

The Eagle

Spring 2017

Volume 19 — Issue 2



Ohio Legislative Notes

The 132nd Session of the Ohio General Assembly started its work in January. These are synopses of some new bills of interest to pro-family conservatives. We list the bill number, primary sponsor(s), committee assignment, and a brief description.

Senate Joint Resolution (S.J.R.) 1. *Sen. Huffman (R). Government Oversight and Reform.* **House Joint Resolution (H.J.R.) 2.** *Rep. Hagan (R) and Patmon (D). Federalism and Interstate Relations.* This resolution asks Congress to call an Article V constitutional convention (ConCon) for proposing amendments that “impose fiscal restraints on the federal government, limit the power and jurisdiction of the federal government, and limit the terms of office for its officials and Members of Congress.” For more on this issue, see remarks by Publius Huldah on Page 5. (Note that Eagle Forum has long opposed an Article V convention.)

House Bill (H.B.) 25. *Rep. Ramos (D) and Leland (D). Government Accountability and Oversight.* This bill proposes that Ohio join the National Popular Vote (NPV) Interstate Compact, a group of states that pledges all their electoral votes to the winner of the national popular vote. This would bypass the Constitutional role of the Electoral College, which has operated successfully for over 200 years. Eagle Forum believes that NPV is a bad idea, since it gives too much power to population centers (cities) in large states.

H.B. 36. *Rep. Vitale (R). Community and Family Advancement.* This is the Ohio Pastor Protection Act, which has been reintroduced after H.B. 286 failed to pass in 2016. The bill specifies that a licensed minister or a religious society is not required to solemnize a marriage that does not conform to the minister’s or society’s sincerely held religious beliefs. This is a good bill that has already received committee hearings.

H.B. 53. *Rep. Becker (R). Finance.* This right-to-work bill would remove a requirement that government (public) employees must join and/or pay dues to an “employee organization” (labor union). This reasonable bill might be a hard sell due to the failure of Senate Bill 5 in 2011. S.B. 5 would have removed certain collective bargaining rights of public employees.

H.B. 56. *Rep. Dever (R) and Gavarone (R). Criminal Justice.* This bill provides for the expungement of a person’s court records if (a) the case against the person

is dismissed or the person is found not guilty and (b) the case resulted from the person being a victim of human trafficking.

H.B. 58. *Rep. Brenner (R) and Slaby (R). Higher Education and Workforce Development.* This bill would require public schools to provide cursive handwriting instruction for grades K-5. This is a sensible proposal; it may be noted that Common Core English does *not* call for instruction in cursive writing.

H.B. 68. *Rep. Anielski (R). Criminal Justice.* This bill would expand the offenses of voyeurism (viewing sexual objects or acts) and pandering (providing) sexually-oriented matter involving a minor. It also protects “impaired persons” (those unable to resist or give consent) from sexual exploitation.

H.B. 86. *Rep. K. Smith (D) and Craig (D). Economic Development, Commerce and Labor.* This bill would increase the minimum wage in Ohio from \$8.15 to \$10.10 per hour. Minimum wage laws are generally harmful since (a) employers may be forced to eliminate low-wage jobs and (b) the laws may deprive young and unskilled workers of entry-level job opportunities.

H.B. 96. *Rep. Hughes (R). Criminal Justice.* This bill would increase the jail term for sexual imposition when the offender has three or more previous convictions of sexual imposition or another sexual offense. Rep. Hughes says “current law is not doing enough to protect the public from serial sexual offenders.”

H.B. 102. *Rep. Brenner (R). Finance.* This is a far-reaching school funding bill that would totally change the current system. The bill would (a) replace local property taxes with a statewide property tax, (b) increase state sales and use taxes to provide revenue for education, (c) eliminate inter-district open enrollment, (d) eliminate current state-funded scholarship (voucher) programs, and (e) create a new system in which a specified amount is provided for each student to attend a public or chartered nonpublic school of their choice.

