supports many of the concepts presented within the book. Ron Paul points out that the founding father's of the country would be horrified to learn of the atrocities experienced by the individuals presented in the book, at the hands of their own government. He too mentions the horrors of the EPA, and their ability to dictate what homeowners can do with their own land, even if the land is nowhere near a protected area. He denounces the TSA, and points out that they, too, have overreaching powers as they grope individuals, including older Americans and small children. He explains the TSA is merely security theater, or a completely false sense of security that is unrealistic. Ron, too, promotes the idea of allowing consumers to buy raw milk if they choose, and the idea of allowing individuals to make their own choices about what they ingest into their bodies, instead of having their choices made for them by unelected government officials. Like his son, Ron Paul points out that these issues are not party issues, but are human and American issues that need to be discussed and acted on, before the situation becomes worse.



John Pozsgai

John Pozsgai was a Hungarian immigrant who purchased a dump near his home. In the process of clearing the area in order to build, he moved dirt and soil from one side of his lot to fill in a lower lying spot on the land. The EPA objected, claiming that Pozsgai violated the Clean Water Act by discharging pollutants into the navigable waters of the United States. In reality, according to Rand, Pozsgai simply moved fill into an area of dry land that was adjacent to a drainage ditch that connected to the non-navigable Delaware Canal. Rand accuses the EPA of falsifying records and manufacturing proof of wetland property, but in the end, the EPA won, and Pozsgai served a year and a half in federal prison, and was fined \$202,000 (later reduced to \$5,000).

Mike and Chantell Sackett

Mike and Chantell Sackett are a couple who purchased land on Priest Lake in Idaho. Owning a construction company, the couple was highly educated in building requirements, and went through all necessary regulations to ensure their building plans were approved. As they placed gravel and fill onto the property, the EPA filed criminal charges, claiming they were in violation of the Clean Water Act, as they were altering wetlands. The property is landlocked in an existing subdivision, and yet they claim, according to Rand, that the land is protected wetland property. Rand claims that at every turn, the EPA misled or simply ignored the Sackett's requests for proof of their violations. The Sacketts requested a hearing, only to be denied by the EPA. They then tried to file suit against the EPA, but the courts rejected their suit. Finally, their suit made it to the Supreme Court, where the Sacketts were vindicated with a 9-0 vote. Further, the Supreme Court decisions made clear their displeasure at the actions of the EPA, and their disdain for the badly written regulations of the agency.

Robert Lucas and Robbie Wrigley

Robert Lucas and Robbie Wrigley are a father and daughter who were both convicted by the EPA of conspiring to violate the Clean Water Act. These individuals owned a plot of land, and began to develop it as they had over two thousand times over the course of their business. This time, however, a local health department employee decided, according to Rand, that the permits the family obtained for septic tanks wasn't right. She went to the EPA, who then attempted to convince the family they "could" be violating the Clean Water Act, as the area "could" be wetlands. Robbie served over two years in federal prison, while her father is still in prison, and all, according to Rand, without any proof of any actual violation of a law.

John Rapanos

John Rapanos began building on his property in 1989, but was told by the EPA he had to obtain a specific, extremely expensive federal permit to continue. Rapanos, knowing



he had obtained all the permits required, refused. The EPA fought that Rapanos' land was a wetland, even though it lay over twenty miles away from any navigable water source. As a result, they filed suit, claiming Rapanos was violating the Clean Water Act. Rapanos won the first suit, but the EPA filed an appeal. Rapanos won on appeal, as well, but the EPA changed their suit, now claiming he was in violation, because the land was hydrologically connected to navigable waters. Rapanos won again, but lost on appeal. The Supreme Court finally heard the case, and was split on decision, although all noted the vagueness of the law, and the necessity for clearer regulations by the EPA.

Ocie Mills

Ocie Mills was an individual who, in 1989, was prosecuted for violating the Clean Water Act by moving fill onto his property as he built a home. The EPA sued, and even though Mills had gone through all the local building permit requirements, he was found guilty, and sentenced to nearly two years in the federal penitentiary. When he was released, he discovered the EPA was demanding that he return the plot of land to its "original" state, but their level requirements were eleven inches lower than what the property originally was. He fought in court, but lost. Later, it was discovered that the jury at his original trial had been tampered with, as the foreman had told the jury of Mills' previous run in with the EPA in 1970, as they attempted to trespass on his land, and he filed suit and won. Rand points to the Mills case to show the EPA holds vendetta against anyone who attempts to fight back.

