










# Values Voter Report - Republican Primary

Except as noted answers are from the Values Voter Debate held on September 17, 2007 in Fort Lauderdale, FL. A full transcript of this debate can be found at [www.valuesvoterdebate.com](http://www.valuesvoterdebate.com).




<p><b>Candidate and Issue</b> Those who participated in the debate are listed first alphabetically followed by the other major candidates</p>	<p><b>Marriage</b> If elected, will you support a Federal Marriage Amendment? And what else will you do to protect the institution of marriage?</p>	<p><b>Life (Abortion)</b> If elected, what will you do to make our laws consistent with our science and restore legal protection and full rights of personhood to every American waiting to be born?</p>
<p><b>John Cox</b> Businessman from Illinois</p> 	<p>I'M VERY HAPPILY MARRIED AND MY LOVELY WIFE IS WATCHING RIGHT NOW WITH MY TWO AND A HALF-YEAR-OLD DAUGHTER. AND YES, I HAVE ONLY BEEN MISTAKEN FOR THE GRANDFATHER FIVE TIMES SO [LAUGHTER] BUT, SERIOUSLY, MARRIAGE IS ABOUT PROTECTING CHILDREN. THAT IS WHAT IT'S ALL ABOUT. THE EFFORT BY THE HOMOSEXUAL LOBBY IS ALL ABOUT TRYING TO GET THE GOVERNMENT TO RECOGNIZE A RELATIONSHIP THAT EXISTS BETWEEN THEM AND HAVE IT VALIDATED AND HAVE IT BENEFITED BY GOVERNMENT LARGESS.</p> <p>WHAT WE NEED TO DO IS CERTAINLY TALK ABOUT FAITH. BUT WE NEED TO TALK ABOUT COMMON SENSE. WE NEED TO TALK ABOUT THE IDEALS OF PROTECTING CHILDREN AND THAT'S SO IMPORTANT TO THE FUTURE OF OUR COUNTRY. BECAUSE, LET'S FACE IT. WITHOUT CHILDREN WE DON'T HAVE A COUNTRY GOING FORWARD. TALK TO CHINA. THEIR ONE CHILD POLICY IS REALLY GOING TO LEAD TO THE DESTRUCTION OF THAT COUNTRY. WE NEED TO HAVE A MARRIAGE AMENDMENT. AND YOU KNOW WHAT? THAT'S A GOOD EXERCISE IN THIS COUNTRY. BECAUSE, AS THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, I WILL TRAVEL EVERYWHERE TO ARGUE THAT MARRIAGE IS COMMON SENSE. IT PROTECTS CHILDREN AND WE OUGHT TO CONTINUE TO JUSTIFY IT AND HONOR IT AND KEEP IT THE INSTITUTION IT SHOULD BE FOR THE PROTECTION OF CHILDREN.</p>	<p>THIS ISSUE TEARS THIS COUNTRY APART AND IT SHOULDN'T. I'M A CHRISTIAN. MOST OF YOU, IF NOT ALL OF YOU, ARE CHRISTIANS OR JEWS. WE BELIEVE IN THE RIGHT TO LIFE. BUT WE NEED TO TALK TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ABOUT RESPONSIBILITY. YOU KNOW, IN 1955 MY MOTHER ALREADY HAD A CHILD. AND SHE CONCEIVED ME. AND MY REAL FATHER WALKED OUT. IF ABORTION HAD BEEN LEGAL IN 1955, I WOULDN'T BE STANDING HERE BEFORE YOU TODAY. THIS IS PERSONAL TO ME. BUT, IT IS ABOUT RESPONSIBILITY. MY MOTHER TOOK RESPONSIBILITY FOR ME. AND SHE IS GLAD SHE DID AND I'M GLAD SHE DID. AND MY CHILDREN ARE GLAD SHE DID AND THAT'S WHAT WE NEED TO TALK ABOUT ON THIS ISSUE WITH THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.</p> <p>I, TOO, WILL MAKE SURE THAT I APPOINT JUDGES THAT DON'T MAKE THE LAW BUT WILL INTERPRET IT ONLY. WE FOUGHT A REVOLUTION 230 YEARS AGO AGAINST A DICTATOR, A KING WHO TRIED TO DICTATE TO US WHAT WE WERE GOING TO BELIEVE. WE NEED TO END THE REIGN OF THE ACTIVIST JUDGES AND RESTORE SOME SANITY TO THE RIGHT TO LIFE.</p>
<p><b>Mike Huckabee</b> Former Governor of Arkansas</p> 	<p>WELL, I WOULD TRY TO DO THE SAME THINGS I DID AS GOVERNOR OF ARKANSAS. WHERE I LED A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT THAT WAS PASSED OVERWHELMINGLY BY OUR VOTERS THAT AFFIRMED WHAT MARRIAGE IS. MARRIAGE IS A RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ONE MAN, ONE WOMAN FOR LIFE. I ALSO BELIEVE THAT WE NEED TO DO OTHER THINGS. I DECLARED A STATE OF MARITAL EMERGENCY IN OUR STATE. CALL PASTORS AND OTHER CLERGY TOGETHER TO COMMIT TO COMMUNITY MARRIAGE POLICIES. TO NOT ENGAGE IN CARRYING ON MARRIAGES UNLESS THEY HAVE COUNSELED WITH A COUPLE BEFOREHAND.</p> <p>WE WERE ONE OF THE FEW STATES THAT PASSED THE COVENANT MARRIAGE BILL IN ARKANSAS. WE ALSO TRIED TO PASS TAX POLICIES THAT FAVORED THE FAMILY BY ELIMINATING THINGS LIKE THE MARRIAGE PENALTY AND INCREASING THE CHILD TAX CARE CREDIT SO THAT FAMILIES AREN'T PENALIZED FOR THE RESULT OF THEIR MARRIAGE. I WOULD SUPPORT STRONGLY AND LEAD. NOT JUST SUPPORT, BUT LEAD AN EFFORT TO HAVE A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO AFFIRM MARRIAGE AS ONE MAN ONE WOMAN FOR LIFE.</p>	<p>IT IS OBVIOUS THAT ALL OF US ON THIS STAGE ARE PRO-LIFE. I THINK THERE IS A REASON THERE ARE FOUR EMPTY PODIUMS HERE TONIGHT. THERE ARE SOME FOLKS WHO WOULDN'T BE REAL COMFORTABLE WITH THAT QUESTION. BUT, THE REASON I'M COMFORTABLE WITH IT IS BECAUSE I'M NOT A PERSON WHO BECAME PRO-LIFE BECAUSE I GOT INTO POLITICS. I'M LIKE A LOT OF YOU. I GOT INTO POLITICS BECAUSE I'M PRO-LIFE.</p> <p>AND, I BELIEVE ON THIS ISSUE OUR CULTURE RISES OR FALLS. BECAUSE IT REALLY SAYS EVERYTHING THAT WE ARE AS A CIVILIZATION. AS TO WHETHER OR NOT WE VALUE THE INTRINSIC WORTH AND VALUE OF EVERY SINGLE INDIVIDUAL HUMAN BEING. THAT IS WHY WE ARE LOOKING FOR SIX COAL MINERS IN THE WOMB OF A MINE IN HUNTINGTON, UTAH. AND THAT IS THE REASON WE HAVE A RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT THE LIVES IN THE WOMB OF THE MOTHER OR THE LIVES OF THOSE OUTSIDE THAT WOMB FROM CONCEPTION UNTIL NATURAL CONCLUSION OF HUMAN LIFE.</p>
<p><b>Duncan Hunter</b> Congressman from California</p> 	<p>YOU KNOW, I THINK RON (PAUL), IT'S TRUE IT'S A STATE LAW THAT IS -- THAT IDENTIFIES MARRIAGE. BUT IT ACCOMMODATES THE JUDEO-CHRISTIAN TRADITIONS OF OUR COUNTRY. THAT'S WHY IT IS SO IMPORTANT THAT WE HAVE THAT LAW THAT ACCOMMODATES THOSE JUDEO-CHRISTIAN TRADITIONS, THAT MAINTAINS WHAT IS PROBABLY THE MOST IMPORTANT INSTITUTION IN THIS COUNTRY, WHICH IS A FAMILY, THE MOST IMPORTANT INSTITUTION THAT WE HAVE.</p> <p>YOU KNOW, I'M REMINDED OF THAT STORY ABOUT THE FAMILY THAT WAS OFF THE COAST OF NEW JERSEY AND THEY WERE PUSHED OUT BY A RIP TIDE. AND THE DAD TOLD HIS LITTLE DAUGHTER "I'M GOING TO HAVE TO TAKE THE SON IN, I CAN'T CARRY YOU BOTH IN. YOU CAN FLOAT ON YOUR BACK ALL DAY, I'LL BE OUT FOR YOU." AND, WHEN THE RESCUERS PICKED THAT LITTLE GIRL UP HOURS LATER, SHE SAID TO THEM, "MY DADDY TOLD ME I COULD FLOAT ON MY BACK ALL DAY." THAT CONFIDENCE THAT MARRIAGE GIVES OUR CHILDREN, THAT MOMS AND DADS GIVES OUR CHILDREN CAN'T BE DUPLICATED BY GOVERNMENT. WE NEED A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO MAINTAIN THE MARRIAGE.</p>	<p>THE FIRST THING I WOULD DO IS PASS THE HUNTER BILL, WHICH STATES THAT LIFE DOES BEGIN AT CONCEPTION. YOU KNOW, THE SECOND THING IS SIMPLY THIS. AND I'VE SAID THIS IN EVERY SPEECH I HAVE MADE IN THIS RUN FOR THE PRESIDENCY.</p> <p>IF A JUDICIAL CANDIDATE CAN LOOK AT A SONOGRAM OF AN UNBORN CHILD AND NOT SEE A VALUABLE HUMAN LIFE, I WILL NOT APPOINT THAT JUDICIAL CANDIDATE TO THE FEDERAL BENCH. IT'S AS SIMPLE AS THAT!</p>




