

## ACT! for America Candidate Questionnaire

**Candidate Name:** Joseph Martin

**Candidate Political Party:** Reform Party of Kansas

**Candidate Signature:** 

**Office Sought (such as Iowa U.S. House District 1):**  
**Kansas U.S. Senate**

Please print or type all information.

1. It is becoming increasingly evident that American dependence on foreign oil, especially oil from countries that support and/or export radical Islamic ideology and terrorism, poses a growing threat to our national security. There has been considerable discussion of alternative energy such as wind and solar, but neither provide any significant solution for the liquid energy needs of our transportation sector, at least for the foreseeable future. Would you support or oppose each of the following proposals to help move America's transportation sector away from foreign oil dependence and thus better protect our national security?

- a. The Open Fuel Standard Act, legislation with bi-partisan sponsorship which would require that starting in 2012, 50% of new automobiles, and starting in 2015, 80% of new automobiles, sold in the United States, be flex-fuel vehicles warranted to operate on gasoline, ethanol, and methanol, or be warranted to operate on biodiesel.

Support                       Oppose                       Undecided

Comments: We have too much federal regulation on energy as it is, with some states (including Alaska and Montana begging the Congress to allow them to begin domestic oil production. There is so much oil under American soil that the major oil companies have continuously lobbied for Federal control and regulation of domestic oil companies. In fact, the price of gas at the pumps has actually been kept relatively low (compared to the price of a barrel of oil and the price of gasoline in other countries) in order to make it harder for domestic oil production to be economically feasible. We also have a drastic shortage in oil refining capacity. In the past 20 or so years, the major oil companies bought up many of the domestic oil refineries and then shut them down, in order to create an artificial bottleneck and thus artificial scarcity of gasoline for American drivers. I would much rather see the free market drive these technical design changes, not only in automobiles and trucks, but also in the production of electricity for families and businesses.

---

- b. A presidential Executive Order mandating conversion of the federal automotive fleet from gasoline to domestically-produced natural gas.

Support                       Oppose                       Undecided

Comments: I do not know if natural gas makes more sense than normal gasoline for fueling vehicles, whether from a production, safety, efficiency, or environmental standpoint. I do know that very many property owners already lease out their mineral rights for natural gas to large corporations, like Williams and British Petroleum, and many of these property owners are already complaining about unethical contract and price manipulation by these companies. This actually sounds like a lobby by these large corporations to drive up the demand for natural gas and to increase their profits while passing only minimal increases to the property owners. I am much more in favor of A) increased domestic oil production; B) allowing and encouraging new domestic oil refineries; and C) encouraging America-friendly alternative fuels like bio-diesel.

---

### **ACT! for America candidate questionnaire, page two...**

c. Expansion of offshore oil and natural gas exploration and drilling.

Support                       Oppose                       Undecided

Comments: And more urgently, domestic oil production where many states already know where the oil is, and in Alaska, where they are already set up to begin if only Congress would give the OK.

---

d. Opening up a small section of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) to oil exploration and drilling.

Support                       Oppose                       Undecided

Comments: And much more that that outside ANWR, such as around Gull Island and Prudoe Bay.

---

2. American companies are prohibited from doing business in or with nations that have been determined to be sponsors of terrorism. However, some federal and state public pension funds, partially funded with tax dollars, invest in foreign companies that do business in and with terrorist-sponsoring countries. Would you support or oppose legislation that would prohibit federal pension funds from investing in foreign companies that do business in and with terrorist-sponsoring countries?

Support                       Oppose                       Undecided

Comments: Sadly, many of these designations are based more on political, economic, and corporate concerns than on whether a country poses any real threat to American interests. But in order to be fair and consistent, the Federal government should be bound by its own decisions as it demands of private American companies.

