

There are many more reasons why Dr. Paul's message of Christian Liberty has rung true with so many, and why I feel he is the only valid choice for our presidential nominee. Please research his positions for yourself - there are several websites below to help you get started. The information contained in this flyer can be verified through various online news sources, or you can contact me personally at mrsjtwalker@gmail.com for more information. I hope you will join me in praying for God's will in the upcoming presidential

ONLINE RESOURCES

<http://www.ronpaul2008.com>

<http://www.ronpaullibrary.org/>

<http://www.youtube.com> - search, "Ron Paul"

<http://www.meetup.com> (find a Ron Paul meetup group in your area)

"The only Republican with the potential to pull an upset victory over Clinton is Ron Paul."

-Dr. Chuck Baldwin, Pastor

This material has not been approved by any political campaign or committee. It has not been paid for or endorsed by any candidate.

INTEGRITY: Continued from previous panel

their college educations, all because his personal principals do not allow him to use taxpayers' money for such purposes. And throughout his congressional career, his principals have NEVER changed - not once. He has stated, "I have never been one who is comfortable talking about my faith in the political arena. In fact, the pandering that typically occurs in the election season I find to be distasteful. But for those who have asked, I freely confess that Jesus Christ is my personal Savior, and that I seek His guidance in all that I do. I know, as you do, that our freedoms come not from man, but from God." And his record has proven this belief. In addition, Dr. Paul's humility is refreshing and inspiring. I recently witnessed his being asked why he is the best candidate for President; his quiet response was, "Oh, I don't think I'm the best judge of that."

Adherence to principals in one's personal life, regardless of what virtues they may publicly espouse, is the true test of that person's integrity. In my research of the major candidates, only Ron Paul passes the test.

THE IRAQ WAR

Mr. HUCKABEE supports the continued occupation of and undeclared war against Iraq. He has made it clear that he will allow our troops to remain in the Middle East. He admittedly will also continue the current trend of preemptive warfare.

By contrast . . .

Dr. RON PAUL believes in the Christian doctrine of, "Just War," which basically mandates that war, while sometimes necessary, must only be waged as a last resort - for a discernible moral and public good, with the right intentions, vetted through established legal authorities (a constitutionally required declaration of war by Congress). The U.S. occupation of Iraq does not meet this criteria. In Dr. Paul's own words, "It has been and remains my firm belief that the current United Nations-mandated, no-win police action in Iraq fails to meet the high moral threshold required to wage just war. That is why I have offered moral and practical opposition to the invasion, occupation and social engineering police exercise now underway in Iraq. It is my belief, borne

"It is patently un-American to tax workers all their lives on the fruits of their labor, and then still take sizeable chunks of what's left at the end that rightfully belongs to their families. -Ron Paul

out by five years of abject failure and tens of thousands of lost lives, that the Iraq operation has been a dangerous diversion from the rightful and appropriate focus of our efforts to bring to justice the jihadists that have attacked us and seek still to undermine our nation, our values, and our way of life."

TAXES

Mr. HUCKABEE has defended his many tax increases during his tenure as governor by maintaining that he also managed to lower many other taxes. I will not attempt to prove otherwise, as his tax record can speak for itself. What I have observed, however, is the fact that, while Mr. Huckabee praises the virtues of lower taxes, his policy proposals are in direct contradiction to his claimed commitment to less taxation. He has proposed many additional social entitlement programs at the federal level; he states, "Every child deserves a quality education, first-rate health care, decent housing . . ." etc. While this goal seems laudable, his proposal of forcing taxpayers to pay for these programs (the moral equivalent of stealing someone's money to give it to another) would serve only to plunge our nation further into debt and financial danger. Mr. Huckabee is a proponent of the so-called, "Fair Tax," a federal sales tax of approximately 30%.

By contrast . . .