<b>Candidate and Issue</b>	<b>Marriage</b> If elected, will you support a Federal Marriage Amendment? And what else will you do to protect the institution of marriage?	<b>Life (Abortion)</b> If elected, what will you do to make our laws consistent with our science and restore legal protection and full rights of personhood to every American waiting to be born?
<p><b>Alan Keyes</b> Former Special Ambassador to the United Nations</p> 	<p>FIRST OF ALL, I THINK IT'S QUITE EVIDENT THAT WE NEED A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT FROM WHAT WE SEE GOING ON RIGHT NOW. THE FOLKS WHO HAVE GOTTEN THEMSELVES SUPPOSEDLY MARRIED, AS GAY COUPLES GOING INTO OTHER STATES DEMANDING THAT THESE MARRIAGES BE RECOGNIZED USING THINGS LIKE THE FULL FAITH AND CREDIT CLAUSE TO REQUIRE THAT EVERY STATE IN THE UNION RECOGNIZE THE ACTION THAT HAS BEEN TAKEN BY THIS LEGISLATURE OR IN FACT IN MASSACHUSETTS ARBITRARILY BY JUDGES AND THEN BY MITT ROMNEY WHO REFUSED TO ACKNOWLEDGE WHAT THE COURT HAD ACTUALLY SAID, WHICH WAS NOT THAT YOU HAVE TO PERFORM SUCH MARRIAGES, BUT THAT THE LAW SHOULD BE REVISED. HE SINGLE HANDEDLY IS RESPONSIBLE FOR BRINGING THEM ON.</p> <p>BUT THE SIMPLE FACT OF THE MATTER IS IF WE DON'T TAKE ACTION AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL, THEN OUR GOVERNMENT WILL HAVE DEFAULTED IN ITS RESPECT FOR ONE OF OUR MOST PRECIOUS UNALIENABLE RIGHTS, WHICH IS THE RIGHT TO RESPECT GOD'S GOD-GIVEN INSTITUTION OF THE NATURAL FAMILY. ABANDON GOD WITH RESPECT FOR THE FAMILY AND WE HAVE NO CLAIM TO RIGHTS.</p>	<p>I THINK THE FIRST AND MOST IMPORTANT THING WE WOULD DO IS TO CHAMPION AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION THAT MAKES IT CRYSTAL CLEAR THAT THE RIGHT TO LIFE OF ALL HUMAN BEINGS, FROM CONCEPTION TO NATURAL DEATH, MUST BE RESPECTED. IT IS SIMPLE, IT IS CLEAR. IT MUST BE DONE. WE ALSO NEED TO REITERATE THE TRUTH. IN THE PRE AM MR. TO OUR CONSTITUTION, IT MAKES IT CLEAR THE ULTIMATE AIM OF OUR GOVERNMENT IS TO SECURE THE BLESSINGS OF LIBERTY TO OURSELVES AND OUR POSTERITY.</p> <p>POSTERITY INCLUDES MANY WE CAN'T EVEN IMAGINE WHO HAVE NOT YET BEEN BORN. SURELY IT INCLUDES THOSE WHO ARE SLEEPING IN THE WOMB. I WOULD ISSUE AN EXECUTIVE ORDER IMMEDIATELY GRANTING THE FULL PROTECTION OF THE PRESIDENCY IN EVERY ELEMENT OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH TO THE LIFE IN THE WOMB. AND, FINALLY, I WOULD MAKE SURE THAT NO JUDGES WERE APPOINTED TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES WHO DOES NOT STRICTLY RESPECT ITS MANDATE TO SECURE THE LIBERTIES OF OUR POSTERITY.</p>
<p><b>Ron Paul</b> Congressman from Texas</p> 	<p>I THINK THE BEST THING A PRESIDENT CAN DO IS SET A GOOD EXAMPLE. AND, I WOULD START WITH HAVING BEEN MARRIED 50 YEARS AND PROUD OF IT. I BELIEVE ALSO THAT I DO NOT SEE ANY NEED FOR ANOTHER CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. I THINK WE HAVE FALLEN INTO A TRAP THAT WE HAVE TO REDEFINE MARRIAGE. WE ARE ON THE DEFENSIVE DEFINING MARRIAGE. WHY DON'T YOU JUST TELL THEM TO LOOK IT UP IN A DICTIONARY TO FIND OUT WHAT A MARRIAGE SAYS. [APPLAUSE]</p> <p>FOR FEDERAL LEGAL PURPOSES, THE DEFENSE OF MARRIAGE ACT IS PROPER. IT TAKES CARE OF ALL THE PROBLEMS. IF YOU HAVE TO HAVE RULES AND REGULATIONS, PUT IT AT THE STATE LEVEL, LIKE THE CONSTITUTION SAYS. BUT, YOU KNOW, MARRIAGE ONLY CAME ABOUT AND GETTING LICENSES ONLY CAME ABOUT IN RECENT HISTORY FOR HEALTH REASONS. IT HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH IT. TRUE CHRISTIANS BELIEVE THAT MARRIAGE IS A CHURCH FUNCTION, IT'S NOT A STATE FUNCTION. I DON'T THINK YOU NEED A LICENSE TO GET MARRIED. WE SHOULD DEFINE IT.</p>	<p>AS AN OB DOCTOR FOR 30 YEARS AND HAVING DELIVERED 4000 BABIES, I CAN ASSURE YOU LIFE BEGINS AT CONCEPTION. I AM LEGALLY RESPONSIBLE FOR THE UNBORN, NO MATTER WHAT I DO. SO THERE IS A LEGAL LIFE THERE. THE UNBORN HAS INHERITANCE RIGHTS AND IF THERE IS AN INJURY OR KILLING THERE IS LEGAL ENTITY. THERE IS NO DOUBT ABOUT IT. I AM SURPRISED THAT I DON'T HAVE MORE CO-SPONSORS FOR THE "SANCTITY OF LIFE ACT" THAT I HAVE WE HAVE WHICH WOULD SOLVE ALL THESE PROBLEMS AND WOULD HAVE ELIMINATED A LOT OF ABORTIONS BY NOW IF WE'D HAVE PASSED IT AND WE WOULDN'T NEED ANY AMENDMENT. IT REMOVES THE JURISDICTION FROM THE FEDERAL COURTS.</p> <p>THAT THE STATES WERE ALLOWED TO PASS THIS IMMEDIATELY IT WOULD GO INTO EFFECT. INSTEAD OF WAITING YEARS AND YEARS AND YEARS FOR AN AMENDMENT THIS WOULD HAPPEN IMMEDIATELY BY A MAJORITY VOTE IN THE CONGRESS AND A PRESIDENT'S SIGNATURE. THERE IS MUCH EASIER WAYS TO ACCOMPLISH THIS BY FOLLOWING WHAT OUR CONSTITUTION DIRECTS US TO DO INSTEAD OF LOOKING FOR MASSIVE NEW LAWS. LET'S JUST USE WHAT WE HAVE AND PASS THIS LEGISLATION.</p>
<p><b>Rudy Giuliani</b> Former Mayor of New York City</p> 	<p>Q: You said that if DOMA were to fail, or states began to legalize gay marriage, you would [withdraw your opposition to] a constitutional amendment banning gay marriage.</p> <p>A: I do not believe under the state that presently exists, with the Defense of Marriage Act and basically one state that has by judicial fiat created same-sex marriage--I don't think we need a constitutional amendment at this point. If a lot of states start to do that--5 or 6 states--then we should have a constitutional amendment. (Source: 2007 GOP primary debate in Orlando, Florida Oct 21, 2007)</p>	<p>Q: If hypothetically, Roe v. Wade was overturned, and the Congress passed a federal ban on all abortions and it came to your desk, would you sign it?</p> <p>A: I probably would not sign it. I would leave it to the states to make that decision. I think that the problem with Roe against Wade is that it took the decision away from the states. (Source: 2007 GOP YouTube debate in St. Petersburg, Florida Nov 28, 2007)</p> <p>I believe the best way we can have common ground in this debate that you're hearing is if we put our emphasis on reducing abortions and increasing the number of adoptions, which is something that I did as mayor of New York City. But I think ultimately that decision that has to be made is one that government shouldn't make. Ultimately, a woman should make that with her conscience and ultimately with her doctor. (Source: 2007 GOP Iowa Straw Poll debate Aug 5, 2007)</p>