Marinus Van Leuzen

Marinus Van Leuzen was a business owner in Texas. When he began to build a home on his property, he was accused of building on a federal wetland, even though he had obtained all necessary permits. He continued, despite warnings from the EPA. He was eventually fined \$350 a month for twelve years, forced to build a moat around the home to "restore" the wetland, and build a billboard, noting his "crime" to the public. In the end, the EPA also forced him to remove his home.

Bill Ellen

Bill Ellen is an environmental engineer who was hired to build duck ponds in Maryland in 1987. In 1989, the EPA changed its vague definition of wetland, and as a result, Ellen was issued a cease and desist order, because his work was now in violation of the Clean Water Act. After months, Ellen finally gave up the fight, and in cleaning up the work site, moved some dirt. He was immediately prosecuted for violating the Clean Water Act, and spent six months in prison, while his employer paid over one million dollars to remain free. Rand points out Ellen's case shows that, if you can buy your way out, the EPA will turn their heads.



Henry Juskiewicz

Henry Juskiewicz is CEO of Gibson guitars. Juskiewicz's company, in 2009, was raided by the Department of Homeland Security, which confiscated hundreds of thousands of dollars in materials, including raw wood from Madagascar and India. Juskiewicz eventually had to sue the government to even learn what he was accused of, and was told he was suspected of importing illegal wood. A second factory was raided, again with armed agents, and Juskiewicz was accused of violating the Lacey Act, a conservation law. Juskiewicz has supplied thousands of pages of documentation, proving the wood was obtained legally, and both countries have asserted Juskiewicz was not illegal in obtaining the wood. Juskiewicz has yet to be charged for any crime.

David McNab

David McNab is a Honduras businessman who shipped lobster to the United States. The National Marine Fisheries Service confiscated seventy thousand pounds of lobster, and stored it for weeks without explanation. The business owners were charged, as they were shipping lobster in plastic instead of cardboard, shipping tails less than 5.5 inches, and trapping some lobsters who were pregnant. Rand notes, however, that only three percent of the lobster tails were undersized, and only seven percent were even of age to produce, showing McNab was likely not intentionally breaking any law. Eventually, McNab was sentenced to over eight years in prison for violation of the Lacey Act, even though Honduras appealed for his release, noting that the laws the US was trying him under were not even valid laws in their country.

Steven and Cornelia Kinder

Steven and Cornelia Kinder were found guilty of harvesting paddlefish and exporting the eggs illegally for sale from Ohio in 2007. They were fined, placed on probation, and prevented from harvesting for three years. Rand points out, however, that had Steven and Cornelia Kinder simply fished on the Kentucky side of the river, they would have been fine, as the same laws are not in place. Rand has worked with these individuals extensively to show the overpowering reach of the government.

Nancy Okail

Nancy Okail is a mother and wife from Egypt who works promoting democracy in her home country. During a change in political tides in December of 2011, she and others in her group were detained by the Egyptian government. Rand mentions he pushed at the time to pull all foreign aid to Egypt until Nancy and her colleagues were released, but his colleagues on Capital Hill rejected his idea. The Senate refused to vote on his amendment, but over the weekend, several Senators went to Egypt to warn them of the



upcoming vote. By the time Rand's amendment was voted on the following week, Egypt had released Okail and the others.

Daniel Allgyer

Daniel Allgyer is an Amish farmer who produces raw, unpasteurized milk for sale. In 1987 though, the FDA banned the interstate sale of raw milk. The FDA brought Allgyer to court in violation of this law, as they set up a sting operation where an undercover agent bought milk from the farm in Pennsylvania, and had it delivered to Maryland. Since it crossed state lines, it violated the law. Allyger was forced eventually to shut down his farm.

The Dollarhites

The Dollarhites are a family in Missouri who are agriculturally based. They wanted to give their teenage son real life experience, so after rescuing two rabbits, they decided to let their son raise rabbits. They called around for governmental regulations, and the USDA told them they did not need a license, as rabbits are considered poultry, and the USDA doesn't regulate poultry. The rabbits sold well, and earned the family nearly \$5000 the first year, \$200 of which was profit. Soon after they downsized their business, they received threats from the USDA, claiming they were in violation of USDA regulations. They were forced to shut down, but heard nothing for a year. They then received notification they had violated the Animal Welfare Act, and were fined \$3.9 million dollars. When pressured by government officials who discovered the Dollarhites situation, the USDA revoked the fine, but required them to sign an agreement that they would never own livestock. When they refused, and requested documentation in writing of all the USDA requests and requirements, the USDA agreed. The Dollarhites have waited over a year for this documentation.

