



Written by [Alex Newman](#) on May 13, 2011

## Ron Paul Critical Of Obama's Bin Laden Hit

During a radio interview, presidential candidate and Republican Congressman Ron Paul (left) criticized the manner in which President Obama reportedly assassinated an unarmed Osama bin Laden, sparking controversy among critics anxious to distort his statement or misrepresent the facts.



"I think things would be done somewhat differently [under a President Paul]," the Congressman stated during the interview. He suggested that the manner in which convicted terrorist mastermind Khalid Sheik Mohammed was apprehended and brought to justice would have been more appropriate.

"[The killing] was absolutely not necessary," Paul also pointed out, emphasizing his respect for the rule of law and the fact that bin Laden — with unknown but presumably extremely significant intelligence value — was unarmed when he was shot through the head.

The Congressman said that under his presidential administration, the operation would not have taken place in the same manner. He suggested instead that bin Laden should have been arrested and tried like other high-profile terror suspects in recent times — a strategy that has proved successful and is in compliance with the law.

Watch the portion of the interview below:

Paul made the remark in question during an hour-long interview with WHO Newsradio 1040 on May 10. And since then, the press has jumped all over the statements in an apparent effort to paint Paul in a negative light.

In subsequent media interviews, the recently announced presidential candidate expanded on his views about the raid. During an [ABC segment](#) with former Clinton White House insider George Stephanopoulos, who said Paul seemed to be "courting" controversy, the Congressman reiterated his position. But, he also expressed satisfaction that bin Laden would no longer be able to cause trouble.

"More than 90 percent of the American public support it," Stephanopoulos [falsely claimed](#), even based on the most pro-Obama polls. "Why are you against it?" Paul responded to the question by explaining that he was in fact opposed to the procedure, not going after bin Laden.

"I have no qualms about getting him," Paul explained, adding, however, that "we could have done it differently." He also noted that even the worst Nazis after World War II were arrested and tried before being executed. "I don't know why we have to embark on a whole new system just because the people get riled up."

Perhaps even more importantly, Paul highlighted another crucial point. "To make a decision on this whole process is a little premature — every day we hear a [different story about exactly what happened](#),"



Written by [Alex Newman](#) on May 13, 2011

---

he told Stephanopoulos, who promptly changed the subject.

And it isn't just small details. As *The New American* [reported](#) last week, the media was left with egg on its face after numerous fundamental changes were made to the Obama narrative. And the discrepancies and contradictions have raised very serious concerns among critics. Former Reagan administration official Paul Craig Roberts [pointed out eloquently](#) that within two days, the official story went from claiming an armed bin Laden had resisted in a fire fight to the open admission that he was in fact assassinated while unarmed — a monumental difference that still has not been addressed.

But despite the dramatic headlines about Paul's statement, the well-known constitutionalist's views are in line with American traditions and values — not to mention the [supreme law of the land](#). The open assassination of an unarmed man who had not been convicted of a crime (and was [not even indicted](#) or [wanted for the September 11 attacks](#), and which, despite popular belief, he [never confessed to](#)) is a new phenomenon in America.

And according to critics of the hit, such as former federal judge and Fox News personality Andrew Napolitano, [the illegal murder sets a dangerous precedent](#). After noting that [the U.S. government had financed bin Laden a few decades ago](#) and that Obama is involved in [countless violations](#) of morality and the Constitution, Napolitano tore apart the non-existent legal justification for the assassination.

"Beyond the issue of [whether the government is telling us the truth or pulling a fast one](#) to save Obama's lousy presidency is the issue of the lawful power of the president to order someone killed," Napolitano explained during his Fox show. Citing the Constitution, international treaties, federal statutes and their interpretations by the courts, the former federal judge explained that "killing by the government is a crime" — except in self-defense, war, or after a fair trial. "None of those conditions existed with bin Laden," he noted.

"Justice must be according to the law, not according to the president," Napolitano correctly explained. Noting that he understood why people would [rejoice](#), however, he warned that "this business of the president deciding to kill people is very dangerous and very unlawful." And even worse than the obvious violations of the Constitution, U.S. law and international treaties — the assassination will be used as a precedent by Obama and his successors "to kill on a whim," Napolitano warned. "Where will it stop? Who will President Obama kill next?"

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5G8zx8HNDIs>

Of course, some neo-conservatives and anti-Paul extremists have pounced on the Congressman's statement with half-baked responses and wild accusations. But because of the naïve notion that an unarmed bin Laden should have been murdered instead of captured, interrogated, and tried, the world may never know now what information he may have had inside his brain — including information that could have possibly [saved innumerable](#) Western and American lives. Even worse than the potential lost intelligence, however, may be the loss of any semblance that the U.S. government is bound by the rule of law.



## Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

### What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.