

# PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

## 2020 Constitution Party Convention

Because our 2020 Constitution Party Convention is being held by teleconference this year, we have been unable to perform a live Presidential Debate as originally scheduled. In lieu of a live debate, it was requested of our debate organizers to develop a list of questions to be answered by each candidate to be published and distributed to each of the convention delegates.

A list of thirteen questions was developed and mailed to each candidate by both USPS and email. The questions are,

1. How would you respond to the statement, "You can't win?" and why are you doing this?
2. Aren't you taking votes from Trump and giving them to the Democratic Candidate?
3. If you were President what would you do about COVID-19? Do you see the virus as a National Security issue?
4. What do you think about Free Trade? Do you favor free trade agreements? Which ones? What about the new trade agreement proposed to replace NAFTA?
5. The Constitution Party platform endorses an end to the Income tax. Do you agree with the platform, and if so, how would you replace the revenue?
6. The Constitution Party platform endorses an end to the Federal Reserve. Do you agree with the platform, and if so, what would that do to the US economy, and what would it mean for US status in the World?
7. What is your position on NATO?
8. What is your position on US intervention in the disputes, elections, and wars of foreign nations?
9. How are you and the Constitution Party different from the Libertarian Party?
10. Where do you differ from the Constitution Party Platform and why?
11. The Constitution Party Platform is 100% pro-life. Are you in agreement with that position? If so, how would you, as President, work to abolish "legal" abortion in the United States?
12. Are federal departments such as the Department of Energy, Bureau of Land Management, HUD, Department of Education, Bureau of Alcohol Tobacco and Firearms, Food and Drug Administration and EPA constitutional? Do they have any merit? If not, how would you address that as President?
13. Do you believe the education system in America is adequate? If not, what measures would you take to improve it?

Below are the questions asked of each candidate and the answers we received. Except for font and size changes, no editing was done to any of the answers submitted. There were no limits as to the length of the responses.

The candidate's answers are listed in alphabetical order by candidate last name.

---

### Question #1

How would you respond to the statement, "You can't win?" and why are you doing this?

---

### **Don Blankenship**

First, I would agree that I am not going to win this election and become the President of the United States. If that is the definition of winning, then we are not going to win absent divine intervention.

However, I would add that no one thought America's founders would defeat the English in the Revolutionary War. Also, as to one of my personal achievements, no one thought I could elect a Republican to the West Virginia (WV) Supreme Court in 2004 because no Republican had won a WV Supreme Court seat in 80 years. But we did.

No one thought we could lead an effort to convert WV from a staunch Democrat state to a

Republican state that gave Trump the largest vote percentage of any state in America. Also, no one thought that my efforts would destroy the United Mine Workers Union, but they did.

No one thought I had any chance of being found not guilty of three felony charges in a US federal court, but I was. Prior to my case, the Southern WV DOJ office had won every felony case in modern times.

No one thought I would be sent to a federal prison for a misdemeanor, but I was. No one thought I could win a WV US Senate seat while assigned to a Nevada halfway house, but according to my opponents polling, I would have won had not nearly every major media network falsely broadcast that I was a felon in the days leading up to the election.

No one thought I would sue the national media for defaming me and sabotaging a US Senate race nor that the suit would survive summary dismissal. But I did sue, and the suit did survive dismissal. We are hopeful of getting to the deposition stage of the case this summer. This case has the chance of decreasing fake news in the future and markedly strengthening the First Amendment.

Despite the above achievements, I do not think we, the CP, can win the Presidential election this year. However, I do believe that with a billion dollars we could win, meaning I think that anyone who had the money to inform the American public of a path to American prosperity and a return to what made us great could win.

But at this stage I do not think we can define winning as winning the election. Winning needs to be defined as making progress toward winning an election in the future.

It took 25 years to convert WV from Democrat to Republican.

Why I am doing this is in the hope that we, the CP, can begin to become a factor in defining the direction of America going forward. We do not have to win Presidential elections to help move the country in the right direction. We can become a factor earlier than people think for several reasons.

First, the Democrats have become extremists and fragmented. Second, once Trump completes his next term, the Republican Party will become equally fragmented. Third, the coronavirus will cause Americans to look for alternatives to both parties. Fourth, the Electoral College allows a small number of voters to play a major role in the outcome of Presidential elections.

As for why I want to do this, I think it needs to be done if our country is to survive.

### **Dan Cummings**

The statement, "You cannot win!" is irrelevant. No candidate of the Constitution Party for President has a significant chance of being elected in 2020. That is not our constitutional and patriotic mission yet. Our constitutional mission now is to proclaim the correct constitutional message as a standard for the future. My determined mission is to present the constitutional doctrine of our Founding Fathers cogently and articulately in its original purity with adequate clarity that it can set a standard for the future direction of our party and a standard for the nation to follow in the future.

### **Don Grundman**

- A) You can NEVER " win," in any possible way, unless you attempt to. When anyone, person or organization, does ANYTHING they may not " win " for a very long time - until they do. " Can't " is not a word in my vocabulary. We automatically " win " whenever we spread our message.
- B) The principles and ideas of the Constitution Party are absolutely vital for the survival of our nation. We have a duty to the nation to spread them through the electoral process and via any other methods.
- C) We are " doing this " to save our Republic.

### **Charles Kraut**

My campaign is not just about me; it is about saving this country. Of course, I believe I am the candidate best suited to win the White House by virtue of my adherence to the Constitution, my extensive research, my travels to more than 50 countries, my ongoing conversations with financial experts in many fields all over the world, my background as a Cold Warrior, and much more.

I am doing this because our nation is in very serious trouble. This trouble has been brought on because we have not held our judges and elected officials to their oath of office to support and defend the Constitution. Through my work over the past dozen years I have identified the root of the problems America faces, and having done so I have also identified the solution.

My campaign is about raising awareness among the American people of the peril we face and of our responsibility as citizens to return America to its Constitution and to become once again people of faith, morality, decency, and integrity.

## **Samm Tittle**

“I am probably the only candidate for President who actually is running to win! Being Hispanic who speaks fluent English, Spanish and French reflects ability to speak and interface with many walks of Life. We can reach Hispanics through the Spanish Networks. Our campaign strategy will include a strong campaign with many facets to include a Million Dollar Mobile/on the Move in the Streets Advertising SAMMTRAIN, fully contained with Command & Control Equipment. Already invested over \$250,000.00 with Advertising paraphernalia helps the finances. Among Americans of Hispanic descent, including Spanish language advertising, we are able to bring in the Hispanic culture as well as any minority feeling they have a chance to WIN!.

The candidate the Constitution Party nominates in this election will have an excellent opportunity because something “different” “the Woman the Country and the “me too” movement is looking for and we will be running against a Democrat with early onset dementia; and a Republican who was impeached last year, who continues contra to Our Constitution, specifically he and his Family afoul the Nobility Clause; Article 1 Section 9 Clause 8 and has no remorse..

We only need a plurality in any State to carry its electoral votes. In a close election, where no candidate has the 270 votes required for election, the election will go to the House of Representatives. Democrats and Republicans actually hate and distrust each other. The Democrats will eventually turn to a Hispanic woman, Samm Tittle, making her the Precedent president. Many Republicans will be pleased with this choice because Samm Tittle and the Constitution Party are very conservative. We gain votes from both Parties and Independents love the idea of “up the Middle”

---

### Question #2

Aren't you taking votes from Trump and giving them to the Democratic Candidate?

---

## **Don Blankenship**

It is a legitimate concern that we might take votes from Trump, but I also think is an easily managed concern.