---

**ACT! for America candidate questionnaire, page three...**

3. Materials distributed in some American mosques advocate the overthrow of America's constitutional form of government and replacing it with Islamic law, known as sharia law. Many such materials also call on Muslims to take up the cause of holy war against all unbelievers. Would you support or oppose congressional hearings to review such materials that are now in the public domain, to determine if they violate federal laws applying to terrorism or sedition?

Support                       Oppose                       Undecided

Comments: We need many more Congressional hearing into what has been going on, not just into these materials themselves, but into who is producing and distributing them and whether they truly reflect the sentiment of the groups they claim to represent. The CIA has admitted to multiple operations that included producing false materials in the name of other groups in order to cast them into a negative light, and this could easily be another instance of this tactic. We also need to have Congressional hearings into the unconstitutional provisions of the Patriot Act and many of the recent executive orders, including Presidential Directive 51 which says that the President can declare an emergency of his choosing and then put his own hand-picked designates into positions of authority supplanting the Congress and the courts. Similarly, we need Congressional oversight hearings into why the White House has refused to allow members of Congress, even those with the highest security clearance, from seeing the Executive's plans for Continuity of Government (COG) in case of emergency; there is some information that Congress has been deemed not to be involved in the COG plans; that is completely unconstitutional and needs to be investigated immediately.

- 
4. Many Muslims in England and Western Europe are pressing the countries where they live to create a separate court system for them, where they would be governed by Islamic sharia law, instead of the law of the countries in which they live. Would you support or oppose allowing Muslims in America to live under their own Islamic court and legal system in such areas as family court, instead of the court and legal systems of the United States and the state in which they live?

Support                       Oppose                       Undecided

Comments: The current system of "Family Courts" is completely in violation of the personal, God-given, constitutionally protected rights of American families, and all of the Federal structures that support and encourage it, including the abhorrent quota system that requires states child custody agencies to take at least certain numbers of children from their families in order to maintain their Federal funding. It was only about 5 years ago that the Kansas legislature passed statutes giving the SRS the power to take our children, no questions asked, in order to receive several million dollars (I believe) in Federal funding. That is an outrage and completely opposed to "Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness"! It must be stopped, both at the Federal level and in the states.

- 
5. Some American banks and investment firms are participating in an Islamic form of

financing known as "Sharia Compliant Financing." Under the rules of Sharia Compliant Financing, a bank or investment firm is required to give a percentage of its profits to Muslim charities, some of which have been shown to have direct or indirect ties to terrorist organizations. Would you support or oppose a government investigation of Sharia Compliant Financing to determine if it violates federal treasury, banking and anti-terrorism laws?

Support                       Oppose                       Undecided

Comments: It sounds like it would be worth investigating, but if the customers of the bank or firm know this is happening, they can choose not to use that institution.

---

**ACT! for America candidate questionnaire, page four...**

6. The FBI has a shortage of Arabic translators capable of translating intelligence that might provide leads to terrorist activity. In spite of this shortage, for the past few years the FBI has rejected most Christian and Jewish applicants who are fluent in Arabic, preferring to limit its hiring almost exclusively to Muslim applicants. Would you support or oppose a government investigation of the FBI Arabic translator program?

Support                       Oppose                       Undecided

Comments: The FBI, CIA, and BATF have all been involved in operations that have attacked and violated the rights of many American people. An immediate investigation into all their policies, practices, and leadership is long overdue.

- 
7. America's humanitarian refugee law allows foreign refugees to apply for expedited entry to the U.S. Would you support or oppose amending U.S. law to (1) require all humanitarian refugees to swear under oath that they will not support or advocate a theological totalitarian form of government to replace our current government, and (2) require the deportation of any refugee who violated this oath?

Support                       Oppose                       Undecided

Comments: I would broaden the oath to state A) that they will not participate in or interfere with any political or commercial operations in America or even in the private actions of American people; B) that they will be diligent in their care to avoid violating local, state, or Federal laws; and C) that they will minimize their travel to necessary areas until they have become more familiar with local, state, and Federal laws.

