

The background of the page is white with several large, light-colored five-pointed stars scattered across it. The stars are positioned at various angles and sizes, creating a subtle pattern.

Honor God
Defend the Family
Restore the Republic

The Official Peroutka 2004 Campaign
Frequently Asked Questions
Volume One

AUTHORIZED & PAID FOR BY PEROUTKA 2004, INC.

www.Peroutka2004.com



Honor God

The very first presupposition of American government is that there exists a Creator God, yet our taxpayer-funded schools teach our children that He either doesn't exist or that they can't mention His name. This attack against the right of the people to acknowledge God is disgraceful and it is un-American. The Constitution Party is committed to an American understanding of law and government – that rights come from God and that it is the purpose of government to secure and defend them.

Commonly asked questions on this subject answered here.

If the Democrats and the Republicans both claim to honor God, and so does Michael Peroutka, what is the difference?

Isn't there a "Wall of Separation Between Church and State"?

What then does the First Amendment mean?

What is the difference between the Wall of Separation and the First Amendment?

Do you support Civil Disobedience against the United States to gain your rights?

The background of the page is decorated with several large, light-colored, five-pointed stars scattered across the white space. The stars vary in size and are positioned in the upper left, upper right, middle right, and lower right areas of the page.

Defend the Family

Strong families are the essential building blocks of a strong, moral and just community. But America's families today are under constant attack by federally funded programs that are dangerous and unconstitutional. Government schools are drugging and "dumbing-down" our children making them dependent and compliant. The Constitution Party encourages faithful fathers and mothers to train their children to love God and serve others according to their own conscience and without the interference of unconstitutional federal programs.

Commonly asked questions on this subject answered here.

Do you support the Federal Marriage Amendment?

Do you support "same-sex marriage"?

Doesn't a State, or the Federal Government, define marriage?

What are your views on education?

Do you support the Human Life Amendment?

Aren't you against abortion?

But without an Amendment, isn't Roe v. Wade still law?



Restore the Republic

America needs and deserves a president that is willing to stand up against the entrenched socialists, elitists and globalists who presently have a stranglehold on American political power. It is clear that both major parties are committed to the agenda of the new world order and seek to enforce economic, military and social policies that are antithetical to the interests of the people of America. Michael Peroutka and the Constitution Party will fight to defend America against its foreign and domestic enemies in order to return to a Republic of Sovereign States based on Biblical principles.

Commonly asked questions on this subject

Would you begin the immediate pull-out of all military from Iraq?

What are your views on taxes?

How will you fund the Federal government?

Are you “Tough on Crime?”

Do you support a popular vote or the electoral college?

Will you secure the borders?

How much property should the Federal government own?

Honor God

IF THE DEMOCRATS AND THE REPUBLICANS BOTH CLAIM TO HONOR GOD, AND SO DOES MICHAEL PEROUTKA, WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE?

One difference is this: We mean it. God is not honored when we slap His name into political speech or stick a cross on something completely unholy. Do you remember the Israelites at Sinai? They called their Golden calf Jehovah, and yet what they did displeased God.

We cannot use “religion” to further our political ends. It is not proper to use God to achieve our ends as men. God is the end, we are not. I subscribe to the Westminster Confession of Faith and the Catechisms – the very first statement in the Shorter Catechism is: The chief end of man is to glorify God and enjoy Him forever.

Recent Presidents have used their alleged religious devotion to justify their personal immorality or their political desires. President Bush has claimed Jesus as his chief campaign advisor. With all due respect, Jesus would not advise His Church to get on the Federal dole by accepting welfare under the name of Faith-Based Initiatives.

ISN'T THERE A “WALL OF SEPARATION BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE”?

That often quoted phrase has been used for more than 40 years to completely eradicate the First Amendment rights the Federal Government was created to secure. The alleged wall of separation is nowhere found in the United States Constitution. In fact, it comes from what was until then an obscure letter from Thomas Jefferson to the Danbury Baptist Association. Therein, he wrote:

“Believing with you that religion is a matter which lies solely between man and his God, that he owes account to no other for his faith or his worship, that the legislative powers of government reach actions only, and not opinions, I contemplate with sovereign reverence that act of the whole American people which declared that their legislature should “make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof;” thus building a wall of separation between church and State.

The Jeffersonian Wall of Separation was to be erected to protect the people and the states from having their liberties curbed by the Federal government. No where in American history prior to 1962 was that Wall of Separation used to do the exact opposite of why it was created – to prevent the Federal government from curbing the religious expression of citizens, and even States and their officials.