The way it can be managed is by choosing what messages will be communicated and where in the country the specific messages are targeted. Also, as noted in response to the first question above, the Democrats are far more vulnerable this year than are the Republicans as far as changing parties or voting against their Party nominee.

The Democrat Party is out of touch with its members best interests, but their members have not had this pointed out to them. This was true in WV, and it is greatly why WV voters converted to Republican and Independent. WV Democrats and millions of national Democrats are moral issue conservatives, but they are with the Democrats because they feel that the Republicans will starve them out.

Consider any of several key issues: illegal immigration, climate change, minimum wage, welfare benefits, abortion, or criminal justice reform.

For example, as to illegal immigration, the Democrat Party is for it. But what is the impact on underprivileged Democrat Party members? Illegal immigrants hold down the minimum wage, and they cause money to be transferred from needy American citizens' social programs to illegal immigrant supporting programs. Illegal immigrants also take away good hourly paying jobs and funding for medical services. The result is that poor Democrat American citizens lose.

As to climate change, the Democrat Party elite are the only Democrats that benefit from the climate change policy hoax. All that poor Democrats get from climate change regulations is higher electric bills and fewer jobs. More climate change regulations will drive up the cost of living and force companies to move overseas just like unfair trade has done.

As to abortion, many Democrats are devoted Christians. They will tell you they do not believe in abortion, but the reality is that they will also tell you they cannot afford to have a child. Over 80 percent of American abortions are said to be done because the mother cannot afford to rear a child. Many female Democrats would be attracted to a political party that supports a program assuring that all newborns would be adopted.

As to criminal justice, again poor Democrats and minorities feel that they are the Americans who are most victimized by the failed criminal justice system. A Presidential candidate that supports legislation increasing the chances of fair trials would be attractive to many minorities. I know this because I spent a year in prison with minorities who are very suspicious of the American criminal justice system.

In short, there are many issues that the CP candidate can support which appeal to Democrats and, if messages are targeted into heavy Democrat strongholds, the CP can attract many more Democrat votes than Republican votes.

### **Dan Cummings**

It is uncertain where most of our votes come from. Many of our faithful members are former Republicans, but a few of them are former Democrats. Perhaps we will take some votes from Trump, but we will certainly never "give" votes to the Democrats. There is no hope from the Democratic Party for reviving our prior Republic and saving the future for our children. The Democratic Party is nothing more or less than an organized crime machine; its platform is a national suicide pact and has no hope of improvement. The Republican Party is somewhat more complex, but it can be analyzed most accurately as the party of collaboration; although its platform contains many wonderful platitudes, those platitudes are never instituted in any practical way, even when the party has full control of the executive and legislative branches of the federal government and overwhelming control in the majority of the state legislatures. It is very difficult to distinguish any significant differences between the Democratic and Republican parties in terms of any substantial results achieved in restoring our prior constitutional republic. It has been simplistically, but very accurately, stated that the Democratic Party is the evil party and the Republican Party is the stupid party. If we do not break from the Republican/Democratic duopoly in one way or another, we will

never make significant improvements in this country, and our freedom is doomed to extinction. The Constitution Party should lead the way back to the principles of our Founders, and we should do that with only minimal attention to possible collateral damage or unintended side effects.

### **Don Grundman**

If we give solutions that Trump does not that is his responsibility for lost votes; not ours. Our solutions will hurt the Democrats ( the Party of Death ) more than the Republicans. We will " take votes " from everyone.

### **Charles Kraut**

It would take a third-party candidate like Ross Perot, someone who could spend millions of dollars to promote himself and his candidacy to have any significant effect on the 2020 election. Because between 30 and 40% of the electorate in this country now consider themselves independent, I am campaigning for the votes of Republicans, Democrats, and Independents, and I anticipate that most of the votes I receive will come from the latter category.

### **Samm Tittle**

NO! Actually many of our votes are going to come from Hispanics and women who would otherwise vote Democrat, or not vote at all. Samm Tittle will attract many Republican votes than almost any other Constitution Party candidate would because of her conservative values. Furthermore, the Republicans will quickly accept the fact that Trump has already changed the 2nd Amendment by "banning bumpstocks" and further "endorsing Red Flag Laws. Republicans and moderate Gun Owners know now clearly that the 2nd Amendment is their "last line of defense" and as in New Mexico at Easter time; all the Residents to include Democrats were threatened with the "Red Flag Law" for something as simple as going to Church on Easter Sunday. Both Parties and especially Independents come to the middle looking for relief from both sides of their basic philosophies. SAMM doesn't have to attack Trump because of the negatives regarding Guns and his last Statement that "he, the President is in 'full control of everything' which goes against Our Constitution and means more to Patriots than show in Polls. We have a super opportunity to draw VOTES from all sides because the line between Democrats & Republicans no longer exists i.e. look at Congress.

---

### Question #3

If you were President what would you do about COVID-19? Do you see the virus as a National Security issue?

---

#### **Don Blankenship**

First, if I had been President for the past three years, I do not think we would have as big a crisis as we have. Also, I think it is ridiculous to blame the crisis on a communist dictatorship not telling us about the virus earlier. Also, I do not think we can blame it on the World Health Organization.

These type viruses which are transferred from animals to humans have been known to have plagued the world since at least 1993. That was twenty-seven years ago. HIV, SARS, and Ebola are the best known of these viruses. Entangling ourselves with countries where eating bats, civet cats, chimps, and monkeys is legal will expose us to more and more of these viruses. Our trade policy of open unfair trade with China has made Americans extremely vulnerable to these animal-to-human viruses.

But as for what I would do now, I would fully lockdown areas like New York and New Jersey. There is no logic to prohibiting foreigners from traveling into America, yet allowing people from one of the most infected areas of the world (New York) to travel freely throughout the country.

Second my "Phase 1 return-to-work policy" would be based on individual vulnerability to the virus versus by state. In other words, those who statistically are far less susceptible to serious illness or death from the virus would be allowed to return to work in all but the heavily infected areas of the country. This is essentially anyone under 54 years of age with no preexisting health issues who represent about 75 percent of working Americans. Once we learned how this was working as to the spread of the virus, we would decide on the next step of returning to work.

This would give us a chance to see how many workers are getting infected and allow us to get a better understanding of the virus while not risking that there would be very many deaths. Also, I would have earlier implemented a far better and more accurate measurement system. All the details of the health of any person whose death was attributed to the coronavirus would have been entered into a database to determine all the causes of death as best as possible.

Of course, as President a person would have far more information than we have to base a decision on.

#### **Dan Cummings**

I would have called upon Congress to immediately close the borders of the United States to any trade with China while the medical facts were ascertained by scientific inquiry. I would not have closed down the internal affairs of the United States but would have acknowledged and respected the authority of the various governors to do so in their respective states. Although the coronavirus might become a crisis of interstate significance, I would not call it a National Security issue.

### **Don Grundman**

- A) It is a bioweapon. Hence it is a national security issue since the people who made it now know how easily they can destroy the US by making " COVID-20 " that much worse.
- B) I would introduce a national " New Health Paradigm " that emphasizes building our immune systems so that even if we are infected it will do us no harm.
- C) I would stop the lockdown immediately as the economic devastation which it is producing will backfire and allow the bug to kill more people when it comes back for " Round #2 " in addition to killing far more people than the bug itself via the economic devastation which it is producing.
- D) We must tell China and its friends who worked with it ( see here the World Bank and " Pandemic Bonds " ) that another " accident " will be considered an open act of war and will be dealt with accordingly.