H.B. 109. *Rep. Patmon (D). Criminal Justice.* This bill would require a mandatory prison term of two years for a felony conviction if the victim is a disabled or elderly person.

H.B. 113. *Rep. Brinkman (R). Economic Development, Commerce and Labor.* This bill would remove a requirement that employees of private companies must

continued on next page

Ohio Legislative Notes (continued)

join or pay dues to an “employee organization” (union). (H.B. 53 is a similar bill affecting public employees.)

H.B. 114. *Rep. Blessing (R). Public Utilities.* This bill would eliminate a mandate (established in 2008) that requires 25% of electric power to be supplied by alternative (renewable) sources by 2025. We believe that market forces, rather than arbitrary regulations, should determine which energy sources are utilized. H.B. 114 was approved by the House by a 65-31 margin. A similar bill (S.B. 320) was vetoed by Gov. Kasich in 2016.

H.B. 142. *Rep. Wiggam (R). Federalism and Interstate Relations.* This bill would eliminate the requirement that a concealed handgun licensee notify a law enforcement officer that the licensee is carrying a concealed handgun when stopped. H.B. 142 is supported by the Buckeye Firearms Association.

H.B. 149. *Rep. Patmon (D) and Conditt (R). Health.* The Abortion Trafficking Prevention Act would prohibit experimenting upon or selling parts of an aborted fetus. The bill makes this activity a felony. H.B. 149 is supported by Ohio Right to Life.

H.B. 176. *Rep. Thompson (R). Education.* This bill would make significant changes to the state’s K-12 student assessments, academic content standards, and evaluations of teachers and administrators. Common Core standards and assessments in language arts and mathematics would be eliminated. New academic standards would be developed in language arts, math, science, and social studies that are consistent with the pre-2010 standards in Massachusetts. New Ohio graduation tests would be based on the norm-referenced Iowa Tests of Basic Skills. H.B. 176 has 26 Republican cosponsors.

Senate Bill (S.B.) 28. *Sen. Uecker (R). Government Oversight and Reform.* The Unborn Child Dignity Act is a sensible bill that requires “fetal remains” from an abortion to be disposed of by cremation or interment. The bill gives the woman having an abortion the right to choose the manner of final disposition. A similar bill (H.B. 417) was rejected in 2016. S.B. 28 is supported by Ohio Right to Life and Citizens for Community Values.

S.B. 52. *Sen. Skindell (D). Local Government, Public Safety and Veteran Affairs.* Marriages are generally performed by licensed ministers, judges, and mayors. This bill would allow *any* person or entity who registers with the Secretary of State to solemnize marriages.

S.B. 85. *Sen. Huffman (R). Education.* This bill would create the Ohio Opportunity Scholarship Program, which would consolidate the EdChoice, Income-Based, and Cleveland scholarship (voucher) programs. Any K-12 student could receive a scholarship if the family income is less than 400% of federal poverty guidelines (\$98,400 for a family of

four). The scholarships would be worth up to \$5,000 for grades K-8 and up to \$7,500 for grades 9-12. This plan would greatly expand school choice in Ohio.

S.B. 91. *Sen. Tavares (D) and Skindell (D). Insurance and Financial Institutions.* This bill would establish the Ohio Health Care Plan, a program that would go beyond Obamacare to “provide single-payer universal access to quality health care, dental care and vision services.” S.B. 91 stands little chance in a legislature dominated by Republicans.

S.J.R. 3. *Sen. LaRose (R). Government Oversight and Reform.* Issue 1 (approved in 2015) established the Ohio Redistricting Commission to redraw Ohio House and Senate districts every ten years. S.J.R. 3 proposes a plan for *Congressional* redistricting. S.J.R. 3 calls for the legislature to conduct the process, and it requires a supermajority vote in each chamber for a proposed plan to be adopted. If the legislature fails to come to an agreement on a new district map, the redistricting would be shifted to the Ohio Redistricting Commission, which consists of seven members: the Governor, State Auditor, Secretary of State, and four legislators (one Republican and one Democrat from each house). Under S.J.R. 3, to approve a ten-year redistricting plan, a bipartisan majority of four Commission members – two from each party – would be required. If less than two minority members agree on the plan, the plan would be adopted but would be subject to revision again in four years.