Objects/Places

EPA

The EPA, or Environmental Protection Agency, is responsible for protecting human health and the environment. According to Rand, this is one of the most out of control governmental agencies, and their actions, which used to be minor fines or civil lawsuits, have become criminal, with massive fines and federal prison time.

Clean Water Act

The Clean Water Act was originally designed to protect against the pollution of the navigable waters of the United States.

Wetlands

Wetlands is a vague term, commonly identified to mean an area that is seasonally or permanently saturated with water in such a way as to become its own ecosystem. Because of the vague wording of the definition, however, many individuals are found in violation of disturbing wetlands, even when the area in question does not meet this vague or accepted definition.

Defense of Environment and Property Act of 2012

The Defense of Environment and Property Act of 2012 is a bill presented by Rand Paul that would effectively define navigable waters, give authority over lakes and streams back to the states, stop governmental agencies from being able to alter property owner rights without hearing, and would force governmental agencies to pay homeowners twice the value of the property if deemed a wetland.

Lacey Act

The Lacey Act is an act originally intended to help conservation efforts, to prohibit the trafficking of illegal fish, wildlife, and plants. It has been revised several times, however, and is now an overreaching government statute that makes vague acts criminal offenses, punishable through huge fines and long prison sentences.



Freedom from Over Criminalization and Unjust Seizures Act (F

The Freedom from Over Criminalization and Unjust Seizures Act (FOCUS) is a bill presented by Rand Paul that will, he says, effectively rein in the Lacey Act by reducing the criminality of the offenses prosecuted by the Lacey Act, but also by redefining those offenses.

TSA

The TSA, or Transportation Security Administration, was originally designed to protect citizens in the air by providing airport security. Today, Rand believes, this agency is overreaching and criminal in their acts, as they are allowed to "grope" citizens and violate liberty and freedoms in the name of security. Rand would like to see the TSA eliminated, and security of airports and airlines returned primarily back to the private sector. He has introduced the Air Traveler's Bill of Rights to combat the TSA, which spells out the regulations the TSA should follow, if they remain in charge.

FDA

The FDA, or Food and Drug Administration, was originally created in 1906, largely in part, according to Rand, due to the book "The Jungle", which depicted horrific conditions in the meat packing plants. Over time, the FDA's power was increased, giving them regulatory rights as well as enforcement rights for anything that could be consumed or cosmetically used by humans. According to Rand, the FDA has far too much power to create their own regulations and procedures.

USDA

The USDA, or United States Department of Agriculture, took over many of the food regulation tasks of the FDA. The USDA, as Rand sees it, is a completely unregulated and overreaching government agency who has far too much power over the informed decisions of knowledgeable men and women. As he points out, the USDA has taken it upon themselves to tell individuals what they can and cannot consume, instead of allowing informed individuals a right to choose what they put into their own body.

Health Freedom Act

The Health Freedom Act, put forward by Rand Paul, is designed to allow vitamin and supplement companies to promote their goods and services, without overreaching regulation from the USDA or FDA.

Themes

How the Government Abuses Power

One of the primary themes of the novel is how governmental agencies such as the EPA abuse their powers. Rand begins the novel by pointing to the vague regulations of the EPA, in terms of their non-existent definitions of "wetlands", "navigable waters", and other terms. He points to several stories where landowners are not only penalized financially for building or renovating their own property, but also criminally charged and forced to serve time in prison, simply for moving dirt, in some cases. Rand notes that the EPA forces landowners to give up their lands, "restore" lands to conditions that never existed, and spend hundreds of thousands of dollars in fines, penalties, and fees to avoid jail time for regulations many do not even know exist.

Rand then points to the Lacey Act to show how the agencies of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife and the National Marine Fisheries Service use the law to prosecute even the slightest of offenses, many of which are not even illegal in the United States. Rand points out that the Lacey Act was originally created to protect against illegal trafficking, but is now used to attack businesses. Gibson guitar was persecuted for importing wood illegally from various countries who certified that Gibson obtained the wood legally. A small group dealing in lobsters was persecuted under the law, even though the country of origin claimed the laws they were using were outdated and invalid. Even fishermen on one side of the Ohio river were prosecuted for offenses not illegal simply fishing on the other side of the river. Further, these agencies often storm in, with armed SWAT teams, to frighten their targets necessarily.