### **Charles Kraut**

This question requires a lengthy answer. Briefly, as President as soon as I became aware that this pandemic had reached our shores I would urge all 50 governors to work closely and quickly with their state legislatures to come up with commonsense approaches to "flattening the curve" and dramatically slowing the spread of this virus. The president has the right to call a national emergency when military necessity requires it, but all of his other authority regarding emergencies comes from Executive Orders which may or may not be constitutional or even legal.

Next, as President I would work with my Health and Human Services secretary to ensure that the United States had adequate supplies of the additional materials that would be needed to protect as many Americans as possible. I would identify those most at risk and focus the efforts of our states and our communities on them.

Third, I would of necessity ask Congress for funding to seek a vaccine and suitable treatment methods for this virus, in order to minimize its effects upon those who have become infected and show symptoms.

Fourth, I would ensure that the Surgeon General was granted all the resources he or she needed to be able to bring this medical crisis to a swift end.

Finally, I would address the American people. I would introduce them to those experts and professionals who knew best how to respond to this situation. I would set the tone and offer encouragement and hope to the American people, but I would let the experts do with they do best and report regularly on their stewardships.

### **Samm Tittle**

As President it behooves the entire Administration & Congress to "have the Truth". Today with the United States 21 year Army Veteran MOS detail in Intelligence "EVENT 201" was thought of over a year ago, and was quickly moved into action because of the Incumbent's "Impeachment"

making him a “Lameduck” President, notwithstanding the Incumbent’s bent toward his desire to be “in full control” he believes it’s okay to over-ride the Constitution. (SEE Legal Discovery of existing “on the Books” Executive Orders. <https://youtu.be/NXX2ZFNBUdc>) FEMA takes over Presidency. Philosophy: “It can’t be a Conspiracy when you discover and see that it’s the Truth”.

---

#### Question #4

4. What do you think about Free Trade? Do you favor free trade agreements? Which ones? What about the new trade agreement proposed to replace NAFTA?

---

#### **Don Blankenship**

I favor Competitive Trade. In a documentary years ago, I called myself a “Competitionist” as opposed to either a Free Trader or a Protectionist.

George Washington was a smart man. His view was that a tariff should be levied on goods imported into America which would make the cost of the goods equivalent to producing them in America. Although this is a little simplistic for today’s world it is directionally correct.

But if American manufacturers were protected to that extent they would not have to be as efficient and innovative as they are today. Efficiency and innovation are key to improving quality of life. So I would not go as far as Washington said we should, but I would go in that direction.

Neither Washington’s view nor our trade policy for the past 60 years nor any policy will be perfect as the circumstances change continually. But there is no question that tariffs are a must if America is to survive. We need the money and we need the jobs. Also, as the world’s largest customer we can use tariffs to influence other countries’ behavior.

Like with many of these questions fully answering this one would require a book.

There are multiple purposes for tariffs. They range from national security to human rights.

As a side note, one of President Trump’s biggest problems is exemplified by his choice of those who influence his positions on trade matters. He has generally surrounded himself with swampers. Specifically, as to trade policy, he has surrounded himself with extreme free traders like Steven Moore and Larry Kudlow. These are well-meaning individuals, but they have never worked in or managed a business in America. They have no clue how disadvantaged American Industry and American workers are in a so-called free trade world.

I know that these individuals are not true believers in Trump’s trade policy views. Steven Moore and I have argued more than once about the subject of international trade. Also, I have interviewed with Larry Kudlow when he worked for Fox. Kudlow has never been a proponent of tariffs. The President needs to do a better job of identifying people who share his views and that is what I would do as President.

You cannot have strict environmental regulations, corporate provided health coverage, minimum wage, paid family leave, and more, yet expect to compete with foreign products which are produced with no concern for the physical environment, the work environment, or the worker. The perfect

tariff would be one that makes the production cost of an item equally competitive, not of equal cost. There is a difference.

Items of national concern like rare earths and medicine need very special and careful consideration. So too does uranium.

In short, its complicated. As to trade agreements, I am aware that many disagree with such agreements. However, agreements are a natural product of conducting business. If you place a tariff on other countries products, they are going to place one on yours. So, discussion of what is in the best interest of the two countries is going to require reconciling, and what is agreed to will need to be documented.

As to NAFTA, I am not familiar with the details of the new deal but the original NAFTA agreement was a disaster just as Ross Perot said it would be. As to which trade agreements I agree or disagree with, I have not studied specific agreements. I doubt that I would agree with any of them as they were entered into with a flawed foundational belief that free trade is always a good thing. But it is not.

A key premise of my tariff policy would be that it is not wise to tax incoming raw materials. It is wise to tax finished products. In other words, do not tax incoming rubber, iron ore, glass, or plastics, but do tax imported cars and trucks. The reason is the value added tax collected in the importing country as the raw materials are converted into finished products is far greater than the amount of the tax on the raw materials.

The China agreement in place the past fifty years was clearly horrible, and I have been preaching that for decades.

### **Dan Cummings**

I favor free trade without "entangling alliances." Commerce conducted within the limitations of and compromised by thousands of pages of "free trade" regulations is not free trade. I oppose, and have always opposed, all of the misnamed "free trade" agreements of my lifetime; they should more honestly and accurately be called "trade management" agreements. I am determined to withdraw and extricate our country from them. I also oppose entangling "free trade" agreements in the future, including, specifically, the one presently being debated.

### **Don Grundman**

Our Founders used tariffs to protect our domestic industry from being annihilated by so-called " Free Trade;" which is generally a weapon of the bankers who use their surrogate countries and companies to weaken their targeted nation.

I have not studied the " New NAFTA " but I understand it to be worse than the Old one.

I would hence favor " Trade Agreements " which stringently protect our industries and workers but not " Free " Trade Agreements.

## **Charles Kraut**

Simply put, if trade requires trade agreements it is not free trade. Trade agreements involve tariffs and other restrictions upon trade. They are intended to protect certain industries by controlling imports from other nations. Today, the economic advantage China enjoys is one of extremely low labor costs. It is much easier and less expensive to produce a product in China and ship it to the United States than it is to manufacture it here. Is this sufficient justification for tariffs? Probably not. Are there certain industries that need "protection?" That should be decided by someone other than the lobbyists for our major corporations.

Think for a moment about interstate trade. Certain states have significant economic advantages if within their borders they have large deposits of natural resources including coal, iron ore, gold and silver, copper, oil, natural gas, and many others. Do we restrict trade between the states because one has an economic advantage over another? We do not. Why, then, do we support protective tariffs and other restrictions against other nations that enjoy similar economic advantages?

Such trade agreements violate Washington and Jefferson's injunction to avoid entangling alliances.

## **Samm Tittle**

Free trade is an excellent idea that has never been tried! The American public has been told agreements like NAFTA were "free trade." they are not. We must not favor any of the agreements that have been sold to the public as free trade, because they are not free trade.

A true free trade agreement will specify each nation can send its products to the markets of the other country without any tariff. Tariffs are Taxes which are a burden on the American Trade because it is the American Consumer who is stricken by the tax burden. We need to negotiate a specific bilateral free trade agreement with each country.

---

### Question #5

5. The Constitution Party platform endorses an end to the Income tax. Do you agree with the platform, and if so, how would you replace the revenue?

---

## **Don Blankenship**

I think it would be very difficult to eliminate the income tax and at the same time comply with the CP's goal of the country being fiscally responsible. We can collect a lot of money from tariffs, sell or lease a lot of federal property, cut a tremendous amount of waste, and utilize a national sales tax to replace a lot of income tax revenue. But I would have to run a lot of numbers and get a lot of advice before saying I would eliminate the income tax.