Summit Student Scholarships

Since the March 31 deadline for early registration has passed, Eagle Forum of Ohio (EFO) is no longer accepting scholarship applications from students to attend Summit Ministries conferences this summer. We congratulate those students who applied and have been accepted as scholarship recipients.

Also note that Eagle Forum Collegians has *not* yet announced a Collegians Summit in Washington, D.C., for this summer. We assume this means that there will be no conference in 2017; thus EFO will not be offering scholarships for this event.

Enemies Within: An Important Video

This documentary by Trevor Loudon describes how a small number of communists, socialists, and extreme Progressives have influenced U.S. laws and politicians. Abetted by the Democratic Party and Islamic activists, their actions are wrecking the U.S. military and our economic prosperity. These subversives have infiltrated the unions, legislatures, the education system, and other U.S. institutions. The video may be purchased or viewed at Amazon.com or EnemiesWithinMovie.com.



Medical System Sues To Hide Costs

by Kenneth D. Christman, M.D. and
Kristine M. Severyn, Ph.D., R.Ph.

Why are medical costs so secret? Why won't your doctor and hospital tell you what they're charging and what you and your insurance will pay?

To remedy this situation, which can saddle patients with unexpected medical bills, the Ohio House and Senate unanimously passed in June 2015, and Gov. John Kasich signed, the Health Care Transparency Law (H.B. 52), written and sponsored by State Rep. Jim Butler (R). The law requires hospitals and doctors to provide a good-faith estimate of what insurance will pay and what the patient will pay before treatment is provided for non-emergency care.

Although Gov. Kasich signed this common sense legislation, which should have taken effect January 1, 2017, he apparently succumbed to pressure by Ohio's powerful health care industry lobby and failed to meet the July 1, 2016 deadline for his administration to write rules for the law's implementation. Citing such rules as necessary to comply with the law, eight organizations representing Ohio's hospitals, physicians, psychologists, and physical therapists filed suit against the state in December 2016 to block the law (*Community Hospitals and Wellness Centers et al. v. The State of Ohio et al.*; Williams County Court of Common Pleas).

With the State of Ohio and the Ohio Department of Medicaid named as defendants in the lawsuit, it's the job of Ohio Atty. Gen. Mike DeWine's office to defend them in court on behalf of Ohio citizens. But is it possible for the Attorney General to properly defend the case if Governor Kasich does not support the law and works with health industry plaintiffs against Ohioans? Describing this as a "fundamental conflict of interest," Rep. Butler requested that Atty. Gen. DeWine hire outside special counsel instead of in-house attorneys. Mr. DeWine has yet to approve Rep. Butler's request, and instead he has assigned the case to Ohio Attorney General staff.

Since Gov. Kasich and the health-care industry are evidently on the same side, the lawsuit may erase or limit the scope of the Transparency Law, thus interfering with the General Assembly's intent. The lawsuit smells of collusion and conspiracy and represents a failure of the executive branch to enforce a valid law passed by the legislature and signed by the Governor.

Not all physicians agree with the position taken by professional organizations suing the state. As a member of and delegate to the Ohio State Medical Association (OSMA), Dr. Christman's views were never solicited before OSMA joined the lawsuit, causing deep concerns that his dues fund an effort diametrically opposed to the

best interest of Ohio patients. In addition, we both are concerned that this lawsuit is not the proper way to dispose of the Transparency Law. *The legal way to repeal a law is through a citizens' initiative or legislative action.*

OSMA President Dr. Brian Bachelder claimed that the new price transparency law is unrealistic. This contradicts Dr. Christman's experience as a private physician who routinely provides patients with medical cost details. He is distressed when insurance companies refuse to divulge what the insurance payment will be and what his patient can expect to pay. In his recent experience as a patient, the hospital informed him of his financial obligations in advance. The medical industry has pricing information. They just don't want to provide it.