Rudy Giuliani received several invitations to the Values Voter Presidential Debate. However, he chose to not participate; Senator Sam Brownback and Congressman Tom Tancredo were also in this debate, but have subsequently dropped out of the race.




Candidate and Issue	Marriage	Life (Abortion)
<p><b>John McCain</b> U.S. Senator From Arizona</p> 	<p><b>WALLACE:</b> Question, Senator McCain, will you vote for or against the federal marriage amendment when it comes up before the Senate in June?</p> <p><b>MCCAIN:</b> I will vote against it because I believe very strongly that in a — first of all, on the sanctity of union between man and woman, but I also believe that the states should make these decisions.</p> <p>The states regulate the conditions of marriage, and unless there's some decisive overruling by the federal courts, then I will continue to believe that the states should decide.</p> <p>We in Arizona should make our decisions about the status of marriage in our state just as the people in Massachusetts and other states should make their decisions. (Source: Fox News Sunday with Chris Wallace, May 22, 2006)</p>	<p>Q: In 1999, you said, "In the short term, or even the long term, I would not support repeal of Roe vs. Wade, which would then force X number of women in American to undergo illegal and dangerous operations." A: That was in the context of conversation about having to change the culture of America as regards to this issue. I have stated time after time after time that Roe v. Wade was a bad decision, that I support the rights of the unborn.</p> <p>Q: If Roe v. Wade was overturned during a McCain presidency, and individual states chose to ban abortion, would you be concerned that, as you said, X number of women in America would undergo illegal and dangerous operations? A: No, I would hope that X women in America would bring those children into life in this world, and that I could do whatever I could to assist them. Again, that conversation from 1999, so often quoted, was in the context of my concerns about changing the culture in America to understand the importance of the rights of the unborn. (Source: Meet the Press: 2007 "Meet the Candidates" series May 13, 2007)</p>
<p><b>Mitt Romney</b> Former Governor From Massachusetts</p> 	<p>I've been in a state that has gay marriage, and I recognize that the consequences of gay marriage fall far beyond just the relationship between a man and a woman. They also relate to our kids and the right of religion to be practiced freely in a society.</p> <p>The status of marriage, if it's allowed among the same sex individuals in one state is going to spread to the entire nation. And that's why it's important to have a national standard for marriage. And I'm committed to making sure that we reinforce the institution of marriage in this country by insisting that all states have a right to have marriage as defined as between a man and a woman; and we don't have unelected judges saying we're going to impose same-sex marriage where it was clearly not in their state constitution.</p> <p>My state's constitution was written by John Adams. It isn't there. I've looked. The people need to speak on this issue and make sure that marriage is preserved as between a man and a woman. (Source: 2007 GOP primary debate in Orlando, Florida Oct 21, 2007)</p>	<p>Q: If hypothetically, Roe v. Wade was overturned, and the Congress passed a federal ban on all abortions and it came to your desk, would you sign it?</p> <p>A: Let me say it. I'd be delighted to sign that bill. But that's not where we are. That's not where America is today. Where America is is ready to overturn Roe v. Wade and return to the states that authority. But if the Congress got there, we had that kind of consensus in that country, terrific (Source: 2007 GOP YouTube debate in St. Petersburg, Florida Nov 28, 2007)</p> <p>"On a personal basis, I don't favor abortion," he said. "However, as governor of the commonwealth, I will protect a woman's right to choose under the laws of the country and the commonwealth. That's the same position I've had for many years." (Source: Erik Arvidson, Lowell Sun, March 20, 2002)</p>
<p><b>Fred Thompson</b> Former Senator From Tennessee</p> 	<p>Q: With gay marriage, the Associated Press reports: "Thompson favors a constitutional amendment that bars judges from legalizing gay marriage, but also leaves open the door for state legislatures to approve the practice." So if a state said, "We want to have gay marriages in our state," you would be OK with that?</p> <p>A: Yes. Marriage is between a man and a woman. Nobody ever thought that that was contested until recently, and we've had a couple judges in a couple states decide to turn all that on its head. I would support a constitutional amendment that addresses this judge-created problem, and say judges can't do that. But, at the end of the day, if a state legislature and a governor decide that that's what they want to do, yes, they should have the freedom to do what Fred Thompson thinks is a very bad idea. (Source: Meet the Press: 2007 "Meet the Candidates" series Nov 4, 2007)</p>	<p>Q: You said in 1994 as a Senate candidate, "I'm not willing to support laws that prohibit early-term abortions. I'm not suddenly upon election as a senator going to know when life begins. It comes down to whether you believe life begins at conception. I don't know in my own mind if that is the case so I don't feel the law ought to impose that standard on other people." So you yourself don't know when life begins? A: No. I didn't know then.</p> <p>Q: You know now? A: My public position has always been the same. I've been 100% pro-life in every vote that I've ever cast.</p> <p>Q: Do you believe that life begins at conception, so abortion is the taking of a human life? A: Yes, I do.</p> <p>Q: But you would allow abortion to be performed in states if chosen by states for people who think otherwise? A: I do not think that you can have a law that cuts off an age group or something like that. It cannot change the way I feel about it morally, but legally and practically, I've got to recognize that fact. (Source: Meet the Press: 2007 "Meet the Candidates" series Nov 4, 2007)</p>




John McCain, Mitt Romney, and Fred Thompson all received several invitations to the Values Voter Presidential Debate, but chose to not participate