The liberal screams about income inequality would certainly become louder and get more ears to listen. In fact, it could be so loud and so offensive to so many that it could backfire and damage the opportunities for the Party to achieve its broader goal of saving the country. Besides, more than 40% of Americans do not pay any income tax today.

In short, the income tax is a bad idea and the IRS is terrible but eliminating all income tax is a real challenge even though doing so would be great. I agree with the goal but it being in the platform is probably not a good idea.

The CP platform should primarily be the Constitution if we want the Constitution to be the supreme law in this country. We should not be too outspoken about making lots of changes to it. It is easier for people to understand and embrace our Party if we are simply for the Constitution than if we are for it but want to change a lot of it.

### **Dan Cummings**

I agree with our platform determination to terminate the income tax; I further propose the repeal of the 16th amendment to prevent its return. I do not intend to replace most of the revenue generated by the income tax because I advocate less government that spends less money on fewer government activities that are strictly limited to a very narrow interpretation of the Constitution. I favor indirect taxes, as did the Founders, for financing the constitutionally legitimate functions of the federal government. I also favor a constitutional amendment (**not** through an Article 5 convention) to repeal the authority of Congress to borrow money on the credit of the United States and to require repayment of the national debt within 50 years.

### **Don Grundman**

A) I totally agree with the platform as I am the only candidate who has produced both radio ads and campaign literature saying " There is no law which requires an American working in America to either file a tax return or to pay income tax." Go to LiveFreeNow.org to find this truth.

B) The revenue from the income tax pays the interest which the FED/Cartel/American Mafia charges us for the currency which it lends to us. If we nationalize the FED ( cut out the Mafia middleman ) and issue interest free United States Notes via the Treasury we will solve the " revenue " shortfall as we will no longer need an income tax. No more payments to " Don Corleone."

### **Charles Kraut**

This platform is easy to agree with because prior to the 16<sup>th</sup> amendment the direct taxation of citizens was prohibited by the Constitution. Had we not created the Federal Reserve, and had we not passed numerous bills in the New Deal, we would not have created the welfare state we have today and would most likely be able to balance our budget.

However, we live in the world that we live in, and our politicians have created this enormous mess with an unpayable and unsustainable national debt. As President I would ask Congress to do something which is politically unthinkable; to begin the process of dismantling the New Deal and the Great Society programs. I would work with the Congress in this by giving them political cover and by

talking to the people of this country about what it meant to be free, and why a welfare state is the antithesis of what America is supposed to be about.

Over a long period of time, assuming that congressional spending can be held in check and significantly reduced as programs are sunsetted, we would begin to eliminate the national deficit and begin to work on paying off the national debt. In this regard and only in this regard would negative interest rates be helpful, and then only to the government.

Once the United States government return to its sole responsibility of protecting the rights of American citizens, the terribly burdensome costs of government boondoggles like Medicare and Medicaid, along with the more than 2000 other federal giveaway programs would be eliminated.

In the meantime, **if** it were politically possible to replace the income tax with something like the Fair Tax, or even a Value Added tax as is so popular in Europe, we would have a good chance of replacing the revenue lost with the demise of the income tax.

### **Samm Tittle**

One of the centerpieces of the Samm Tittle campaign has been a 10% Tax across the Board. Ten percent tax on all new retail sales, exempting only food with a consideration on Pharmaceuticals/Medicines. This tax will fall on anyone doing business on a cash basis just as it impacts everyone else. That means we suddenly have tax revenue from groups that have previously evaded taxes. These include illegal aliens, prostitutes, drug dealers and anyone else being paid in cash.

A ten percent tax on retail sales of newly manufactured goods, will cause unprecedented economic growth since it will be a tax cut on the most productive Americans. The tax is so simple to collect, it will not be necessary to file tax returns any more. Your taxes are collected as you spend money, rather than being withheld from your paycheck.

By taxing spending, instead of taxing earning, we will now have incentives built into the system to encourage savings and earning more income. Of course it WORKS! Visitors from other countries are paying taxes which develops more income for the American Taxpayer, especially when they are in Business and can save/earn earn/save for their Futures.

---

## Question #6

---

6. The Constitution Party platform endorses an end to the Federal Reserve. Do you agree with the platform, and if so, what would that do to the US economy, and what would it mean for US status in the World?

---

### **Don Blankenship**

The Federal Reserve should be abolished. That is not a difficult question to answer.

However, it is very difficult for me to answer exactly what it should be replaced with and how the transition would be managed. There are many different systems in place in the world, but none are perfect.

The only commitment I can make relative to the Federal Reserve is that I would direct those more familiar with the options than I am to come up with a suggested alternative and a transition plan that would minimize the potential chaos and disruption that abolishing the Federal Reserve might cause.

The Federal Reserve is far more political than it ought to be. It holds a monopoly over money supply. It is unaccountable and unaudited, but abolishing it requires a lot more thought than I have given it.

### **Dan Cummings**

I favor the termination of the Federal Reserve System. To begin that process, and to generate publicity and motivate public opinion and sentiment against the Federal Reserve System, I will appoint a commission to investigate, thoroughly audit, and expose the Federal Reserve throughout its entire history of 107 years; I will appoint former Congressman Ron Paul as Chairman to direct that commission, if he is still healthy and sentient. I favor the institution of a voluntary alternative legal tender system of precious metals but oppose its use by the federal government. The federal government should be obliged to operate on its own quasicounterfeit currency to incentivize it to preserve its value; it should not be permitted to collect taxes or provide any kind of welfare in precious metals. A change in legal tender laws would obviously cause various economic adjustments, but continuing the present system will also cause continuing economic fluctuations with the net effect being a general overall decline in our economy and our fiat currency. After our adjustment to new currencies, I expect an overall average improvement in the economy, particularly if our oppressive bureaucratic regulations are simultaneously eliminated by attrition. A more sound currency might cause some scorn from trading partners more accustomed to managed fiat currencies, but they can adjust to our ways if they want to trade.

### **Don Grundman**

I totally agree with the platform and if we nationalize the FED and replace debt-money Cartel/Mafia Federal Reserve Notes with Treasury issued interest-free United States Notes our currency will have more value and our national status will be greatly enhanced. We will experience a fantastic and sustained prosperity when we eliminate the FED parasite.

## **Charles Kraut**

The Federal Reserve should never have been created. It served as a model for the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, both of which likewise should not have been created.

That said, it is both essential and almost certainly impossible for us to end the Federal Reserve. The Fed has placed so much money into circulation and bought up so much of public and private debt in United States that ending it out right would bankrupt the United States instantly. The fact that the Federal Reserve has become the de facto guarantor of all the big banks in the United States is another reason why ending it would be disastrous.

The Federal Reserve has the United States firmly in its grip. It calls the tune on far more than the current rate of inflation and the value of the dollar. It has extended its authority, both with and without congressional authorization, into the control of interest rates and the manipulation of the economy in areas like unemployment, wages, and other issues that belong elsewhere.

The Federal Reserve keeps the United States going. If we were on to abolish it is almost certain that the dollar would collapse, causing a global panic that would greatly exceed the destruction wrought in the Great Depression. The world depends upon the United States dollar. That relationship is unsustainable and unpopular; there are limits yet to be discovered as to how far and how much the Federal Reserve can go and do.

By all means, "End the Fed." Just be prepared for something very closely resembling the end of the world when you do so.