Americans lost price transparency and free markets in medical care in 1965 when the federal government ignored the Tenth Amendment and intervened in medical care through Medicare and Medicaid. Once they were firmly established, these programs introduced price controls which destroyed any semblance of free markets, thereby causing economic harm to U.S. citizens.

Now Americans see pharmaceutical companies deeply discounting drugs sold in other countries, while these companies decry the same drugs' re-importation at lower prices. We see government force vaccines on school children, college students, and health care workers. Under the pretenses of "quality and patient safety," hospitals and health-care providers collect statistical data, which may be wasteful and not meaningful to good patient care. And more germane to medical price transparency, we see over-utilization of health care, such as hospital emergency rooms for minor ailments, sold under the guise that someone else is paying for it.

Price transparency is an everyday part of life. Car mechanics and plumbers give customers price estimates before they do repairs. With all its advanced medical technology, why should the medical industry be exempt from free markets?

Dr. Christman is a plastic surgeon practicing in Dayton, Ohio. He is a member of and delegate to the Ohio State Medical Association and past president of the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons. Dr. Severyn lives in Dayton, has a Ph.D. in Biopharmaceutics, and is a registered pharmacist who researches medical informed consent issues.

WHAT CAN YOU DO?

1. Watch this one-minute video: <https://vimeo.com/199704865> (click the "Watch on Vimeo" if the black "Stop" box pops up).
2. Write a personal letter to your state representative and state senator (www.legislature.ohio.gov).
3. Share this information with like-minded friends and family.



Eagle Council XLV

Eagle Council XLV was held in St. Louis from Sept. 16-18, 2016. The main focus at the conference was Eagle Forum founder *Phyllis Schlafly*, who died at age 92 only a few days before the event. Several presentations from the meeting were covered in the last issue of *The Eagle*. Additional talks are summarized below.

Former U.N. Ambassador **John Bolton** is a Senior Fellow with the American Enterprise Institute. He gave a very informative presentation on the Obama legacy in *foreign policy*. “The dominant issue today is national security,” Mr. Bolton began. “There are two *imminent threats* in the world today: *Islamic terrorism* and *proliferation of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons*.”

The terrorism threat today is worse today than in 2001, and the menace continues to spread. It is unlike previous threats, since there is no single country responsible for it. Unfortunately, Pres. Obama and Hillary Clinton didn’t recognize it as a hostile ideology. They think it’s just a bunch of criminals, and if the perpetrators are apprehended the threat will eventually go away. This is not reality. “Countries across North Africa and the Middle East are falling apart, and a comprehensive strategy is needed to defeat the Islamist extremists.”

The second imminent threat is the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Bolton called the Iran nuclear deal “the greatest act of diplomatic appeasement in American history.” Iran is already in violation of the agreement. The country is still the biggest enabler of terrorism, and it has exchanged American hostages for money. Obama made numerous concessions to get the deal. Hillary Clinton facilitated the agreement, and (despite her campaign rhetoric) she fully supported it.

Bolton said there are also two *strategic threats* America has to deal with: Russia and China. Russia is deeply engaged in Europe and the Middle East. They used force to change national boundaries in Georgia and Ukraine, and they are now threatening the Balkans. Putin sensed weakness in Obama, and Russia will continue to move aggressively until America pushes back.

China is making territorial claims in the South China Sea. They are creating new islands and building bases there. China is undergoing a huge military build-up and expanding its cyber capability. The U.S. under Obama paid little attention to this, and we are in retreat.

“Obama believes that a weaker America will lead to a more secure world,” Bolton declared, “but this is just wrong!” To avoid conflict overseas, we need to demonstrate strength. He added “there is no longer any national security wing in the Democratic Party.”