Next, Rand points to the TSA as perhaps the most invasive governmental agency who abuses power. He notes their use of "groping" in the name of safety, the use of scanners that are believed to be hazardous to health, and their seemingly unwarranted searching of small children, ill, and elderly. He notes several cases of inappropriate TSA agent behaviors in terms of their searching of young women, and even their levels of theft in airports. He reminds readers that this governmental abuse is not even justified, as their actions do little to obtain real airline safety.

Finally, Rand points to the over-reaching powers of the FDA and USDA as they persecute farmers and ranchers for unexplained offenses without proper citation or legal movement. He mentions cases of crackdowns on Amish farmers selling raw milk, sting operations involving armed raids on simple farms, and even the attack on small rabbit sellers, who are fined exorbitant amounts of money.

In all cases, Rand's stories of these agencies involve huge fines, prison time, armed SWAT teams, illegal search and seizure, trespassing of government agents on private land, and other displays of power meant to intimidate and alarm. These agencies, according to Rand, need to be stopped, and their regulations need to be better defined, and more reasonably regulated.



How Americans Have Lost Freedom

Another primary theme in "Government Bullies" is that of the freedoms Americans have lost at the hands of rogue government agencies. First, Rand touches on the losses of property owners in their fights with the EPA about the coding of their properties as "wetlands". Rand notes that property owners have not only lost their lands to the EPA, but also their right to a hearing, and to a fair trial. In many cases, these individuals are not even allowed to protest their sanctions, as they are not "criminal", but merely violations regulated by the EPA. The EPA, because it is "protecting" the environment, is rarely challenged, and when they are, the court system often denies the challenge, simply because the regulations are so vague to begin with. Property owners have lost the right to do what they choose with the land they own.

In addition, Rand points to the loss of American citizens to even earn a living without the intrusion of government. Everything from fishing to making guitars is now regulated by the government, and that government even attempts to enforce the laws of foreign governments that do not apply to those citizens. Fisherman who merely make mistakes lose their entire business, and in some cases, end up in jail. Companies lose their goods to the EPA and other agencies without any notification of why, and without compensation for the loss of those goods.

The TSA, according to Rand, has stolen many of the freedoms of US citizens, including the right to privacy, and the freedoms against illegal search and seizure. Citizens are no longer free to pack their belongings as they see fit, but are held to ridiculous regulations, and failure to comply with those regulations results in a complete loss of privacy as complete body scanners and body searches are conducted. Parents have even lost the right to refuse a stranger, TSA security, from touching their children.

Also, Rand points to the FDA and the USDA, noting that because of these agencies, citizens have lost the freedom to choose the foods, supplements, and nutrients they put into their own bodies. The government now regulates even the ability to buy and sell raw milk, and therefore, controls the freedom of consumers to drink such milk. Rand reminds readers that what we choose to eat and drink should be up to us, and not up to our government. He notes that, because of these agencies, information about possible helpful health solutions are being hidden, unable to be promoted by the nutrient companies.

In these cases, citizens of the United States have lost many of the fundamental rights and freedoms US citizens are promised by the US Constitution. Rand notes that the founding fathers would likely be furious if they saw the amount of government interference with freedom citizens face today, and he urges people to begin fighting back.



How Rand Paul Is Helping to Fight Back Against Government Bu

Another primary theme in the novel is how Rand Paul has helped the American people fight back against government bullies. Throughout the novel, Rand points to the bills and laws he has introduced to the Senate to combat these out of control government agencies. He mentions the Protection of Homes, Small Business, and Private Property Act of 2012, which was designed to strengthen private property rights and limit government power. He also mentions the Defense of Environment and Property Act of 2012, which seeks to define navigable waters, exclude streams from federal jurisdiction, reduce the ability by the EPA to define navigable waters without congressional authorization, give power back to the states, and stop federal agents from entering private property.

Rand also mentions his Freedom from Over Criminalization and Unjust Seizures Act (FOCUS). This act was introduced to reduce the over criminalization of accidental legal breaches as a due course in commerce and general business, and to help define the vague laws of the EPA. Additionally, Rand mentions his support of the Air Traveler's Bill of Rights, which include rules proposed for the TSA to follow. These include the ability for airports to opt out of using the TSA, adding the ability for those who fail the scan test to rescan, the expansion of canine screening, elimination of pat downs for those under twelve, and protections for those detained by the TSA. The Health Freedom Act is another introduced by Rand. This act protects vitamins and supplement manufacturers from unreasonable government regulations.