## **Samm Tittle**

We should all enthusiastically agree with the portion of the Constitution Party that calls for abolition of the Federal Reserve bank. In a world without the Fed, the US Treasury will print banknotes just as they currently print FRN.

We should all also favor eliminating the unbacked federal Reserve Notes returning to gold and silver coinage as the US constitution provides for in Article I, Section 8, Clause 5. In that case, all new notes printed by the Treasury would be redeemable on demand in, then silver and gold coins would once more be minted for circulation and the currently circulating FRN would be redeemed for a value based on the silver coins circulated by the mint.

The United States would lead the world if our dollars were once more gold and silver. The mint could easily prevent our coins being hoarded by the simple expedient of a small seigniorage of 3%. Meaning the US Mint makes 3% for turning bullion into silver or gold coins. Therefore the face value of the coin is slightly more than the bullion, or melt value of those coins.

### Question #7

7. What is your position on NATO?

---

## **Don Blankenship**

My position is that our allies who stand together with us against the likes of North Korea, Iran, and other rogue countries must remain our allies. Therefore, we need something like NATO wherein well behaved and common purpose allies communicate and stay prepared to join together in defense of our common interests.

At the same time, it is not American taxpayers' responsibility to fund NATO, and American soldiers should always be commanded by American officers. My preference would be to rename NATO to something that is more suitable to inclusion of all our allies. For example, Australia comes to mind. By dissolving NATO, we could get a chance to fully revamp the funding and structure of the organization.

## **Dan Cummings**

I favor our extrication from NATO rather rapidly. I will announce very early, perhaps before my inauguration, that United States troops will be withdrawn from Europe with all deliberate speed, beginning at the eastward fringes of NATO and working westward. I will also do all in my power to withdraw from other foreign "entangling alliances," especially the United Nations. I will revoke diplomatic immunity for the United Nations and all of its associated personnel on my Inauguration Day and encourage New York City to vigorously enforce all of its laws against United Nations personnel. I will do all in my power and executive authority to extricate the United States from the United Nations within 90 days and compel it to cease its operations in the United States and depart from our borders within one year.

## **Don Grundman**

NATO must be abolished as it has long ago fulfilled its original purpose and has morphed into an evil organization responsible for war crimes such as killing hundreds of thousands of civilians in Libya.

## **Charles Kraut**

NATO is another one of those violations of George Washington's injunction about entangling alliances. It came about when the United States emerged as the world's sole remaining superpower. Then for a time it shared that title of superpower with the Soviet Union, and because of that perceived threat NATO was formed. NATO is based on a false idea, that if one of its members were attacked it should be considered an attack on all the others. When we consider the possibility of a nuclear exchange, it would certainly have been best to exclude all those nations not possessing nuclear weapons from involvement and participation. Instead, by bringing them into NATO, all of them have become targets for attack by any adversary.

Like the Federal Reserve, we may not be able to end NATO overnight, but we can certainly do it gradually. We should not, for instance, have added former Soviet bloc nations to NATO. To a man like Putin that would look like nothing less than what we used to call Soviet aggression and an application of the "Domino theory." With the end of the Cold War we should have reduced our military footprint throughout the world just as the Soviets did.

## **Samm Tittle**

The NATO alliance remains a strong deterrent to the threat of military force by Russia. Samm Tittle will continue the US policy of urging (expecting & collecting) NATO member nations to pay at least 2% of their GDP to fund NATO operations.

---

## Question #8

---

8. What is your position on US intervention in the disputes, elections, and wars of foreign nations?

---

### **Don Blankenship**

We have neither the right nor the responsibility to police the world. Our involvement in conflicts between other countries should only be undertaken if it is fully clear that our national security is at issue.

For example, if China were to attack Canada, it would not be reasonable to stand aside. But conflicts between Middle Eastern countries when neither of which present any risk or benefit to us is not the American peoples' concern, and so it should not be the American military's concern.

Intervention in conflicts between other countries should be rare, and we should not have troops in 140 plus countries as we do now.

### **Dan Cummings**

I am opposed to our intervention in the internal affairs of any other country and in any international conflicts that do not very directly involve the United States or threaten our own national security.

### **Don Grundman**

We must stay out of such things to the greatest degree possible but we must realize that our past history of NOT following such an idea has made some countries, such as Taiwan, dependent upon our protection from their genocide and enslavement.

### **Charles Kraut**

The United States has a dreadful record of assassinations, death from above through the use of armed drones, engaging in combat operations in countries against which we have not declared war, regime change, and nationbuilding. All of these activities have been politically motivated and virtually all of them have failed dramatically.

The United States Senate in a bipartisan vote rejected the Versailles Treaty in 1919 which would have required the United States to engage its Armed Forces, possibly under the command of foreign generals, in wars in which the United States had no strategic or political interests. We were called "isolationists" for doing so, but it was the correct policy then and is the correct policy now. We only create enemies when we engage in regime change and the War on Terror.

### **Samm Tittle**

The United states does not need to interfere in the internal affairs of foreign nations. Jimmy Carter tried it with disastrous results. We should not be involved in any war unless it affects the

national security of the United States. We should not get into any war unless we plan to use massive force, protect our troops, have a clear definition of what constitutes victory, and an exit strategy. Although we are not the Policeman of the World; it behooves us to keep our Ambassadors adept to each Foreign Nations concerns; especially when it might have influence in our Homeland.

9. How are you and the Constitution Party different from the Libertarian Party?

---

**Don Blankenship**

Of course, the biggest single difference is abortion.

Generally speaking, I think the difference between my views and Libertarians has to do with their beliefs regarding social liberties. It is my opinion that their idea of legalizing recreational drugs is misguided. Also, I would disagree with their position of banning capital punishment and allowing same sex marriage. However, having seen how flawed and political our criminal justice system is, I have become increasingly concerned about capital punishment.

The Libertarian view is that nearly everything an individual does is okay and anything a government does is wrong. They oppose all regulations, tariffs, and seemingly even the principle of corporations. My view is that we are over regulated but having little to no regulation would be chaotic and misguided. Their view favors abolishing nearly all government authority. They also favor same sex marriage. And it seems they are okay with sanctuary cities. But I do agree with much of what LP members stand for.

My views do not differ much from the Constitution Party. However, I do believe that in order to achieve the Party goals we need to be more tolerant of other peoples' views. For example, most all CP members believe fully in the sanctity of life and so do I. But the question we must ask ourselves is: "Will we save millions of unborn lives by taking a position that isolates us from most Americans and thereby excludes us from the conversation?"

My view of the CP platform is that we have to clarify what our Mission Statement is. Do we want to save the country? Or will we be satisfied, once the country is gone, to say that we told you so?

Do we want to be able to say to abortionists after another 30 million unborn people have been killed that we are right, and they are wrong? Or do we want to be part of saving 15 million unborn lives?

My view is that either position is morally correct. But I believe we should do what we can to save as many unborn people as we can.

**Dan Cummings**

I differ with the Libertarian Party in that I believe in individual nationhood, the individual security of our nation, national citizenship, and secure international borders. I abhor their cowardly refusal to confront and reject abortion as an obvious act of aggression against another individual and view it as severely hypocritical. I reject their contention that homosexuals can "marry," since marriage is, and always has been, a specific heterosexual union. Those with defective gender attraction are free to institute and live in whatever personal arrangements they choose without interference from society, but society is under no ethical obligation to recognize those arrangements. I am not a prohibitionist

and favor major changes in our drug prohibition laws; however, I understand very well that marijuana freedom is far less important than other freedoms that are presently severely compromised by our enormous federal government. However, I consider myself rather libertarian in the Leonard Read school; he emphasized *economic* liberty, the liberty that is most difficult to maintain and popularize. My biggest disappointment in the Libertarian Party is that it cowardly abandons and subverts its sound fundamental principles when considering Social Security in the same manner as does our own Constitution Party; both parties delusionally advocate gradual extrication from Social Security by impossible fiscal measures.