<b>Candidate and Issue</b>	<b>Radical Islam (Terrorism)</b> What would be your strategy to protect our streets, our people, and our American way of life from the designs of radical Islam?	<b>N. American Union / Globalism</b> Will you assure us that you will abolish all plans to promote the economic integration of North America, which consists of open borders among the U.S., Canada, and Mexico?
<p><b>John Cox</b>                      Businessman from Illinois</p>  <p>www.cox2008.com                      877-234-3800</p>	<p>I AGREE WITH TOM AND MIKE THAT WE ARE FACING THE STEEPEST TEST TO OUR FUTURE AS A COUNTRY. BUT YOU KNOW WHAT? WE HAVE FACED THESE TESTS BEFORE. IN THE 40s, FIGHTING HITLER, A MEGALOMANIAC WHO USED RELIGION TO GET PEOPLE TO FOLLOW HIM AND WHO DIDN'T HESITATE TO KILL 6 MILLION INNOCENT JEWS. WE'VE GOT TO FIGHT THIS WITH EVERY BREATH OF OUR BEING. BUT YOU KNOW WHAT? WE ALSO HAVE TO MAKE SURE THAT WE KILL THE BAD GUYS.</p> <p>BUT, WE ALSO TALK ABOUT SPREADING PROSPERITY AROUND THE WORLD. I DON'T KNOW IF WE'LL GET A CHANCE TO TALK ABOUT IRAQ. BUT, YOU KNOW WHAT, YOU'VE GOT TO REPLACE EVIL WITH SOMETHING ELSE. WITH GOOD. YOU KNOW THERE IS A THIN LAYER OF ISLAM THAT IS USING OIL AND LET ME TELL YOU. IRAQ IS ABOUT OIL. IF SADDAM DIDN'T HAVE OIL, HE WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN A THREAT TO THE UNITED STATES. WE'VE GOT TO GET THAT OIL PUMPING. WE'VE GOT TO GET THE IRAQIS PROSPEROUS. WE'VE GOTTA GET THEM TO BELIEVE IN THEIR GOVERNMENT SO WE CAN GET OUR TROOPS HOME, SO WE CAN CLAIM VICTORY AGAINST THESE JIHADISTS THAT WOULD USE RELIGION TO KILL INNOCENT PEOPLE.</p>	<p>MRS. SCHLAFLY, I'M PROUD OF THE FACT THAT WE'RE BOTH FROM ILLINOIS. IT GIVES ME GREAT COMFORT TONIGHT, ESPECIALLY WHEN I HEAR THAT OBAMA AND CLINTON ARE ALSO FROM ILLINOIS. [BOOS] I, TOO, WILL NEVER SURRENDER THE SOVEREIGNTY OF THE UNITED STATES. WE ABSOLUTELY HAVE TO SECURE THE BORDERS. WE HAVE TO ADDRESS THE ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION PROBLEM. WE HAVE TO DO IT BY PUTTING SOME CEOS IN JAIL. WE HAVE TO START ENFORCING THE LAW AGAINST EMPLOYING ILLEGAL ALIENS. THAT IS GOING TO SOLVE THE PROBLEM. BUT WE HAVE TO MAKE SURE WE HAVE TRADE WITH OTHER COUNTRIES. SO I'M NOT INTERESTED IN GIVING UP OUR SOVEREIGNTY, BUT I AM INTERESTED IN OPENING UP CHANNELS OF TRADE.</p> <p>BECAUSE YOU KNOW WHAT? WE BENEFIT WHEN WE SELL MICROSOFT SOFTWARE AND WE SELL CELL PHONES MADE BY MOTOROLA. ANOTHER GOOD ILLINOIS COMPANY, AROUND THE WORLD. AND TRADE IS ALSO A WEAPON OF PEACE. YOU KNOW YOU ARE NOT GOING TO BOMB YOUR MOST IMPORTANT CUSTOMER. YOU ARE NOT GOING TO INVADE YOUR MOST IMPORTANT SUPPLIER. SO WE HAVE GOT TO MAKE SURE THAT WE INCREASE TRADE AROUND THE WORLD. BUT WE ALSO HAVE TO MAKE SURE WE RETAIN OUR NATIONAL SOV-EIREIGNTY</p>
<p><b>Mike Huckabee</b>                      Former Governor of Arkansas</p>  <p>www.mikehuckabee.com                      501-324-2008</p>	<p>THE THREAT WE FACE IS ONE A LOT OF AMERICANS DON'T FULLY COMPREHEND OR UNDERSTAND. THIS ISN'T A TYPICAL GEOPOLITICAL WAR. IT IS A WAR AGAINST AN ENEMY THAT HAS NO NATIONAL BORDERS OR BOUNDARIES, AND IT IS NOT A WAR WE ARE FIGHTING OVER A BORDER OR BOUNDARY. IT IS A THEOLOGICAL WAR. IT'S NOT POLITICALLY CORRECT TO SAY THAT, IT'S JUST THE TRUTH. WE ARE FIGHTING PEOPLE WHOSE RELIGIOUS FANATICISM WILL NOT BE SATISFIED UNTIL EVERY ONE OF US IS DEAD. IT IS THE PERFECT MARRIAGE OF RELIGION AND STATE. AND THAT IS WHY IT IS SO INCREDIBLY DANGEROUS. MORE SO THAN ANY ENEMY WE FACE.</p> <p>AND HERE'S THE REALITY. WAR IS ABOUT WILL. WHOEVER CHOOSES TO LEAVE, LOSES. WE CANNOT AFFORD TO LOSE. BECAUSE THIS IS NOT A WAR ABOUT IRAQ. IT IS NOT A WAR ABOUT AFGHANISTAN. IT IS A WAR ABOUT OUR SURVIVAL AS A CIVILIZATION AND AS A PEOPLE. AND EVERY EFFORT MUST BE MADE TO DEFEND THIS GREAT COUNTRY AGAINST IT</p>	<p>THE THREAT WE FACE IS ONE A LOT OF AMERICANS DON'T FULLY COMPREHEND OR UNDERSTAND. THIS ISN'T A TYPICAL GEOPOLITICAL WAR. IT IS A WAR AGAINST AN ENEMY THAT HAS NO NATIONAL BORDERS OR BOUNDARIES, AND IT IS NOT A WAR WE ARE FIGHTING OVER A BORDER OR BOUNDARY. IT IS A THEOLOGICAL WAR. IT'S NOT POLITICALLY CORRECT TO SAY THAT, IT'S JUST THE TRUTH. WE ARE FIGHTING PEOPLE WHOSE RELIGIOUS FANATICISM WILL NOT BE SATISFIED UNTIL EVERY ONE OF US IS DEAD. IT IS THE PERFECT MARRIAGE OF RELIGION AND STATE. AND THAT IS WHY IT IS SO INCREDIBLY DANGEROUS. MORE SO THAN ANY ENEMY WE FACE.</p> <p>AND HERE'S THE REALITY. WAR IS ABOUT WILL. WHOEVER CHOOSES TO LEAVE, LOSES. WE CANNOT AFFORD TO LOSE. BECAUSE THIS IS NOT A WAR ABOUT IRAQ. IT IS NOT A WAR ABOUT AFGHANISTAN. IT IS A WAR ABOUT OUR SURVIVAL AS A CIVILIZATION AND AS A PEOPLE. AND EVERY EFFORT MUST BE MADE TO DEFEND THIS GREAT COUNTRY AGAINST IT</p>
<p><b>Duncan Hunter</b>                      Congressman from California</p>  <p>www.gohunter08.com                      619-463-3896</p>	<p>YOU KNOW THE LAST TWO NATIONS THAT THE UNITED STATES SAVED BEFORE 9/11 WERE TWO MUSLIM NATIONS. SO, TO MY FRIEND RON PAUL, DON'T BLAME AMERICA FIRST!</p> <p>NOW, HERE'S WHAT WE HAVE GOT TO DO. WE LIVE IN AN ERA OF TERRORISTS WITH TECHNOLOGY. THAT MEANS WE HAVE TO CUT OFF EVERY BUSINESS THAT WOULD SELL KILLING TECHNOLOGY TO NATIONS IN THE MIDDLE EAST THAT MIGHT MOVE IT TO NATIONS OR TO GROUPS THAT MIGHT USE IT AGAINST US. WE HAVE TO LOCKDOWN THE BORDER. THAT MEANS FINISHING MY BORDER FENCE. ALL 854 MILES THAT I LEGISLATED THAT THE PRESIDENT SIGNED OCTOBER 26TH AND HAS ONLY BUILT 17.9 MILES. AND LASTLY, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, WE HAVE TO LEAVE IRAQ IN VICTORY.</p>	<p>I'VE GOT AN IDEA FOR A REAL NORTH AMERICAN UNION AND THAT WOULD HAVE BEEN IF CANADA AND MEXICO, WHEN AMERICA SADDLED UP AND SENT OUR MARINES AND OUR SOLDIERS INTO IRAQ INTO HARM'S WAY, IF THEY HAD STOOD WITH US INSTEAD OF RUNNING AWAY FROM US. THAT WOULD HAVE BEEN A REAL NORTH AMERICAN UNION.</p> <p>NOW, LET ME TELL YOU. THIS ISN'T FREE TRADE. IT IS ONLY FREE TRADE IN ONE DIRECTION. CHINA IS MOVING MASSIVE AMOUNTS OF GOODS INTO THIS COUNTRY, DISPLACING AMERICAN JOBS. THEY'RE CHEATING ON TRADE BY DEVALUING THEIR CURRENCY BY MORE THAN 40% AND THAT IS SWEEPING AMERICAN PRODUCTS OFF THE SHELF AND TAKING AMERICAN JOBS AWAY. AND, THIS MASS OF TRUCKS THAT COME INTO THIS COUNTRY WILL REPRESENT EXPOSURE FROM TERRORISM. BECAUSE YOU ARE GOING TO HAVE MASSIVE CARGO CONTAINERS COMING IN. EXPOSURE FROM CRIMINAL ELEMENTS AND, LASTLY, THAT AMERICAN TRUCKING FAMILY WILL LOSE THEIR JOBS WITH THE MASSIVE NUMBER OF TRUCKS COMING IN WITH CHEAP LABOR AND CHEAP PARTS. NO ON THE NORTH AMERICAN UNION.</p>