“The 2012 Benghazi attack was a strategic loss,”

Bolton reported, “the effects of which we are still feeling.” The U.S. mishandled the situation before, during, and after the attack. “Our people [diplomats] were under threat throughout North Africa and the Middle East, but Obama did nothing to secure them.” The threat level was high in Libya, and this should have been addressed by Secy. of State Clinton. Remarkably, no U.S. assets were put into motion during the Benghazi attack, and Clinton even left the State Department to go home while the conflict was in progress. Afterwards, there was no determined effort to deal with the perpetrators; only one terrorist was apprehended and prosecuted. Bolton concluded that “the Obama legacy is that you can assassinate a U.S. representative with impunity.”

Faith Whittlesey was a staff member under Pres. Reagan and is a former U.S. Ambassador to Switzerland. In her talk she noted similarities between *Ronald Reagan* and *Donald Trump*. Reagan was criticized for his career as an actor, and both political parties often worked against him on policy issues. Trump has been criticized by both parties for his business background and inexperience in politics.

Whittlesey knows Donald Trump personally due to her residency in south Florida. She said “I knew early on that Trump was the most electable of all the Republican candidates.” She has observed his charisma and his ability to dominate the conversation in a room. She knows that Trump has the courage to take on the establishment (the kingmakers). Whittlesey noted that while “Trump lives in New York and Palm Beach, he is not a member of the elite class.”

Trump talks about issues that typical Americans care about, but which most candidates avoid: putting America first, rebuilding our military, questioning trade agreements, challenging immigration policy, building a wall along our southern border, rebuilding America’s infrastructure, strengthening America’s manufacturing base, and having our allies pay for their own defense.

Whittlesey sees Trump as very intelligent and quick-minded. “He has a wonderful family – five stable, well-mannered, and successful children. Trump is pro-life but doesn’t talk about it much. His list of potential Supreme Court nominees is exemplary – all are pro-life.”

Stephen Baskerville is a professor of government. His remarks focused on the *politics of sex*, which he called a “new public agenda” based on the “ideology of the erotic.” Baskerville said the agenda has its roots in the feminist movement, and that same-sex marriage and LGBT politics are integral parts of it.

“Same-sex marriage is a great loss for society,” Baskerville remarked. The attack on marriage is a part of the radical agenda of the Left, seeking to destroy marriage, family, and fatherhood. “Motherhood is a biological fact,” Baskerville noted, “but fatherhood is a social
continued on next page



Eagle Council XLV (continued)

necessity.” The greatest threats to natural marriage are the divorce regime and the welfare state. These have led to poverty, single-parent families, the absence of fathers, and children who become school dropouts, addicts, and criminals. “Two-parent families are being looted through taxation to benefit these other relationships.”

“Same-sex marriage will continue to create problems in society,” Baskerville said. To ease the situation: (1) marriage must be a legally-enforceable contract, (2) the parent-child bond needs to be sacrosanct, and (3) serious welfare reform is needed.

Sam Clovis was a Co-chair for the Trump campaign. He is a Tea Party activist and a professor of economics at Morningside College. He calls himself a “fighter pilot with a Ph.D.” Clovis described the *political movement* that Donald Trump represents:

*It is *modern*, having originated from such leaders as Russell Kirk, Barry Goldwater, Phyllis Schlafly, and Ronald Reagan.

*It is *uniquely American*, recognizing our nation as blessed by God with resources, geography, and an educated society.

*It is *conservative*, based on four pillars: (1) a limited government with enumerated powers, (2) fiscal responsibility with a balanced budget and limited taxation and regulations, (3) a strong national defense, and (4) protection of the people and cultural values of the U.S.

*It is *populist*, putting the national interests of America first and protecting our people, resources, and allies.

America has well-defined strengths that battle against Progressivism:

*Individual *liberty*, guided by free will and conscience.

*The traditional nuclear *family*, society’s building block.

*The primacy of *faith*, with strong churches and Judeo-Christian values.

*Voluntary association in *community*, with vital social, professional, and community organizations.