### **Don Grundman**

I and the the CP are pro-life and anti-sodomite. The LP is the complete opposite.

### **Charles Kraut**

The Libertarian party, from my experience in speaking to its members, generally ignores God. It is positioned somewhere between a constitutional republic and anarchy and is dangerously close to the latter. Members of the Libertarian Party have told me that basically it is the party of “if it feels good, just do it - as long as it does not hurt anyone else. “ This is a false concept. We have a responsibility to one another to be moral and decent responsible citizens. This comes from the foundation of our laws, which is the Christian gospel.

I believe in God. I believe in truth. I believe that God has given us commandments for our benefit. The Constitution Party believes this as well.

### **Samm Tittle**

We differ from the Libertarian Party in two important ways. First of all, our position on social issues and our world-view are based upon Judeo-Christian beliefs found in the Bible. Intellectually mechanically & philosophically our United States has made it through 244 years in it's Foundation, holding fast to “Equal Rights for All. Special Privileges for None maintains a United agreement to disagree, still in respectful growth. The second major difference is our understanding of the need for a strong national defense, and secure borders. Therefore, while Libertarians agree with us on taxes and economic policy, they differ substantially on social issues, national defense, and including secure borders. The foundation of Independent thinkers is fine, but thinking first about our own Fellow Citizen keeps everyone independently free of being pushed into losing independence because of someone else's dependence. Example: If everyone sat on one side of the Road expecting to be dependent and the independent was forced to fulfill the needs of the dependent; after a while everyone would move over to the side of the dependency and the independents run out. “WHO PAYS”? Philosophically when EVERYONE becomes dependent, no one is independent. “Whatever the government (we are the government) gives to the Dependents, the government (we are the government) can take back. Everyone becomes “the Dependent” and you end up asking “who is working”? America is good at one thing. Being Independent. That means we all work; in order to maintain our independent lives.

10. Where do you differ from the Constitution Party Platform and why?

---

### **Don Blankenship**

I somewhat touched on where I disagree with the platform in answering some of the prior questions.

The "national CP platform" in my view should be limited to federal national policy issues. The Constitution says the power of the federal government is limited to the powers the Constitution allots to the federal government. Most CP members would be thrilled if that were actually the case in America today. That, in my view, should be our goal.

If the CP platform is essentially the Constitution itself or as close to the Constitution as it can be, the Party would be far more attractive to far more voters. State CP Party platforms could be different because they could address the state parties view on matters where the state has authority and on supporting and securing states' rights.

We do not need to surrender our individual and personal beliefs about abortion, illegal immigration, trade policy, income tax, or other matters to be relevant proponents of the Constitution and morality. But if our platform overly limits our membership numbers, then our opportunity to achieve our ultimate goals is reduced.

### **Dan Cummings**

Platform item #7 Congressional Reform:

Our platform states, "We seek to abolish Congressional pensions and other benefits that extend beyond their term in office." That concept is appropriate but should also specifically include abolition of presidential and vice presidential pensions and all other benefits that extend beyond their terms in office.

Platform item #8 Cost of Big Government:

The statement in our platform, "We call for the abolition of the Civil Service system, which is perceived to confer on government employees a 'property right' regarding their jobs," reflects very limited understanding of the beginnings of the Civil Service System. In the beginning the Civil Service System was conceived as an alternative to and a replacement of the prior "spoils system," a very corrupt system in which the government payroll was used as rewards for political patronage instead of reasonable compensation for service to the citizens of the United States. We should not advocate a return to that "spoils system." The original Civil Service System was intended to improve the quality of the federal workforce by setting standards to be met by federal employees and enforcing those standards by testing prospective government employees to verify and validate their high competence for the contemplated employment. In the beginning, the Civil Service System conferred no employment "property rights," but no public service unions existed then. The problem is the later development of governmental employee unions that soon insisted upon and eventually achieved their desire of a "property right" to their federal employment with all of its benefits. The original concept that government workers should be qualified for their work and should serve the citizens was a solution, not a problem; the later intervention of labor unions is the problem. We should stand for

the abolition of labor unions among any and all governmental employees, including public school teachers, while supporting the original civil service concept that all those who are compensated by the taxpayers should be validated and verified as to their qualifications (and temperament) to serve the citizens of the United States **at the pleasure of those citizens**. Governmental employees who are not satisfied with such an arrangement are free to leave that employment and seek compensation elsewhere, where useful and productive work is expected. ***In brief summary, public service employment at taxpayer expense should be difficult to acquire and easy to lose.*** An improved replacement sentence for the platform should read something like, "We favor the abolition of labor unions among all public servants who are compensated by the taxpayers of the United States while retaining the original mission of the Civil Service Commission to limit federal employment to those who can verify and validate their high qualifications for service to the citizens of the United States. We do not recognize any 'property right' pertaining to any employment financed by the taxpayers."

Platform item #8 Cost of Big Government:

The statement in our platform, "The government promised to deliver the benefits [Social Security], and we must meet this commitment," is utterly and completely incompatible with our goals to restore limited constitutional government and drastically diminish the size of the federal government. Those promises were made by constitutional apostates and heretics. It is not our moral obligation to fulfill unsound promises made by others; instead, our moral obligation is to fulfill our own promises to restore the limited constitutional government of the Founding Fathers. That obligation, which we should fill with full honor, is incompatible with Social Security. Social Security is the keystone of the welfare state; we will become a free nation again when it no longer exists.

Platform item #25 Social Security:

The statement in our platform, "The Constitution grants no authority to the federal government to administer a Social Security system" is fully correct and can stand alone. We completely invalidate that statement by the following statement that we intend to "meet the obligations already incurred under the system." The system has no limits (no legislative termination at any time in the future) on the "obligations" to present and future generations, so how can we "meet [any] obligations" with only limited funds, and the funds are severely limited due to the profligate and reckless spending of our present and prior Congresses. Ponzi schemes can never be ended in fairness to everyone involved; that is why they are so evil to begin in the first place. A recent reasonable estimate of the cost of our established "entitlements" to the next few generations totals twice the total domestic product of the entire world. The promised benefits cannot and will not be fully paid; the program will eventually end in some type of honestly acknowledged or inflation-obscured bankruptcy. We should not pretend that we can change that result. We should advocate abolishing the system posthaste. It is the only honest proposal that we can advocate. Furthermore, as a Christian political party, we should advocate the Biblical Christian doctrine of nonretirement, of working throughout our lives until death; retirement is not a Christian principal (Genesis 3:19).

Platform item #28 Taxes erroneously states: "The 16th Amendment does not provide authority for an unapportioned direct tax."

Correction: The 16th Amendment was a grave mistake that should never have been ratified; however, while it remains a part of the Constitution, it does explicitly and unambiguously authorize nonapportioned direct taxes ("The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, **without apportionment** among the several States, and **without regard** to any **census or enumeration**." ) Our best strategy is to expose the great evils that it has financed and advocate its specific repeal in the same manner in which the 18th Amendment was repealed; we should not weaken those efforts (or look foolish) by interpreting words contrary to their specific meaning or pretending that the 16th Amendment is something other than its plain unambiguous meaning. That sentence in item #28 should be stricken from our platform while we unambiguously continue to advocate repeal of the 16th Amendment.