<b>Candidate and Issue</b>	<b>Radical Islam (Terrorism)</b> What would be your strategy to protect our streets, our people, and our American way of life from the designs of radical Islam?	<b>N. American Union / Globalism</b> Will you assure us that you will abolish all plans to promote the economic integration of North America, which consists of open borders among the U.S., Canada, and Mexico?
<p><b>Alan Keyes</b> Former Special Ambassador to the United Nations</p>  <p>www.alankeyes.com 800-727-6142</p>	<p>I THINK THE FIRST THING WE HAVE TO UNDERSTAND AND WE OFTEN FORGET IT IS THE EFFORT AGAINST TERRORISM ISN'T ISOLATED FROM THE DEDICATION THAT YOU AND I ALL HAVE TO A FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPAL. WHICH IS THAT IT IS ORDAINED BY THE LAW AND WILL OF ALMIGHTY GOD. THAT INNOCENT HUMAN LIFE MUST BE RESPECTED.</p> <p>THE FIRST THING THAT WE NEED TO DO IN MAKING SURE THAT WE HAVE THE FIRMNESS AND THE CONFIDENCE TO PROSECUTE THE WAR ON TERROR IS TO MAKE SURE THAT WE UNDERSTAND THAT AS WE FIGHT AGAINST A KILLING OF INNOCENTS ABROAD AND IN 9/11 IN NEW YORK, WE MUST FIGHT AGAINST THE KILLING OF INNOCENCE IN THE WOMB. THE PRINCIPLE IS THE SAME. THE EVIL IS THE SAME. AND WE MUST STAND THE SAME AGAINST THAT. AND IN DOING THAT, WE MUST ENLIST THE AID OF EVERY HUMAN BEING OF CONSCIOUS. ISLAM IS NO EXCUSE FOR ABANDONING THAT WHICH WE HAVE AGREED UPON THROUGHOUT THE WORLD THAT EVERY NATION MUST RESPECT THE CLAIMS OF INNOCENT HUMAN LIFE.</p>	<p>THANK YOU. PHYLLIS, I THINK THE SIMPLE ANSWER TO YOUR QUESTION IS ALL OF THE PARTICULARS THAT YOU PRESENTED IS YES, I WOULD UNDO IT ALL. I BELIEVE IT REPRESENTS NOT JUST A SURRENDER OF OUR BORDERS. NOT JUST SOMETHING THAT INVOLVES US IN AN UNDERSTANDING OF TRADE THAT IS NOT FAIR TO OUR WORKERS, NOT FAIR TO OUR PEOPLE. IT IS THE BETRAYAL OF THE SOVEREIGNTY OF THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES. AND, BY THAT, I DON'T JUST MEAN SOVEREIGNTY ALONG THE BORDERS AND PHYSICAL CONTROL.</p> <p>WE HAVE ELITES WHO NO LONGER LISTEN TO US. WE SAY THAT WE WANT SECURE BORDERS FIRST AND THEY REFUSE TO GIVE THEM TO US. WE SAY THAT WE WANT RESPECT FOR THE SOVEREIGNTY OF THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES AND THEY REFUSE TO GIVE IT TO US. TIME AND TIME AGAIN, IT HAS BECOME CLEAR THAT SOMEWHERE ALONG THE WAY WE HAVE LOST CONTROL OF THOSE WHO ARE SUPPOSED TO REPRESENT THE SOVEREIGNTY OF OUR PEOPLE. FINAL POINT: WE NEED TO UNDERSTAND PART OF THE REASON WE ARE LOSING OUR OWN SOVEREIGNTY IS BECAUSE WE HAVE TURNED OUR BACKS ON THE SOVEREIGNTY OF ALMIGHTY GOD.</p>
<p><b>Ron Paul</b> Congressman from Texas</p>  <p>www.ronpaul2008.com 703-248-9115</p>	<p>WE, INDEED, DO HAVE A PROBLEM. BUT IF WE GO AT THIS INCORRECTLY WE ARE GOING TO DO MORE DAMAGE TO OURSELVES THAN WE ARE TO OUR ENEMIES. WE HAVE TO UNDERSTAND THE MOTIVES OF THOSE WHO COME HERE AND KILL US. AND, IF WE DON'T UNDERSTAND THAT WE ARE NOT GOING TO WIN THIS FIGHT. THEY COME HERE AND KILL US BECAUSE WE OCCUPY THEIR LANDS AND THEY RATIONALLY REASON AND COME AND SAY WE HAVE TO DO SOMETHING ABOUT IT. IF YOU ARE GOING TO REGULATE ISLAMIC THINKING IN THIS COUNTRY, BE CAREFUL. BECAUSE, ALL THE RULES YOU SET WILL BE USED AGAINST CHRISTIANS. TO PROTECT CIVIL LIBERTIES. IF YOU USE THE VIOLATION OF CIVIL LIBERTIES WHEN IT COMES TO HABEAS CORPUS AND SECRECY AND ALL, WE ARE GOING TO SUFFER FROM THIS.</p> <p>IF WE COULD HAVE DONE SOMETHING BEFORE 9/11, WE SHOULD HAVE GOTTEN THE GOVERNMENT OUT OF THE WAY ON REGULATING OUR AIRLINES. WE SHOULD HAVE HAD MORE RESPECT FOR PRIVATE PROPERTY, THE CONSTITUTION, AND ESPECIALLY THE SECOND AMENDMENT. AND, WE WOULDN'T HAVE HAD TO FACE THE CRISIS ON 9/11 NEARLY AS BAD. SO, INDEED, IT IS A PROBLEM. BUT THE ANSWER CAN BE FOUND IN THE CONSTITUTION, I CAN GUARANTEE YOU.</p>	<p>THIS IS AN EASY ONE FOR ME. NOT ONLY DO I NOT WANT A NORTH AMERICAN UNION, I WANT US OUT OF THE U.N., THE IMF, THE WORLD BANK, THE WTO, NAFTA, AND CAFTA. NAFTA HAS NOTHING TO DO FOR FREE TRADE. IT'S A PRETENSE TO LOWER TARIFFS, BUT IS A REASON TO GO TALK TO THE WTO TO RAISE TARIFFS. WE NEED FREE TRADE. THAT IS VERY, VERY IMPORTANT. BUT YOU DON'T GET THAT BY WORLD GOVERNMENT. AND, THOSE OF YOU WHO ARE SO HIGH-MINDED ABOUT SOVEREIGNTY YOU WOULDN'T SUPPORT THIS WAR. THERE'S TWO REASONS WE HAVE GONE TO WAR. ONE TO GO AFTER THE WEAPONS WHICH DIDN'T EXIST AND THE OTHER WAS TO ENFORCE U.N. RESOLUTION. THAT'S CRIMINAL. [CHEERS &amp; BOOS]</p> <p>I BELIEVE THAT IF WE WOULD HAVE FOLLOWED THE CONSTITUTION AND IF WE HAD ONLY DECLARED THE WAR, WE WOULD HAVE HAD THE DEBATE BEFORE THE WAR, AND WE WOULDN'T HAVE LOST 5,000 MEN IN THE MILITARY. WE OUGHT TO FOLLOW THE RULES OF THE LAW AND THE CONSTITUTION.</p>
<p><b>Rudy Giuliani</b> Former Mayor of New York City</p>  <p>www.joinrudy2008.com 212-835-9449</p>	<p>Q: What would you do as president to repair the image of America in the eyes of the Muslim world?                      A: The most important thing to do is to make certain we remain on offense against Islamic terrorism. Then make it clear that what that means is this is a small group of people, Islamic terrorists, who have defiled a great religion (Source: 2007 GOP YouTube debate in St. Petersburg, Florida Nov 28, 2007)</p> <p>"The horror, the shock and the devastation of those attacks on the World Trade Center, the Pentagon and over the skies of Pennsylvania lifted a cloud from our eyes. We stood face to face with those people and forces who hijacked not just airplanes but a religion and turned it into a creed of terrorism dedicated to eradicating us and our way of life. Terrorism did not start on 9/11. It had been festering for many years. And the world had created a response to it that allowed it to succeed." (Source: 2004 Republican Convention Speech Aug 30, 2004)</p>	<p>Q: Has this country become protectionist, or are there serious, real national security concerns?                      A: I think we're on a verge of going in one direction or another. I mean, for example, if you want to get specific, the four trade deals with Peru, Colombia, Panama, South Korea that are in front of Congress right now, which the Democrats are trying to block, would be good deals for the US. In 3 of the 4 of them, we would actually get to export more than we're importing. Why they would want to block this I can't understand. We're already importing about 98% from those countries. [Regarding protectionism], I think you got to almost separate them into two different categories. There's economic protection, and then there's protection for safety, security and legal rights. And I don't think we've done a particularly good job on the second. We can't say because these agreements weren't perfect, because they have problems, because they have issues, we're going to turn our back on free trade. (Source: 2007 Republican debate in Dearborn, Michigan Oct 9, 2007)</p>