Dr. RON PAUL believes that concern for our fellow man should be our motivation to help others, not government-mandated taxpayer charity. As he has stated concerning misplaced government spending, "It is, of course, very easy to be generous with the people's money." He believes that we, the Church, should take responsibility for helping those in need, and that welfare programs serve only to perpetuate the poverty of most, rather than motivating them to improve their station in life. Dr. Ron Paul wishes to, in his own words, "get rid of the income tax and replace it with nothing." He does not advocate a flat tax, nor a, "fair" tax. Eliminating the federal income tax would easily be possible by simply reducing federal spending.

Should Christians
vote for
MIKE HUCKABEE,
or
RON PAUL



With many of us Christian conservatives trying to find a Republican presidential candidate we can support, some of us are getting excited about former Arkansas governor, Mike Huckabee. So is it true that Mr. Huckabee is the one who Christian conservatives should be supporting?

MIKE HUCKABEE'S record is, at first glance, largely conservative. He is pro-life, pro-family, pro-gun, and has made his Christian beliefs very clear in the public arena. However, the fact is that a quick delve into Mr. Huckabee's past tells a bit of a different story. As John Fund, journalist for opinionjournal.com, has stated, "I have known and liked him for years... But I also know he is not the 'consistent conservative' he now claims to be."

Likewise, Betsy Hagan, Arkansas director of conservative group Eagle Forum was once "his Number 1 fan." But she ended up disappointed with his record. "He was pro-life and pro-gun, but otherwise a liberal," she says. "Just like Bill Clinton he will charm you, but don't be surprised if he takes a completely different turn in office."

Likewise, Phylis Schlafly of the national Eagle Forum chapter has stated, "[Mr. Huckabee] destroyed the conservative movement in Arkansas, and left the Republican Party a shambles. Yet some of the same evangelicals who sold us on George W. Bush as a 'compassionate conservative' are now trying to sell us on Mike Huckabee."

*As a staunchly Christian, freedom-loving American myself, I have found the perfect alternative to Mike Huckabee as the Republican nominee. His name is **Dr. RON PAUL**. Dr. Ron Paul is a conservative Christian grandfather, an Obstetrician by trade, and the leading advocate for freedom since the late 70's as a Republican Congressman in our nation's capital. His fellow Congressmen have long recognized him as one of the only honest men in Washington; one of his colleagues has noted, "Ron Paul personifies the Founding Fathers' ideal of the citizen-statesman. He makes it clear that his principles will never be compromised, and they never are." So, in what ways are Mr. Huckabee's positions unacceptable to true conservatives, and how are Dr. Ron Paul's views preferable?*

I have never been one who is comfortable talking about my faith in the political arena. In fact, the pandering that typically occurs in the election season I find to be distasteful. But for those who have asked, I freely confess that Jesus Christ is my personal Savior, and that I seek His guidance in all that I do. -Ron Paul

SANCTITY OF LIFE

Mr. HUCKABEE is unmistakably and commendably pro-life. However, his approach to eliminating abortion is an unfortunately impractical one, and would take many years longer than his presidential term, during which millions more unborn children would continue to die. His preferred method is to eliminate abortion by means of yet another Constitutional amendment. While this is a worthy effort, the fact is that the Constitutional amendment process is a lengthy one, and one over which the U.S. President holds little, if any, say-so. Not only that, but once the amendment comes up for a vote, it would likely be denied, which would reset the entire process.

By contrast . . .

Dr. RON PAUL's position is that abortion should be removed from federal jurisdiction altogether. Like other forms of violent crime, such as murder, abortion should be an issue for the individual states to decide upon. This is the approach that will start savings babies' lives *immediately* - the ability to fight and defeat the pro-abortion movement will be infinitely easier at the state level than at the federal level. How many millions of the unborn have died because of the nationalized lawmaking approach to abortion? Roe vs. Wade should be overturned, and decision-making power with regards to abortion should be eliminated from the realm of the federal courts. While this is not the perfect solution to elimination abortion throughout America, it is the only viably immediate solution, and it is the Constitutional approach.

