



Report: Rand Paul Copied Sections of 2013 Book from Think Tank Study

By: Evan McMurry – November 3, 2013

According to a new post by BuzzFeed[1], a section of Senator Rand Paul's (R-KY) book *Government Bullies* was lifted word-for-word from a Heritage Foundation study, the latest in a series of plagiarism accusations that are suddenly dogging the Kentucky Senator. BuzzFeed's Andrew Kaczynski wrote that 1,318 words of Rand's 2013 publication were taken verbatim from a 2003 study by the political think tank. Heritage is attributed as the source of the information in the footnotes, but not cited as the source of the actual text in the book. In addition, later passages were similar to a Cato Institute report, Kaczynski reported.

This is at least third plagiarism allegation against Paul in the past week. The first, discovered by Rachel Maddow[2], found that Paul had lifted a plot summary of the movie *Gattica* from Wikipedia. Politico then found that a section of his response to President Barack Obama's 2013 State of the Union address was copied word-for-word[3] from an Associated Press report in 2011. [4]

Paul's office defended the passage. 'In the book *Government Bullies* all the information...was sourced by end notes,' Doug Stafford, a Paul aide and co-author of the book, told BuzzFeed. 'In the two cases described, the end notes clearly define the sourcing for the book. In no case has the Senator used information without attribution. There were 150 endnotes and cites including The Heritage Foundation and Cato Institute. This is a witch hunt and grasping at straws.'

Below is the original Heritage Foundation passage: 'This prosecution also reveals the risks of federalizing criminal law. Observers have long warned against allowing the federal government to encroach on the traditional state function of enacting and enforcing general criminal laws. Here, the federal government, through the Lacey Act, claims to enforce foreign laws against foreign and U.S. citizens. These regulations were not made by the U.S. Congress or by some executive agency, but by a foreign government with unfamiliar procedures. If the government of Honduras had actually believed these regulations to be valid, they were free to bring charges. Instead, the U.S. government prosecuted a case on what turned out to be bad law.'

And the passage that appears in Paul's book: 'This prosecution also reveals the risks of federalizing criminal law. Observers have long warned against allowing the federal government to encroach on the traditional state function of enacting and enforcing general criminal laws. Here, the federal government, through the Lacey Act, claims to enforce foreign laws against foreign and U.S. citizens. These regulations were not made by the U.S. Congress or by some executive agency, but by a foreign government with unfamiliar procedures. If the government of

Honduras had actually believed these regulations to be valid, they were free to bring charges. Instead, the U.S. government prosecuted a case on what turned out to be bad law.'