Publius Huldah is a Constitutional lawyer, philosopher, and national speaker. She presented knowledgeable and convincing arguments why an *Article V convention* (or ConCon) is a bad idea. “The ConCon lobby wants to replace our Constitution,” she began. There are two ways to amend the Constitution. First, Congress can propose amendments which are then ratified by the states. All current amendments followed this process. The second possibility, as listed in Article V, is for Congress to call a Constitutional Convention at the request of two-thirds of the states.

“Our problem today is not a defective Constitution,” Huldah argued. “Our problem is a disobedient government that ignores the Constitution.” The United States is a federation of sovereign states, and the federal government only has enumerated powers in four areas: (1)

military defense and international commerce and relations, (2) immigration and naturalization, (3) regulation of interstate commerce, weights and measures, patents and copyrights, the monetary system, bankruptcy, mail delivery, and some road-building, and (4) the securing of civil rights. “All other powers,” Huldah noted, “are reserved to the states or to the people by the Tenth Amendment.”

Huldah went on to list several potential problems with a new Constitutional Convention.

*Only Congress can call for a convention, which means they set the rules. Huldah says “a convention would have to be called *before* we find out how it operates.”

*Delegate selection would be by Congress, by state legislatures, or by vote of the people. Huldah cautioned that “none of these processes is guaranteed to select wise and moral people.”

*Delegates would have the power to change our form of government and write a whole new document. The original convention (1787) was supposed to *revise* the Articles of Confederation. “The delegates ignored this charge and instead wrote a new Constitution.”

*Some people have proposed language for a new Constitution that would destroy U.S. sovereignty. One group wants a Marxist Constitution, and others want a “North American union” that would meld the U.S., Canada, and Mexico into a single entity. A ConCon is needed to initiate such plans.

*Delegates would likely have sovereign immunity, which would make them immune from civil suit or criminal prosecution. Like the 1787 convention, some or all of the proceedings could be held in secret – so the American people would not know the result until the conference ended.

*Conservatives like Mark Levin and Michael Farris have proposed that a ConCon could be limited to certain topics, like a balanced budget or parental rights. Huldah argued that there is no way to limit the scope of a convention ahead of time.

Huldah repeated her claim that the problem is *not* the Constitution; the problem is that the Constitution is being ignored. She sees only two ways to attack the problem. First, elect virtuous and wise candidates into office. Second, call upon the states to oppose lawlessness. Huldah said state legislatures are “enthusiastic participants in federal tyranny.” That is, state governments have repeatedly taken federal funds to implement unconstitutional federal programs. She said states must oppose federal violations of the Constitution via the process of *nullification*.

Huldah concluded that “it is our sovereign duty to know and enforce the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution.”



Marching for Science

A *March for Science* is scheduled for April 22 in Washington, D.C. The organizers claim the March “is a celebration of our passion for science and a call to support and safeguard the scientific community.” This sounds innocuous enough, but is this descent on the Capitol a good idea?

First of all, the March for Science is a *political* event. The fact that it’s in Washington on Earth Day should tell you that. A primary sponsor is the Earth Day Network, the promoter of an activist environmental movement designed to build a “sustainable environment, address climate change, and protect the Earth for future generations.” Another sponsor is the American Geophysical Union, which takes pride in “its role in developing solutions for the sustainability of the planet.” Now responsible stewardship is a good thing, but the environmentalists’ global agenda takes it to a whole new level.

Another sponsor is Nextgen Climate America, whose website claims that climate change poses “current and future harms” and is “primarily caused by heat-trapping pollution from the combustion of fossil fuels.” In truth, the debate on the extent, long-term effects, and human involvement in climate change is ongoing.


The National Center for Science Education, another sponsor, says that evolution “is not scientifically controversial” and “should not be treated as controversial within a science class.” These claims are at odds with the principle that science inquiry should be open-minded and objective.

The American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) is also a sponsor. AAAS defines science as “a process of seeking natural explanations for natural phenomena.” This is a clear statement of materialism (or naturalism), a doctrine that excludes teleological (purposeful design) explanations in science.