Candidate and Issue	Radical Islam (Terrorism)	N. American Union / Globalism
<p><b>John McCain</b>                      U.S. Senator                      From Arizona</p>  <p>www.johnmccain.com                      703-418-2008</p>	<p>"I firmly believe that the challenge of the 21st century is the struggle against radical Islamic extremism. It is a transcendent issue. It is hydra-headed. It will be with us for the rest of the century. I have served my nation and my country and the people of this country for all of my adult life. I am the most prepared. I have been involved in these issues. I have served this nation in the military and in the Congress, and I'm the best prepared and need no on-the-job training to meet that challenge."                      (Source: 2007 GOP Iowa Straw Poll debate August 5, 2007)</p> <p>"The sacrifices borne in our defense are not shared equally by all Americans. But all Americans must share a resolve to see this war through to a just end. We must not be complacent at successes, AND we must not despair over setbacks. We must learn from our mistakes, improve on our successes, and vanquish this unpardonable enemy. If we do less, we will fail the one mission no American generation has ever failed-to provide to our children a stronger, better country than the one we were blessed to inherit."                      (Source: 2004 Republican Convention Speech August 30, 2004)</p>	<p>"I'm a student of history. Every time the United States has become protectionist and listened to the siren song that you're hearing partially on this stage tonight, we've paid a very heavy price. The Smoot-Hawley Tariff Acts in the 1930s were direct contributors to World War II. It sounds like a lot of fun to bash China and others, but free trade has been the engine of our economy. Free trade should be the continuing principle that guides this nation's economy."</p> <p>"I have a glass of ethanol every morning before breakfast. (Audience laughter.) But I still don't support the subsidies, and I don't think we need them. And I think we ought to have sugarcane-based ethanol into this country, and I don't think that subsidies are the answer, because I'll open up every foreign market to our agricultural products, who are the most productive &amp; best &amp; most effective agriculture in the world. All this bashing of free trade--Ronald Reagan must be spinning in his grave."                      (Source for both quotes: 2007 Republican debate in Dearborn, Michigan October 9, 2007)</p>
<p><b>Mitt Romney</b>                      Former Governor                      From Massachusetts</p>  <p>www.mittromney.com                      857-288-6400</p>	<p>"I want to bring in a real strong team of people who have very different backgrounds, a lot from the private sector, and I want to take on a whole series of efforts. One is not just to win the peace in Iraq &amp; in Afghanistan, but I'd like to take on an effort globally to defeat jihad which is military in scope but also non-military, that combines our non-military resources with those of other nations to help move the word of Islam toward modernity and help the Muslims themselves reject the extreme."                      (Source: Fox News Sunday: 2007 "Choosing the President" interviews August 12, 2007)</p> <p>To win the war on jihad, we have to not only have a strong military of our own--and we need a stronger military--we also need to have strong friends around the world and help moderate Muslims reject the extreme. Because ultimately the only people who can finally defeat these radical Islamic jihadists are the Muslims themselves.                      (Source: 2007 GOP Iowa Straw Poll debate August 5, 2007)</p>	<p>BECK: Do you believe that there is any kind of desire in the business community to have a North American Community?</p> <p>ROMNEY: Well, there may be on the part of some people, but I think the idea has no merit whatsoever, and if I'm president we will not in any way release our sovereignty or diminish it, either by eliminating borders or checkpoints or by building a superhighway or entering into treaties like the Law of the Sea Treaty that removes some of the most important elements of our sovereignty.</p> <p>This idea has no merit at all. The right way for America to become stronger is not to try and attach some other nation to us or get cheap labor from next door. It's instead to strengthen our own nation, invest in technology, in productivity. (Source: Glenn Beck program, CNN Headline News, November 14, 2007)</p>
<p><b>Fred Thompson</b>                      Former Senator                      From Tennessee</p>  <p>www.fred08.com                      No listed phone #</p>	<p>I think we've got to come to terms with the nature of the threat that our country faces. It is a global war. Islamic fascism has declared it upon us. They look at it as something that's something that's been going on for a long, long time. They're perfectly willing for it to go on for a long time more, killing millions of innocent people in the process. They play by no rules, and they are intent on bringing down Western civilization and the United States of America. So we have to understand what's necessary &amp; the determination that we need to show to friend and foe alike that we'll do what's necessary to fight on any front that we have to fight on. This is a front in a much broader war, &amp; I think the young people that I talk to coming back from there understand that. In fact, sometimes it's strange to me to think that the average 20-year-old serving in Iraq knows more about what it takes for our national security than the average 20-year veteran on Capitol Hill. (Source: 2007 Republican debate in Dearborn, Michigan, October 9, 2007)</p>	<p>"Global competition and a growing economic disparity among our citizens are challenges. But how we react to them is more important than the challenges themselves. Some want us to withdraw from the world that presents us with so many problems, in the hope they will go away. Some would push us towards protectionist trade policies. Others see a solution in raising taxes and redistributing the income among our citizens.</p> <p>Wrong on all counts. These are defensive, defeatist policies that have consistently been proven wrong. They are not what America is all about.</p> <p>We're not afraid of globalization. It works to our benefit. We innovate more and invest in that innovation better than anywhere else in the world. Same thing goes for services. Free trade and market economies have done more for freedom and prosperity than a central planner could ever dream and we're the world's best example of that. So, why do we want to take investment dollars out of growth, and invest it in government?" (Source: The Fred Factor, by Steve Gill, p.170 June 3, 2007)</p>

Candidate and Issue	Immigration	War in Iraq
<p><b>John Cox</b>                      Businessman from Illinois</p>  <p>www.cox2008.com                      877-234-3800</p>	<p>Q: Will you oppose guest workers?                      A: I oppose a guest worker program. We don't want to create a second class of citizens in this country. We want people who come to America to ultimately be Americans. At the same time, we ought to make sure that we send the people home who have cut in line, but we've got to make sure that we bring the people in who are waiting in line, and waiting for the bureaucracy 10 or 15 years to get to this country legally.                      (Source: Values Voter Presidential Debate, Sept. 17, 2007)</p> <p>"While legal immigration is good for America, illegal immigration hurts our economy and strains our public services. Amnesty is not the answer, nor are "guest workers." We need Citizens who want to become part of our nation, learn English and contribute to the economy. I will crack down on businesses that hire - and exploit - illegal labor. We must protect our borders and enforce our laws."                      (Source: Campaign website, July 2, 2007)</p>	<p>"There is a thin layer of Islam that is using oil. And let me tell you, Iraq is about oil. If Saddam didn't have oil, he would not have been a threat to the United States. We have got to get that oil pumping, we have got to get the Iraqis prosperous, we have got to get them to believe in their government so we can get our troops homes, so we can claim victory against these jihadists that would use religion to kill innocent people." (Source: Values Voter Presidential Debate Sept. 17, 2007)</p> <p>"I believe we need to quickly build up Iraq's economy by returning oil production to full capacity so they can become self-sufficient, then we will be able to pull out our troops victorious. A prosperous people do not turn to terrorism. We must win the war in Iraq and elsewhere so we are fighting terror over there, not over here."                      (Source: Campaign website, July 2, 2007)</p>
<p><b>Mike Huckabee</b>                      Former Governor of Arkansas</p>  <p>www.mikehuckabee.com                      501-324-2008</p>	<p>Q: What do you think should be done with the 12 million undocumented aliens that live in the US?                      A: The first step is a secure border, because otherwise nothing really matters. But I do think the pathway has to include people going to the back, not the front of the line. There can't be an amnesty policy, because that's an insult to all the people who waited, sometimes, ridiculously, for years, just to be able to make the transition here. If you can get an American Express card in two weeks, it shouldn't take seven years to get a work permit to come to this country in order to work on a farm. So if our government is incapable of making that process in that length of time, then we should do it in a way to outsource it. And here's why: When people come to this country, they shouldn't fear. They shouldn't live in hiding. They ought to have their heads up, because we believe every person ought to have his or her head up and proud. (Source: 2007 Republican primary debate on Univision Dec ember 9, 2007)</p> <p>Q: Did you support tuition breaks for children of illegal immigrants in Arkansas?                      A: It wasn't a break. What I supported, and I still do, was the idea that you don't punish a child for the crime of a parent. I still don't believe that. I don't believe that this country has reduced itself to the point that when a parent commits a crime and breaks the law, that you grind your heel in the face of 6-year-old. What I did support was when a child had been in our schools all his or her academic career and wanted to go to college, if that student would apply for citizenship, then they would be able to go to college....                      (Source: CNN Late Edition: Presidential series with Wolf Blitz November 25, 2007)</p>	<p>Q: Why not withdraw the troops from Iraq?                      A: Because we are winning. Civilians deaths are down 76% since the surge. Even the military deaths are down over 60%. And that's not the only way we know we're winning. We're winning because we see in the spirit of our own soldiers a sense of duty and honor that they are being able to carry out a mission that they were sent there to do. To take them out of it not only means we lose, but it means we totally destroy their sense of morale, and it may take a generation to get it back. But there's more at stake than just their morale. It's the safety and the security of the Middle East and the rest of the world. This is about every one of us being able to be free, to have a future, and to be able to know that we're not going to allow a vacuum there, which happens if we lose--and we lose when we walk away--to create an opening so that terrorists can build even greater cells of training there. That's why we have to stay. And it's why we have to win. (Source: Republican primary debate on Univision Dec ember 9, 2007)</p>
<p><b>Duncan Hunter</b>                      Congressman from California</p>  <p>www.gohunter08.com                      619-463-3896</p>	<p>Q: Is it even practical to try to send 12 million illegal immigrants all home?                      A: Folks that are here illegally have to leave and let me tell you why. Today, if you're a dry wall contractor and you play by the rules &amp; pay \$27/hour, you will be constantly under-cut by contractors who use people who are here illegally. That's not fair to Americans who play by the rules. That's one reason you have, in certain areas, especially in the construction trades now, higher levels of unemployment.                      (Source: GOP Presidential Forum at Morgan State University Sep 27, 2007)</p> <p>"This administration has a case of the slows on border enforcement. As long as you've got a revolving door and you have no border, it's not just an immigration problem, it's a homeland security problem. We need to build the border fence. We need to have a Border Patrol which is big enough to get the job done, and we need to be able to ask people when they want to come into America, knock on the front door, because the back door is going to be closed."                      (Source: Republican Debate in South Carolina May 15, 2007)</p>	<p>Q: Surveys show that 2 out of 3 Hispanics think that the US should withdraw its troops from Iraq.                      A: My son came back from his third tour as a US Marine on Thanksgiving, having served in Iraq twice and Afghanistan. And, you know, if you check with the Hispanics of the 1st Marine Division or the 10th Army Division of the 1st Cavalry, you'll get a lot different poll than the poll that you're telling me right now, because the young men and women who are serving over there know we can win in Iraq. And let me tell you what they've done. With blood, sweat and tears they have brought down the attack rate in Anbar province by 80%. They brought it down over the entire nation. The Iraqi army is now standing up, all 131 battalions. That government's going to hold and the army's going to hold, and we are going to leave Iraq in victory, and we're going to leave an Iraq that will be a friend, not an enemy of the US. So we're going to be victorious in Iraq, and Hispanic Americans who serve there know that.                      (Source: 2007 Republican primary debate on Univision December 9, 2007)</p>