FAMILY

Mr. HUCKABEE is strongly in favor of a federal Constitutional amendment defining marriage as being only between one man and one woman. Initially, this seems to be a positive fact for Christians. But the prospect of permitting our federal government to define marriage is a dangerous one at best. It has enormous potential to destroy other aspects of the family, such as parental rights. Mr. Huckabee's stance on federally defining marriage is reminiscent of Hillary Clinton's, "it takes a village"

philosophy. The Federal government can take the very precedents we ask them to set, and then use them in the future to in turn and declare that one's marriage and family are legally void if they don't educate and raise their children the way the government requires. This is at LEAST as much of a risk as the kind of family dynamic that many are trying to prevent with a Marriage Amendment. Many Christians seem to believe that, without legal recognition of marriage, the sanctity of the family is in jeopardy. The reality is that a legal definition of marriage would begin the erosion of the sovereignty of one's family over their own home. In addition, it is ill-advised that many in the church continue to believe that we must judge candidates based on their willingness to use the government to enforce family values. The Apostle Paul makes it clear in Romans that the break down of values in Roman society was itself an effect, not a cause. It was the judgement of God against a people who had turned away from Him and His glory to worship the creations of man in the first place. The state is not God, nor can it do His job. We need a government that is kept in check and fulfills only its proper role of protecting the temporal life, liberty, and property of the individual, or we will continue our nation's spiritual decline. No laws or surrender of our God-given individual rights will stop it.

By contrast . . .

Dr. RON PAUL has stated that that his preference would be for CHURCHES to decide on the issue of marriage, rather than federal government. God has already defined marriage - why should the government need to qualify Divine Law? Dr. Paul supports the Defense of Marriage Act & the Marriage Protection Act, both of which seek to protect traditional marriage at the state level. In his own words, "I am unwilling either to cede to federal courts the authority to redefine marriage, or to deny a state's ability to preserve the traditional definition of marriage." If we allow government to define marriage at all, then we have already given up on the principle that our marriage and families are between us and our God, and we would therefore no longer have the right to complain about odd definitions of marriage. By giving the central planners power over the definition, they can (and eventually probably will) expand "marriage" to include anything they want it to. If we truly care about marriage, we should make sure that it is kept sacred by securing it as far away from government regulations as possible.

INTEGRITY

It is inevitable that, during an election, the candidates' personal lives will eventually come under scrutiny. While our aim should not be to personally attack anyone, it is important to take an individual's personal, demonstrated values into account when considering how fit they are for office. Having said that, I consider it worth mentioning that MIKE HUCKABEE has been involved in several events which cause one to question his integrity and honesty. According to various news sources (including the American Spectator and MSNBC), the Arkansas Ethics Commission officially reprimanded Mr. Huckabee for ethics violations five times in 14 years, including once for taking money from an organization whose donors he refused to disclose. He also used public money for family restaurant meals, boat expenses, and other personal uses. He attempted to claim as his own \$70,000 worth of furnishings that were actually donated to the governor's mansion, not to him personally. State ethics rules later forced him to renounce this claimed, "gift." He has also repeatedly maintained the claim that a particular tax which he passed during his term as governor was actually voted for by the citizens of the state. In fact, this is a complete falsehood - this tax for which the people, "voted" never actually appeared on the ballot, it was only signed into effect by then-governor Huckabee.

By contrast . . .

If there has ever been a truly squeaky-clean politician, **Dr. RON PAUL** fits the bill. Having never encountered a politician whom I deemed truly trustworthy, I was personally very skeptical when I initially heard of Dr. Paul. So I set out to find out the truth about him - or rather, to TRY to find something bad about him. Every candidate has at least a little hidden dirt, right? Well, apparently not this one. His fellow congressmen are admittedly humbled by his consistent, quiet integrity. He has never accepted a government-paid junket (would you or I be willing to forgo this seemingly harmless perk of Congressional life?), refuses participation in the lucrative Congressional pension program, and even refused to allow his children to accept federal funds for

Continued on opposite side