Platform item #28 Taxes:

The "apportioned state-rate tax" proposal is a catastrophically erroneous constitutional myth. This concept of requisitions that were apportioned to the states was clearly and unambiguously expressed in the Articles of Confederation and was the method by which the Confederation Congress was financed for the 8 years that the Articles were in effect; however, that method of financing the confederational government was a catastrophic failure. While it was operational, the United States was facing bankruptcy and financial ruin due to lack of compliance by the states. That financial situation was so desperately ineffective that the Confederation Congress proposed amendments to the Articles on 4 separate occasions (in only 8 years) to give that Congress authority to establish an independent source of revenue, primarily tariffs, and to penalize noncompliant states; on each of those 4 occasions 12 out of the 13 states ratified the proposed amendment; however, the Articles of Confederation required unanimity for all amendments to the Articles, so each of these proposed amendments failed because each was rejected by one state or another. Fortunately, our wise Founders at the Philadelphia Convention left state requisitions out of the Constitution; the word "requisition" does not even appear in the Constitution. This concept ("apportioned state-rate tax") will encourage and enable some of the most perverse incentives of basic human nature. It will NOT incentivize politicians to spend less recklessly than does the present system; to the contrary, Congress will surely be incentivized to spend much more freely whenever it feels that it can simply send its bills to the state legislatures. The statement in our platform that, "The effect of this 'state-rate tax' will be to encourage politicians to argue for less, rather than more, federal spending and less state spending as well," is utterly delusional because the incentives in favor of spending and in opposition to taxation will be divided between 2 separate political constituencies. The appropriating/spending institution (Congress) will have an overwhelming incentive to spend because it can do so without practical limitations and without political pain. The taxing institutions (state legislatures) will suffer the political pain for laying and collecting the taxes that enable the federal government to continue its profligate spending but will have no effective way to restrain that spending. Our minimally informed electorate will hate our state legislators for the imposed taxes but will still love Congress for its spending. One of the most perverse aspects of "federal aid to the states" that we constitutionalists almost universally oppose is that the money seems "free" to the states, and very few state legislators have the integrity or fortitude to decline it. Requisitioning the states for federal revenue is the exact reverse situation in which the Congress gets "free" money (for which it need not tax) without any political incentives for economizing. It also gives the biggest (and most liberal/socialist/fascist) states too much leverage over the budget; they could manipulate the federal government in an unfavorable and very unconstitutional direction by threatening to withhold its financing. This proposal will have **unintended consequences** and **collateral damage** in the extreme and will be worse than the

17th Amendment for weakening the influence of the small states. We should remove this paragraph from our platform and replace it with a simple statement (for adequate clarity) unambiguously repudiating the concept of apportioned state requisitions.

### **Don Grundman**

There is no part of the platform which I disagree with.

### **Charles Kraut**

The Constitution Party has taken some positions I would not call extreme, but which are far beyond the realm of political reality. I have struggled with the no-exception rule on abortion but understand that any abortion is the taking of a human life – though not that of a citizen.

I am also concerned with the emphasis on Jesus Christ in our Preamble. As a faithful, active Christian I understand why the Founding Fathers made no mention of God in our Constitution. Christians have no more right to impose their beliefs on people of other faiths than they do upon us – though some of them will use any means at hand to do just that.

We do not have the right to discriminate against who will come to this country and become responsible citizens. If we declare America to be a Christian nation, we are doing exactly that.

### **Samm Tittle**

I fully support the Constitution Party platform. Finally we would have a President who respects, appreciates and wants to fill the Requirement to “Preserve, protect & defend” everyone’s right to the Constitution. It is the ONLY LAW of this Land.

---

#### Question #11

11. The Constitution Party Platform is 100% pro-life. Are you in agreement with that position? If so, how would you, as President, work to abolish "legal" abortion in the United States?

---

### **Don Blankenship**

As noted above, I am in agreement—I am 100% pro-life. But as a practical matter, I do not think that even a President banning abortions would end abortions. If it would and I could issue an executive order to do so I would.

Assuming I could not ban abortions as President, I would select pro-life minded judges. I would make adoption extremely easy. I would end taxpayer-funded abortions. I would make illegal any abortion in which the pregnancy could be ended without aborting the unborn child. Also, I would attempt to pass the laws Missouri has passed that restrict and discourage abortion.

Finally, I would fund a research project that would seek to eliminate the need to abort any unborn person in order to end a pregnancy.

### **Dan Cummings**

I will immediately call upon Congress to entirely terminate and abolish all federal judicial appellate jurisdiction in all matters of medical care, specifically including abortion; this should include a prohibition against the use of any prior federal court decisions as precedents in any court of the United States. This will liberate the various state legislatures and governors to reestablish their prior abortion laws; I will encourage those legislatures and governors to make those laws as restrictive as they can achieve. I will call upon Congress to recriminalize abortion within the District of Columbia, where the Constitution provides Congress with full legislative authority for all criminal laws, including homicide laws. I will call upon Congress (and use executive orders where relevant) to repeal and terminate completely and absolutely all aspects of federal law favoring, enabling, and/or financing abortions, including, but not limited to:

- terminating all federal appropriations for Planned Parenthood and all similar organizations,
- terminating all federal employment medical insurance fringe benefits paying for abortions, and
- terminating abortion as a recognized deductible medical expense for federal income tax law.

While strongly favoring the reinstatement of very strict laws in all of the 50 states, I will oppose any criminal laws from Congress (outside of the District of Columbia) because all criminal laws belong to the states under the Constitution.

### **Don Grundman**

A) I am in complete agreement with that position. I am an abolitionist.

B) I would defund any and all abortion providers and do a massive program of "reverse Social Engineering;" i.e.; I would restore a "Culture of Life" in our nation so that abortion will be unthinkable.

### **Charles Kraut**

The President has no legal authority in the area of abortion. He can create Executive Orders all day long, but they must not be given the force of law because doing so will be unconstitutional. Instead, I will communicate frequently with the American people and urge them to return to the standards we once upheld. I would urge Congress to act to render Roe v. Wade moot and explain to the American people why 80% of abortion mills are in black neighborhoods. If necessary, I will urge one or more test cases to be brought before federal courts and then the US Supreme Court that will give the Court the opportunity to overturn Roe v. Wade themselves. The US Supreme Court has reversed itself more than 236 times on Constitutional issues.

### **Samm Tittle**

Anyone can answer are you Pro-Life? Where would "they" be without it! Posterity is the only way to go in the United States believed our Founding Fathers when their desire was to carry on an

already great Country. I am 100% pro-life. As president, I will veto any bill that contains Planned Parenthood funding. In final if my mother & father had not been Pro-Life; we would not have been able to fulfill "God's 2020 Vision" with SAMM 2020, the President in the Race that vows to honor, respect and fulfill the Constitution of our USA.

---

## Question #12

12. Are federal departments such as the Department of Energy, Bureau of Land Management, HUD, Department of Education, Bureau of Alcohol Tobacco and Firearms, Food and Drug Administration and EPA constitutional? Do they have any merit? If not, how would you address that as President?

---

### **Don Blankenship**

As someone who was CEO of a major publicly traded energy company for two decades, I can tell you we do not need plus 100,000 direct and contractor employees in the Department of Energy. Yes, we need to abolish the Department of Energy. The truth is that I have never met a Department of Energy employee or contractor to my knowledge.

And yes, the Education Department needs to be abolished. As a parent who had two children in public schools (20 years ago), I know that our primary and secondary education is subpar. It is even worse today, and so my five grandchildren are home schooled. We need to get rid of the Department of Education.