Odd only to our modern courts and opinions, Jefferson concluded this letter with a prayer for “*the protection and blessing of the common Father and Creator of man.*” Odder still, though only to our modern courts and opinions, this letter was written while Thomas Jefferson was president and was written on Presidential stationery

WHAT THEN DOES THE FIRST AMENDMENT MEAN?

The First Amendment reads:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof...

The only branch of government governed by the Establishment Clause is the United States Congress and the only subject matter governed by the First Amendment are Laws. Thus, if the one acting is not the Congress, and the thing being done is not legislation, it does not violate the Establishment Clause.

WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE WALL OF SEPARATION AND THE FIRST AMENDMENT?

Under a Peroutka presidency, no longer will it be the policy of these United States to require a State or the people to obtain a license to engage in the free exercise of religion. That right is unalienable, granted by God and secured by the United States Constitution. If I were president of these United States, the Chief Justice of Alabama would still have a job – in fact, his right to freely exercise his religion, even in his official capacity, would be secured.

It seems to me that constantly when our religious liberties are attacked, “the people” appeal to the Federal government, usually unsuccessfully, for a grant of right (i.e. a license) to engage in that otherwise unlawful conduct. In 1962 when prayer was removed from the schools, and in all the subsequent cases resultant therefrom, we appealed to the Federal government to reconsider their actions.

This is an inappropriate appeal. Does God much exempt us from our obligations of worship if the Congress makes it a felony to pray to Him? Certainly, no, for we must obey God rather than men. So if God would require that we commit a felony to fulfill our obligations to Him, certainly He requires our utter resistance to any such law that preempts man’s ability to Honor their Creator.

In the immortal words of President Ronald Reagan, “Tear down this wall.”

DO YOU SUPPORT CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE AGAINST THE UNITED STATES TO GAIN YOUR RIGHTS?

Absolutely not. Civil disobedience is an action that violates the Law to gain your own personal interests. However, any law passed that prohibits the free exercise of religion is no law, and ultimately violates the supreme Law of God. It is not civil disobedience to obey God, the source of all Law and Liberty.

Defend the Family

DO YOU SUPPORT THE FEDERAL MARRIAGE AMENDMENT?

No. Even while I do not support a sodomy-based anything, I do not support the Federal Marriage Amendment because it is wholly unnecessary and inappropriate. If the Supreme Court can ignore the First and Second Amendments with impunity, what is to lead me to believe they would remain obedient to another Amendment appended to the Constitution?

DO YOU SUPPORT "SAME-SEX MARRIAGE"?

Of course we do not support sodomy-based marriage. So, you inquire, what is my solution? The federal government has an obligation under Article IV §4 to ensure to each member State that it, and every other member State, will be Republican in form of government. Thus far, sodomy-based marriage has not been, and I expect never will be, enacted in proper republican fashion. Rather, it has been, and will be, imposed by judicial fiat. Such an action is not republican in form, and will be utterly resisted to the grave if necessary under a Peroutka Presidency. The obligation of the Full Faith and Credit clause of Article IV, §1 is give full faith & credit to another member State's legitimate public Acts, Record and Judicial Proceedings. When a State, or Federal Judiciary oversteps its bounds, that Proceeding will be ignored.

DOESN'T A STATE, OR THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, DEFINE MARRIAGE?

Who is the definer of marriage? Certainly it is not the United States government, nor even the State government. The author and perfecter of Marriage is none other than the LORD Almighty.

WHAT ARE YOUR VIEWS ON EDUCATION?

First and foremost, education is an issue parental responsibility. Children are born not into "society" nor into an education system, but into a family. A few years ago, my wife and I started home schooling our children, and it was a decision we will never regret.

Secondly, nowhere in the United States Constitution is the Federal government authorized to expend even one penny on education. Please see my position statement regarding the Department of Education.

DO YOU SUPPORT THE HUMAN LIFE AMENDMENT?

To give the United States government the power to define life is to give it the power to define certain people out from the rights inherent to life. Again it is wholly unnecessary, inappropriate and potentially dangerous. Our Declaration claimed that all men were endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights. One such right was the right to Life. This right is unalienable and therefore not within the proper purview of any human government.

AREN'T YOU AGAINST ABORTION?

Yes – absolutely; categorically; no exceptions; all nine months – however you want to say it. Abortion is a national disgrace that must be immediately ended. So why, when the power is within the President, would we await the Amendment process (and risk it failing)? It was more than 30 years ago that pro-life Congressmen have been promising to end *Roe v. Wade*, and yet it still stands. You must ask yourself, "Are they serious about ending abortion?" A tree is known by its fruits, and there is no good fruit coming out of Congress. Please view my speech given at the 2004 March for Life and/or read my statements made at my announcement.