Candidate and Issue	Immigration	War in Iraq
<p><b>Alan Keyes</b> Former Special Ambassador to the United Nations</p>  <p>www.alankeyes.com 800-727-6142</p>	<p>"Our country's immigration policy should encourage legal immigration to be maintained, and illegal immigration to be curtailed. The policy should be enforced through existing laws. It's a travesty when those who have abided by the law and become citizens through the proper means are considered no different than those who have not. If we start extending all the privileges of life and citizenship to people who are not citizens and who are not here legally, then we're breaking down our own laws." (Source: Campaign website, "Issues" Oct 1, 2007)</p> <p>Q: Is it even practical to try to send 12 million illegal immigrants all home?  A: : Well, I think, especially in this context, it's important to remember a number of things. The border is a matter of security, first of all. And we have to make sure that we control it, or no laws we pass have any significance. People will still cross on their own terms. So the very first priority has to be to get back control.  (Source: GOP Presidential Forum at Morgan State University Sep 27, 2007)</p>	<p>"I think the most important thing to remember is that our efforts in Iraq and elsewhere right now that followed in the wake of September 11 aren't an effort to defend Black people, white people, Jewish people, Christian people, et cetera. They're an effort to defend the United States of America from a deep and terrible threat that came against us in disregard of the fundamental moral principle that is supposed to govern all international affairs, all wars that are conducted by countries, and that is that you do not consciously target innocent human life.</p> <p>My father was a soldier--fought in Korea and Vietnam and World War II, did not stand in defense of this race or that, but stood in defense of the common principles of moral decency and justice that are derived from that premise that I talked about, that our rights come from God." (Source: GOP Presidential Forum at Morgan State University Sep 27, 2007)</p>
<p><b>Ron Paul</b> Congressman from Texas</p>  <p>www.ronpaul2008.com 703-248-9115</p>	<p>"I see the immigration problem as a consequence of our welfare state. We encourage people not to work here, but the welfare we offer the people who come--they get free medical care. They get free education. They bankrupt our hospitals. Our hospitals are closing. And it shouldn't be rewarded. That means you don't give them citizenship. You can't solve this problem until you get rid of the welfare state, because in a healthy economy, immigrants wouldn't be a threat to us."  (Source: GOP Presidential Forum at Morgan State University Sept. 27, 2007)</p> <p>Q: Is it even practical to try to send 12 million illegal immigrants all home?  A: I would not sign a bill like [comprehensive immigration reform], because it would be amnesty. I also think that it's pretty impractical to get an army in this country to round up 12 or maybe 20 million. But I do believe that we have to stick to our guns on obeying the law, and anybody who comes in here illegally shouldn't be rewarded. And that would be the case. (Source: GOP Presidential Forum at Morgan State University Sept 27, 2007)</p>	<p>"And, once again, I would like to reiterate from a Christian viewpoint. You know the true doctrine of war written by Christianity, the doctrine of non-war, the just war, is that you do it only under certain circumstances. You don't do it for U.N. resolutions, You don't do it for weapons that don't exist. You need to do it with a moral justification. If we would have declared the war like I insisted. They should if they want to go to war, we wouldn't be debating the war now. It would be over and we'd all be a lot better off and we would have 5,000 Americans still alive and 30,000 uninjured! (Source: Values Voter Presidential Debate, Sept. 17, 2007)</p> <p>PAUL: [to Duncan Hunter]: We have lost over 5,000 Americans killed in Afghanistan &amp; Iraq, plus the civilians killed. How many more you want to lose? How long are you going to be there? What do we have to pay to save face? That's all we're doing, is saving face. It's time we came home. (Source: 2007 GOP debate at UNH, sponsored by Fox News Sep 5, 2007)</p>
<p><b>Rudy Giuliani</b> Former Mayor of New York City</p>  <p>www.joinrudy2008.com 212-835-9449</p>	<p>Q: What do you think should be done with the 12 million undocumented aliens that live in the US?  A: The first thing that has to be done is we have to end illegal immigration. If we don't end illegal immigration, we're really going to risk legal immigration. We should end illegal immigration at the border, because it can't be really dealt with internally. We should do it by having a fence, a technological fence, as well as a physical fence. It should be used to alert the Border Patrol of the people coming to the border, and we should stop people from coming in. Then we should have a tamper-proof ID card that everybody can get who wants to come into the US legally. When we accomplish that, when we have control of our borders, when we preserve the legality of immigration, we can then turn to the people that are here. The people that come forward can sign up. They can pay taxes, and then the people who don't, those people should be expelled from the US if they don't already leave. (Source: 2007 Republican primary debate on Univision December 9, 2007)</p>	<p>Q: Your best estimate as a potential commander in chief, how long will U.S. troops be in Iraq?  A: For as long as necessarily to get the strategic objective achieved. Our strategic objective is an Iraq that's stable and an Iraq that will act as an ally of the US in the ongoing Islamic terrorist effort war against us. Some think that that's possible, some think that it's impossible, but that's certainly the best strategic objective.  Q: And if it becomes clear there's no political reconciliation between Shiites and Sunnis?  A: If it became clear to any president, Republican or Democrat, that the people in charge of the effort tell you, "Hey, Mr. President, we can't accomplish this," I think any president would have to take that real seriously and start thinking about, well, how do we extricate ourselves from this.  Q: But as of now you're, you're prepared to spend several more years if necessary?  A: For now, [there should be no] time limits placed on the military.  (Source: Meet the Press: "Meet the Candidates" series Dec 9, 2007)</p>