Style

Perspective

"Government Bullies" is told in first person, although many of the stories within the book are told third person by Rand himself. There can be no question that Rand Paul is biased in his work, as he focuses often on his own efforts to combat the overreaching governments he complains of. This view is necessary, however, as it does help Rand to show that his efforts as a Senator are right, and valid. The stories he presents do serve to show governmental power out of control, and serve to show his opinions that government needs to be reigned in are righteous. That being said, as with any story, Rand tells the tales that serve to support his already existing ideas, and his existing platform. Readers have only his version of the story, which of course is told using his point of view, and told with a slight slant in his favor. Again, however, Rand also does not champion one political system over another, or claim the issues are related to Democratic or Republican rule. Instead, he appears to be stating simply that readers need to be aware of bigger issues, and focus on reclaiming their freedoms. His ability to remain unbiased in terms of party lines does lend credit to his statements, as he is not speaking for or against a certain political party, and he is not trying to drum up support for any particular political figure.

Tone

Rand Paul's tone in "Government Bullies" varies greatly throughout the book. For much of the novel, Rand is combative, as he attacks governmental agencies he sees as out of control. He challenges the decisions of the EPA, TSA, FDA, USDA, local governments, state governments, and federal governments. In addition, he accuses individuals of using politics for personal gain, and even accuses government agencies of holding grudges, and having vendettas. He uses specific cases to illustrate his points, and his tone is constantly accusing to those involved. His tone does, at time, change to disbelieving and nearly humorous as he discusses the specific cases he has found, and he notes often that he wishes he were kidding, showing a whimsical side. At other times, his tone is educational, as he explains to readers the history behind certain laws or pieces of legislation. Finally, at other times, Rand's tone is challenging, as he asks Americans to rise up, and fight for their rightful freedoms. While the book is certainly biased, the author does tend to write using a variety of different styles, which helps to soften the overall feel of this highly accusatory novel.

Structure

The book is broken into four sections of unequal length, not including the Foreword or Introduction. The Foreword, written by Rand's father, Ron Paul, is twenty one pages in length, and merely introduces the concepts within the novel. Similarly, the Introduction,



written by Rand, further introduces the concepts in the book, and informs the reader of how each section is laid out. Each section first discusses a governmental agency (or several) that Rand believes are out of control. Next, each section gives several examples of how that agency uses or abuses power. Third, Rand offers readers an opportunity to see how he himself has attempted to introduce change, and discusses ways the reader can assist this change. Each section is divided into an unequal number of chapters, each of which is named both by number, and with a name that lets the reader know what will be contained within. The Conclusion of "Government Bullies" summarizes Rand's points, while the Appendix and Acknowledgements gives the reader more places to look for information, and informs the reader of those Rand wishes to thank. In total, the book is 319 pages in length. It is written with bias toward Rand's political views, obviously, but it is also well written and at times even comical. In all, the novel is an informative, albeit slanted, look at governmental agencies that the reader may want to read more about, in order to determine how he or she views its actions.

Quotes

"The sole purpose of government is to protect our liberties. But today we have a government that has too often become the enemy of liberty. The Constitution is supposed to restrain and limit the government's power. But every day our government behaves as if it has no limits on its power." - Foreword, vii.

"The point is that when we allow arguments to degenerate into emotions and platitudes we lose track of two important things: 1. Are the current regulations actually working? 2. Will the new regulations mean loss of jobs?" - Introduction, pg. xxxii.

"Since its creation in 1970, the Environmental Protection Agency has done more harm than good. Typical of government as opposed to private solutions, with the inception of the EPA bad policy began to outweigh the good intentions, the massive cost quickly surpassed the original concern of "doing nothing", and the new powers given to washing ton bureaucrats inevitably began to corrupt absolutely." - Part 1, Chapter 1, pg. 5.

"The Corps ordered Van Leuzen to create and publicly display a ten-by-twenty foot billboard carrying a message of apology to his government." - Part 1, Chapter 6, pg. 74.

"During one of the dozens of hearings held regarding this property, an architectural review board member said, "In my former life as a seagull, I was flying up and down the California coastline and saw your house built shaped as a seashell." And because his house plan did not match the seashell shaped house, this board member envisioned in her previous life as a bird, she voted against approving any of his plans." - Part 1, Chapter 6, pg. 77.