BUT WITHOUT AN AMENDMENT, ISN'T ROE V. WADE STILL LAW?

Conspicuously absent from the Supremacy Clause of the U.S. Constitution in Article VI, §2 are judicial proceedings. Rather, only laws made in pursuance to the United States Constitution are the Supreme Law of the Land. The President of the United States has an obligation under Article IV, §4 to secure to each member state that the United States will be Republican in Form. Roe v. Wade was decided by a rogue Judiciary.

It is an Oath-bound obligation, therefore, of the Chief Executor of the Laws of the United States to refuse to enforce Roe v. Wade as law, since it is not Law – it is a mere Judicial Proceeding. By enforcing Roe v. Wade, the President is violating his Oath of Office.

Restore the Republic

WOULD YOU BEGIN THE IMMEDIATE PULL-OUT OF ALL MILITARY FROM IRAQ?

Simply yes. We will begin the immediate removal of all troops, in all 152 countries in which they are presently engaged in “police action” or active warfare, under United States command or foreign command. It is that simple. I provided to www.vote-smart.org the following statement:

Article I §8 of the U.S. Constitution does not grant to Congress the power of “nation building.” No where in the entire charter was any branch of Government, not even the President, granted the authority to intermeddle with the affairs of one nation for the benefit of these United States. If I am elected President, I will heed the advice of our first President, George Washington, given in his Farewell Address of September 19, 1796:

Observe good faith and justice toward all Nations. Cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct; and can it be that good policy does not also enjoin it?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular Nations and passionate attachment for others should be excluded ...

The Great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign Nations is in extending our commercial relations to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements let them be fulfilled, with perfect good faith. Here, let us stop.

American foreign policy will no longer include so many foreign entanglements, and the children within these United States will not be committed to engage in a war to “free” any people. No longer will these United States seek regime change nor the concept of spreading democracy through warfare.

WHAT ARE YOUR VIEWS ON TAXES?

As Justice Marshall said, “The power to tax involves the power to kill.” State and federal governments “get you” when you earn a living by a confiscatory tax on your income. The only way to evade that tax is to become jobless. While not the federal government, State and local governments tax your property. Since you are a physical being, you must reside somewhere. The only way to evade that tax is to become homeless, or cease to exist.

The two keys of governmental taxation in America are taxations on necessity – you have to work and you have to live somewhere. Such taxation is contradictory to the dignity of human life – and unconstitutional. The Congress was never authorized to commit a direct taxation.

Furthermore, since some people earn more, and others own more, they pay more in taxation but receive no greater benefit or rights from the government. This is taxation without representation.

What is more offensive, those who are “on the dole” have representation without taxation, which is as offensive to American governance as the cry of our Founders.

HOW WILL YOU FUND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT?

If the United States government would resolve itself to do nothing more than what is Constitutionally permissible, it could easily be funded with an import tariff. Perchance there is a deficit, the Constitutional remedy would be to apportion the deficit amongst the states.

ARE YOU “TOUGH ON CRIME?”

The United States Constitution only gave the Federal government power over three areas – the punishment of counterfeiting, felonies on the high seas and treason. Everything else is properly within the jurisdiction of state and local governments.

However, it is inherently contradictory to the dignity of human liberty to cage a man for his life as punishment. I would encourage the States to establish Justice in their criminal system by establishing the policy that crimes should be remedied by restitution or execution.

DO YOU SUPPORT A POPULAR VOTE OR THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE?

One of the genius actions of our Founders was the creation of the Electoral College. But that has been perverted by vocal minorities on consolidated population centers. However, the solution is not to move toward a popular vote. It is rather to embrace the Electoral College as it was conceived.

Do you remember that USA Today red and blue map after the 2000 elections? It was the major cities in the States of New York, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, &c. that made those States cast 100% of their electoral vote to the Democrat nominee. If the States would honor their local principles, they could simply apportion their electors by Congressional District. That way, one heavily partisan population center cannot impose its opinion on the rest of the State.

WILL YOU SECURE THE BORDERS?

Please see my filmed position statements on immigration. However, briefly I can tell you this ... the borders will be secure. If necessary, I will build a wall on the Southern border to prevent illegal aliens from overrunning our Southwest, putting an enormous burden on the border States.

The INS will be required to deport any illegal alien upon finding him within these United States.

HOW MUCH PROPERTY SHOULD THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OWN?

No more that what is Constitutionally permissible, which is to say whatever is necessary to house our military and the 10 square miles that now composes Washington, D.C. Thus, the livelihood the citizens will be secured from a federal take-over of their land.

*For more information and the most recent articles,
visit us online at www.Peroutka2004.com*