Candidate and Issue	Immigration	War in Iraq
<p><b>John McCain</b>                      U.S. Senator                      From Arizona</p>  <p>www.johnmccain.com                      703-418-2008</p>	<p>Q: Are you just playing politics, backing a new plan which would enforce the borders but without any longer a path to citizenship?                      A: Very seldom have I seen an issue that aroused this much passion with the American people. No one is for amnesty. I and the president came forward with a plan that we thought was comprehensive and workable with the priority being border security, which remains my position. Why we failed is because the American people have lost trust and confidence in us. We have to succeed, because there's 12 million people who are in this country illegally, which is de facto amnesty, and we need a temporary worker program. I commit to securing the borders first. We can secure those borders. As president, I would have the border state governors certify that those borders were indeed secure.                      (Source: 2007 GOP debate at UNH, sponsored by Fox News Sept. 5, 2007)</p>	<p>Q: What would you do as president to repair the image of America in the eyes of the Muslim world?                      A: The first and most important and vital element is to continue this surge which is succeeding and we are winning the war in Iraq. Secondly, I would make sure that we do what we can to help reconstruct the country, to help the Maliki government move forward as rapidly as possible to train the police.                      (Source: GOP YouTube debate in St. Petersburg, Florida Nov 28, 2007)</p> <p>Q: The biggest issue between Hillary and you clearly is the war in Iraq. You strongly support the troop surge. She wants to start pulling the troops out. Is that a winner for Republicans in 2008?                      A: I don't know. And I can't be concerned. Because I know too many brave young Americans that are serving and sacrificing in Iraq, as we speak. I would much rather lose a campaign than lose a war. (Source: GOP primary debate in Orlando, Florida Oct 21, 2007)</p>
<p><b>Mitt Romney</b>                      Former Governor                      From Massachusetts</p>  <p>www.mittromney.com                      857-288-6400</p>	<p>Q: The majority are in favor of granting legal status to undocumented aliens if they meet certain criteria. If the majority supports that, why not support that idea?                      A: You know, I have the occasion to talk to people who have loved ones that are hoping to come to this country, to be reunited with family members. And they're staying in their home countries applying legally. I believe that those people ought to be the first ones to get to come to this country. Those who have come illegally, in my view, should be given the opportunity to get in line with everybody else, but there should be no special pathway for those that have come here illegally to jump ahead of the line or to become permanent residents or citizens. They should be treated like everybody else who wants to come to this country. We're going to protect legal immigration. At the same time, we're going to enforce the law, show that we're a nation of laws, and welcome the people who have been standing in line first. (Source: Republican primary debate on Univision Dec ember 9, 2007)</p> <p>"I hate the idea of in any way making it more difficult for kids, even those who are illegal aliens, to afford college in our state." (Source: <i>Boston Globe</i>, August 11, 2004)</p>	<p>Q: For how long do we need to leave our troops in Iraq?                      A: Let's talk about our mission there. This is not just about strategy &amp; allies. It's not about oil. It's not about just the economy. It's not just about standing up for the fact that we've been there for a long time. It's about human lives. What we're doing in Iraq relates to protecting the lives of American citizens, here, around the world. It relates to lives throughout the world. It relates to dignity &amp; freedom. We're in Iraq because we want to make sure that Iraq does not become what Afghanistan was under the Taliban: a place that they could recruit and train and launch attacks against us on 9/11, and other attacks throughout the world. The last thing America could stand for would be to have Iraq become an Afghanistan. Fortunately, the surge is working. It's going to keep that from happening. We're going to have stability and security there and American lives will be saved by virtue of the extraordinary sacrifice of American servicemen.                      (Source: Republican primary debate on Univision Dec 9, 2007)</p>
<p><b>Fred Thompson</b>                      Former Senator                      From Tennessee</p>  <p>www.fred08.com                      No listed phone #</p>	<p>Q: The majority are in favor of granting legal status to undocumented aliens if they meet certain criteria. If the majority supports that, why not support that idea?                      A: Because we have to enforce our borders, and we have to uphold the law. There are millions of people who have stood in line in US embassies around the world, waiting to become American citizens, waiting to become legal residents of the US. But when they finally come here, and when they are joined by those people in Latin America who have often fought tyranny, who have fought against the Castro regime, who have come here and risked their lives to become US citizens, when all those people come here, they become a part of us; they become a part of our family. It would disrespect them if we said other people who had not obeyed the law and had not gone through the process, to set them above them and to give them special status above those who have obeyed the law and fought so hard to become good American citizens and legal residents.                      (Source: 2007 Republican primary debate on Univision Dec ember 9, 2007)</p>	<p>Q: Has the Bush policy toward Iraq been a good one?                      A: I think the policy that we're engaged in now is the right one. Clearly, to me, we didn't go in with enough troops and we didn't know what to expect when we got there. But now we're showing signs of progress. I think we got to take advantage of the opportunities that we have there, to turn around and us to stabilize that place and not to have to leave with our tail between our legs. If we did that, it would make for a more dangerous USA.                      (Source: 2007 Republican debate in Dearborn, Michigan Oct ober 9, 2007)</p> <p>Q: A couple of years ago you said, "It's just a matter of staying the course. And as long as we have the will to stay, we'll be OK." Is that still your view?                      A: Yeah. I think so. It seems to me like, at the end of last year, we were losing the war. It seems to me now, in the last five months, that there've been a lot of good things happen there.                      Q: But staying the course, the status quo, can that be our strategy?                      A: Well, it's not a stay-the-course strategy, in terms of what's been going on there. It's giving us an opportunity to succeed. You know, we've got take yes for an answer. We got to take success as a reality when we find it. (Source: Meet the Press: "Meet the Candidates" series Nov 4, 2007)</p>

# Values Voter Report — Republican Primary

Yes/No Questions from Round 2 of the Debate (Gray=Yes, Black=No, White=No Answer)	Fred Thompson	Mitt Romney	Mike Huckabee	Tom Tancredo	John Cox	Sam Brownback	Ron Paul	Duncan Hunter	Alan Keyes	Rudy Giuliani	John McCain
<b>Judicial Activism:</b> A federal judge has ordered the Indiana legislature to never allow prayer in Jesus' name. Will you, as President, consider impeachment a possible remedy for judicial activism?											
<b>Mexico City Abortion Policy:</b> Would you require that federal funding recipients "will neither actively provide or promote abortion" within the United States as well as abroad or overseas?											
<b>Multiculturalism:</b> Do you agree that the excessive and overbearing use by liberals of "multiculturalism" weakens American culture and creates unnecessary divisions among the citizenry?											
<b>Amnesty:</b> Will you oppose all plans for amnesty, path to citizenship, guest workers, and seasonal passes until the high un-employment for minority youth and students has dropped to 5 percent?				*	*	*					
<b>Social Security:</b> Would you revive President Bush's attempt to introduce personal retirement accounts as a way to reform Social Security, thus allowing all Americans, particularly low wage workers and the self-employed, an investment in their future...?											
<b>First Amendment:</b> Would you support legislation that prevents federal courts from hearing lawsuits brought to stop state and federal officials from acknowledging the sovereignty of God in such ways as public prayer, the Pledge of Allegiance and the public display of the Ten Commandments?								*			
<b>Judges:</b> Will you nominate only judges and justices that are demonstrably faithful to the judicial role of following the text of the Constitution and who not only refuse to legislate from the bench, but are committed to reversing prior court decisions?											
<b>Military Chaplains:</b> If you are elected president, will you protect your military chaplains' right to pray according to their faith?											
<b>Fairness Doctrine:</b> If elected, would you veto any legislation that contains language of the so called "Fairness Doctrine"?								*			
<b>Health Care:</b> Will you protect the availability of needed medical care by opposing current efforts to subject Americans to government-mandated health insurance and universal coverage?											
<b>Hate Crimes:</b> If elected, could we count on you to veto any so-called "hate crimes" legislation?											
<b>Balanced Budget:</b> If elected, will you reign in this out of control spending and work hard to balance the budget?					*						
<b>Border Enforcement:</b> Is this the kind of border enforcement policy we could expect in your administration?											
<b>Disabled Patients:</b> Would you pursue or support legislation that would protect the cognitively disabled and vulnerable people from being dehydrated to death by having their food and water taken away?											
<b>Pornography:</b> Will you agree to prosecute the broad range of illegal adult pornography, rather than just the most extreme material, and prosecute all violators of federal obscenity law?											
<b>Evolution:</b> Will your office support and encourage a more open approach to education in the presentation of scientific facts that contradict the theory of evolution?											

\* Candidate used a minute to explain his position that particular issue. These answers can be found in the full transcript at [www.valuesvoterdebate.com](http://www.valuesvoterdebate.com)