"I just arrived in Congress last year, but it is clear to me that what they were up against wasn't just the EPA. It wasn't just the Army Corps of Engineers. It wasn't a Democratic regulator versus a Republican regulator. It was, and is, the most powerful Leviathan of all - the Establishment and all its inertia and bureaucracy combining to maintain the status quo." - Part 1, Chapter 7, pg. 100.

"In a strange way, it would almost be comforting if this vendetta against Gibson were nothing more than just basic corruption and petty partisan politics. At least at some detestable level, it would have a sort of logic to it. The alternative is worse - that our government really is just this stupid." - Part 2, Chapter 9, pg. 119.

"Historically, the criminal law was intended to punish only offenses that were known and understood by all people to be inherently evil or wrongful, offenses such as murder, rape, theft, arson, etc. Yet today, the criminal law is constantly used to punish behavior such as fishing without a permit, packaging a product incorrectly, or shipping something with an "improper" label." - Part 2, Chapter 12, pg. 151.

"When something bad happens, to whatever degree, there is always someone clamoring for the government to "DO SOMETHING!" about it. Understandably, such



outcries often come from the victims or their families. But more often the cry for government "Solutions" comes from journalists, eager to stoke the fire." - Part 3, Chapter 15, pg. 183.

"We cannot continue to try to buy allies, or pay off our enemies. So many of the countries we send aid to dislike us, regularly disrespect us, and openly tell the world they will side with our enemies." - Part 3, Chapter 16, pg. 199.

"A leader of the farm freedom movement, Joel Salatin, also spoke at the rally. Joel is a farmer and author from Virginia, who noted that the government allows kids to ingest Mountain Dew, Twinkies, and Cocoa Puffs, but finds raw milk to be a health threat to worry about." - Part 4, Chapter 17, pg. 220.

"Criminal law is increasingly used as a tool by government to punish and control honest businessmen attempting to make a living. Historically, criminal law was intended to punish only the most horrible offenses, legitimate crimes that virtually everyone would agree were inherently evil or wrongful - murder, rape, theft, arson, and the like. But today the criminal law is used to punish behavior such as fishing without a permit, packaging a product incorrectly, or shipping something with an "improper" label." - Part 4, Chapter 21, pg. 256.

"The status quo is broken. Worse, our federal government and its many tentacle agencies have become the enemy of the people as much if not more than they have been public servants." - Conclusion, pg. 262.



Topics for Discussion

Rand Paul is a well known politician. Do you think his writing is biased, or do you think Rand's book is based entirely on factual information? Why? What does this tell you about books written by politicians, or those with their own agendas?

Rand portrays the EPA as a bullying entity who uses vague definitions to plague American citizens. Based on the stories presented in the book, do you think it is possible the EPA oversteps its bounds? Do you think the term "wetlands" and "navigable waters" should be better defined? Do you believe the EPA should punish based on intent, or breaking the laws and regulations?

What do you think of the Lacey Act, as it is presented in the book? Do you think we, as a nation, should enforce the laws of other countries, even if those countries disagree with our actions? Why or why not? If Gibson guitar had been purchasing and importing wood illegally, do you believe the EPA had a right to confiscate their materials, without any warning or explanation? Why or why not? Do you think, if you owned one of those guitars, you should be prosecuted for purchasing it, even if you didn't know it was processed illegally?

Rand is very clear on his opinion that the TSA violates our rights as Americans through their methods of "groping" passengers as they fly. He is adamant that they do not help security, and that they actually take away more than they contribute. Do you agree that we, as Americans, have traded freedom for a false sense of security? Why or why not?

Rand mentions his belief that we, as a nation, can no longer afford to give aid to foreign countries. However, he also notes that if we must continue, we should never give aid to those countries who openly detest us. Do you agree with Rand? Why or why not? What do you think of us giving foreign aid? Should we give it to countries whose governments openly object to us? Why or why not?

Why was the FDA created? Do you think this was an appropriate reaction to the issue? Why or why not? What agency took over the food administrative portions of the FDA? What is Rand's primary complaint about the FDA at this point?

What is the argument in the book regarding raw milk? Do you think the government should be able to control whether or not you consume raw milk? Why or why not? Do you think those who attempt to avert the law are right, or wrong? Why?