As one who has interacted a lot with EPA, I learned that EPA stands for Equal Poverty for All. The truth is EPA policies have not only cost millions of Americans their jobs but has also caused far more worldwide pollution than it has prevented. The EPA should be abolished, but some of its functions would need to be continued.

As for ATF, I once had a positive experience with them, but I do not know what all they do. I do know that there is a need to somehow keep track of explosives. The coal company I managed used tons of explosives every year and many companies do. So, there are some ATF functions that need to be continued. The ATF budget is much smaller than the other agencies. I would need to learn more to further develop my view. Perhaps, ATF's meaningful functions could be folded into DOJ, but then DOJ is so corrupt, maybe not.

As for FDA, I would not abolish it. Its budget is only 10% of the Department of Energy, and its fundamental purpose of regulating the sell and prescription of drugs is necessary. I doubt Americans would be comfortable with eliminating food and drug regulations, so these functions need to be performed better and not discontinued.

As for HUD, I believe it could be eliminated, but here again there are some functions that might need to be continued. We have too many street people. We do not need more. Street people need to either be put to work or, if mentally impaired, they need to be placed in some sort of facility. HUD is primarily performing a communist government function. But given how our government has destroyed the American way of life and exported millions of American jobs, eliminating HUD would need to be done over several years. It could not be done humanely if it were abolished as quickly as the Dept. of Energy and Dept. of Education could be eliminated.

As for the Bureau of Land Management, it could be fairly quickly eliminated as the federal government needs to divest a huge portion of its land holdings. There are some functions like protecting some national monuments and trails that would need to be continued. But given the waste in all government departments, as well as the Department of the Interior, it should not be very challenging to eliminate BLM.

In summary, many cabinet positions and agencies could and should be eliminated, but there are some worthwhile functions that need to be folded into other government department responsibilities. The waste in these Departments is enormous, and there is plenty of low hanging fruit to lower the budget deficit.

As to whether these agencies are Constitutional, I would say it is arguable that they are not. However, in my view, it would be much easier to eliminate them than to win the court battle to have them declared unconstitutional. There are many more obvious violations of the Constitution that would be in front of these if we were seeking to declare things unconstitutional. For example, state abuse of federal government power such as sanctuary cities and federal abuse of states' rights like the right to ban abortion would take precedent over declaring government departments unconstitutional.

### **Dan Cummings**

I consider all of these named federal agencies (and others not named herein) to be unconstitutional; because they are unconstitutional, I do not ponder much upon their possible merits. I favor their defunding, legislative repeal, and liquidation, beginning with the Department of Education and Bureau of Alcohol Tobacco and Firearms. Any meritorious functions they provide can be left to the states.

### **Don Grundman**

I would ban obviously unconstitutional departments ( Education goes immediately ) and would evaluate all other Departments for their contributions to national defense; stripping them down to perform only such functions.

### **Charles Kraut**

The only Cabinet departments that are nominally constitutional are those created by Congress or to which Congress has given their blessing. The President cannot do everything himself as the enforcer of the laws, particularly when Congress has passed, and the President has signed into law so many laws requiring the establishment of government bureaucracies.

Some of these departments serve useful purposes until they exceed their Congressional authority and begin to operate in areas closed to them by law. Those departments must be made accountable to the people – or, at the very least, to Congress.

### **Samm Tittle**

I believe the department Education needs to be eliminated because it does not create or produce anything and has never been a requirement under our Constitution. However Education

being paramount for our Children's children's posterity; SAMM 2020 has a Plan for successfully educating our Children. . We can combine the federal Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management and Bureau of Indian Affairs,

---

### Question #13

13. Do you believe the education system in America is adequate? If not, what measures would you take to improve it?

---

#### **Don Blankenship**

No, the education system in America is not adequate. It is horrible. We rank in about the middle of developed countries as to the quality of education. This is hardly exceptional as we like to consider ourselves. Many of our schools are no more than day care centers.

Our major universities are so liberal and anti-American that our founders would turn over in their graves if they could. Common core is a disaster. America's founders are ridiculed in our history books which sometimes grant as much space to Madonna as to George Washington. Climate change is taught as a science even though at best it is a theory.

The waste is incredible. The Teachers' Union is a communist entity.

As for measures to improve education, we should prohibit public school teachers from being union members. Most teachers are members of either the American Federation of Teachers or the National Education Association. Both of these unions support liberal policies and fill our children's heads with the liberal ideology. No union has better educating our children as it mission.

All textbooks should be fact checked. We should establish test scoring minimums to earn diplomas from each grade. We should have teacher performance standards greatly based on these diploma scores.

We should also place more focus on vocational education in secondary schools.

All classes must be taught in English. Conversely, and perhaps unpopular to many CP members, all students should be taught Spanish as a second language in grade school. Like it or not, our kids will need to be able to communicate and get along with other Americans.

Competition in all elements of education should be embraced, not eliminated.

As President, I would set as a goal being number one in the world in math, science, technology, reading, and literacy. We would continually make whatever changes/adjustments that are needed to achieve that goal.

In closing, our Party has an opportunity to make progress toward becoming a powerful and relevant political party. We need to be willing to adapt to the realities in which we are faced. But we should not compromise our moral beliefs, and we do not have to.

### **Dan Cummings**

The biggest obstacle to improved education in America is federal intervention at all levels from prekindergarten to postgraduate college. I favor the immediate defunding of the Department of Education. I will veto any federal legislation that contains any appropriation for that department except for liquidation expenses. I will appoint as Secretary of Education someone who understands and opposes federal intervention in the education system and who accepts as his or her sole mission the complete and methodical liquidation of that institution. As president I will have no constitutional authority to intervene directly in our educational system, even for its improvement; I can best serve our educational system by systematically dismantling any federal intervention in the system.

### **Don Grundman**

Our educational system is totally shot and should be totally scrapped and replaced by homeschooling and decentralized local educational control in the smallest units possible. The totally evil teachers unions are deadly enemies of children and of true education. They must be destroyed.

" The Underground History of American Education " by John Taylor Gatto describes how our schools were created to produce mindless drones.

We must rebuild education to produce thinking human beings.

### **Charles Kraut**

Our educational system is clearly failing in every respect. Government control and Islamic and gay rights influences are combining to produce K-12 graduates with no study habits, no ability to take notes, no real knowledge, and no desire to learn. In addition, they have been indoctrinated in Islam, sexual deviance, gender confusion, and worse.

We must return our public schools to local control and eliminate the influence of the Federal government. This can be done by rejecting all Federal funding of public schools. Most of that money is used to pay bureaucrats whose sole function is to prepare and submit reports to the Department of Education. Then, parents need to be recruited to carefully oversee their children's education, including attending PTA meetings, school board meeting, and actual classes on a regular basis with their children.

### **Samm Tittle**

Our educational system is not adequate and has served America poorly for a number of decades. Under our constitution the federal government is limited to exactly 18 enumerated powers, found in Article I, Section 8, and education is not one of those enumerated powers.

James Madison wrote, in Federalist Paper number 45, under the pseudonym Publius, "The powers delegated by the proposed Constitution to the federal government are few and defined. Those which are to remain in the State governments are numerous and indefinite." Clearly one of those numerous powers retained by the states was education.

As president, and true advocate for Education for all walks of Life we will work to abolish the federal Department of Education, replacing our Education for our Children with the SAMM2020 Solution.. Among the many problems with our current education system is rampant political correctness that has led to numerous instances of harassment and discrimination against conservative faculty members. I am a proud me