- 
8. Abdurahman Alamoudi, who is serving a 23 year prison term on terrorism-related charges, was instrumental in the approval and placement of many of the Muslim chaplains in the U.S. prison system. Would you support or oppose a government investigation of all U.S. prison chaplains who were approved by Alamoudi to determine if they have links to terrorist organizations or suspected terrorists?

Support Oppose Undecided

Comments: Are you saying that U.S. Prison chaplains do not have the same background checks as most employees of private businesses? That seems very hard to believe. On the other hand, the Federal government has openly held dozens if not hundreds of alleged "suspects" of terrorism in Federal, military, and private prison camps, preventing them from seeing their families or legal counsel, and failing to make any formal criminal charges against them. This is a violation of Habeas Corpus, as named in the Constitution. Not content with this, the White House lobbied Congress to pass the Military Commissions Act, which states that the President or his designate can name any one an "unlawful enemy combatant" and then do all these same things to that person, including holding them indefinitely without charge and holding military tribunals with no pretense of honoring God-given or constitutionally protected rights, even stating that hear-say testimony can be allowed as "evidence". This outrageous, unconstitutional "law" must be overturned immediately.

---

### **ACT! for America candidate questionnaire, page five...**

9. Iran continues its march toward the development of nuclear weaponry, and it is becoming increasingly likely that Iran will acquire nuclear weapons some time within the next three to five years. If diplomacy and sanctions fail to "persuade" Iran to end its drive to develop nuclear weapons, would you support the use of targeted military force to destroy Iran's nuclear weapons program before it is capable of using or exporting such weapons of mass destruction?

 Support Oppose Undecided

Comments: "Preemptive strikes against potential enemies" has been the slogan for so many failed foreign invasions, that have been tremendously expensive, both in terms of lives lost, hundreds of billions of dollars spent, and damage to the good name of our country, that I should hope that it is held in great suspicion from now on. The same officials that admit to flawed intelligence before are now demanding decisive actions now, and yet our soldiers are being overworked to the point of exhaustion, including the national guardsmen of many states. We must bring our soldiers hope as quickly as possible to defend our own borders from the unchecked invasion of nearly half a million illegal aliens every year.

---

10. It has become increasingly common for foreign nationals to sue American authors in foreign jurisdictions. These suits claiming defamation are filed in foreign jurisdictions because such jurisdictions do not provide the constitutional protections of free speech that exist in America. Earlier this year New York passed legislation protecting authors from such lawsuits. Similar legislation, known as the Free Speech Protection Act, has been introduced with bi-partisan sponsorship in Congress. Would you support or oppose the Free Speech Protection Act?

 Support Oppose Undecided

Comments: I would need to see the details of the bill to decide. I definitely support free speech as a personal right that is specifically named in the 1<sup>st</sup> amendment. I strongly oppose the McCain/Feingold Act that violates freedom of speech and the freedom of the press regarding the actions of candidates before an election, and I will work to overturn it. Other books have been unlawfully and unconstitutionally suppressed as well, including The Law That Never Was about the IRS. I will work to stop such unconstitutional violations of our free speech.

---

11. Recently a police officer who ticketed a Muslim was threatened with a lawsuit from an Islamic organization claiming discrimination. Would you support or oppose legislation protecting first responders from lawsuits filed by organizations known to be consorting with or providing support to terrorist organizations, or who have been indicted as a conspirator or co-conspirator with terrorist organizations?

Support

Oppose

Undecided

Comments: Such designations by the Federal government have not always been above suspicion, and so such blanket protection would likely only compound the problem. We do need to stop the abusive lawsuits made by many organizations, including especially the Southern Poverty Law Center. We also need to investigate the many accounts of police brutality and excessive force, such as the many deaths due to tasing, and to demand disciplinary and criminal penalties where needed. But this will probably need to be done locally in the short term. I would support Congressional hearings to investigate such incidents if necessary.

---