The March for Science website states that “recent policy changes have caused heightened worry among scientists.” This is clearly aimed at policy changes within the Trump administration — for example, the President’s skepticism about global warming, the appointment of an EPA critic to lead that agency, budget reductions, and a hiring freeze on federal employees.

Our concern is that many scientists and technologists may be lured into supporting the March for Science, thinking it is a fine way to gain public and government support. Few people in technical fields pay much attention to political issues like global environmentalism and science education policy.

“Satellite marches” have been scheduled in various cities in the U.S. and other countries. In Ohio, events are planned for Cincinnati, Cleveland, Columbus, Dayton, Mansfield, Oxford, and Yellow Springs. The Cleveland march is being organized by Patricia Princehouse,



an evolutionary biologist at Case Western Reserve University. Princehouse is no stranger to science controversy. From 2001-2006 she led Ohio Citizens for Science, a special interest group that pushed for an evolution-only curriculum in science. The group stridently opposed including both strengths and weaknesses in evolution in the state science standards, and they misrepresented the debate as one of creationism vs. science.

Those who think the March for Science is just an outpouring of support for science can look to Patricia Princehouse as evidence that the event has an ulterior motive. Is the March misguided? It appears that the answer is “yes.” It may seem innocent on the surface, but a divisive political agenda lurks in the background.

* * * * *

The Eagle Forum of Ohio State Board

The EFO Board of Directors elected a new slate of officers at their April 8 meeting. These include a new Chairman (Khadine Ritter) and Vice-Chairman (Dennis Strickler); the other officers remain the same (see box below). Current Eagle Forum of Ohio Board members are Nancy Capps (Kent), Raija Daley (Hudson), Melanie Elsey (Uniontown), Loretta Hurite (Cuyahoga Falls), Robert Lattimer (Stow), Barbara Monteith (Silver Lake), Khadine Ritter (Marietta), Kathy Sadler (Stow), and Dennis Strickler (Malvern). EFO’s accountant is Barbara Strickler. We thank retiring Chairman Melanie Elsey for her many years of service to Eagle Forum, including a long tenure as state leader. Page 6

**The Eagle: quarterly newsletter of
Eagle Forum of Ohio 330-688-4362
3095 Silver Lake Blvd., Stow, Ohio 44224**

Eagle Forum of Ohio is an independent state organization, separate from national Eagle Forum founded by Phyllis Schlafly.

Chairman: Khadine Ritter
Vice-Chairman: Dennis Strickler
Treasurer: Barbara Monteith
Secretary: Kathy Sadler

The Eagle Editor: Bob Lattimer
E-mail: rplattimer@gmail.com
Internet: www.EagleForum.org

(Note: This is the national Eagle Forum website; there is no state website.)

To submit an article or news item, contact the Editor.

To subscribe, send your check to the above address.

*Paper copy by first class mail — minimum donation \$15 per year. *E-mail version — minimum donation \$10 per year. Checks should be made out to Eagle Forum of Ohio. EFO is a 501(c)3 organization; all donations are fully tax-deductible.

Book Review. Big Agenda: President Trump's Plan to Save America, by David Horowitz (2017)

David Horowitz was born into a Jewish family in New York City. His parents were Communists and supporters of Soviet Russia. Not surprisingly, David developed into a loyal and vocal proponent of the New Left during the 1960s and 1970s. He underwent a complete change in the 1980s, however, and emerged as a conservative and a supporter of Ronald Reagan. Since then Horowitz has written and spoken extensively about the threats from Progressivism and, more recently, radical Islam. He has been particularly active in denouncing the entrenched liberal ideology on college campuses.

In his current book *Big Agenda*, Horowitz describes the "Trump movement" and its battle against the Progressive assault by the Democratic establishment. He skillfully enumerates the chief goals and methods of the liberal Left, and he describes how Donald Trump has attacked those strategies and gained a following among everyday Americans. In the process Horowitz explains how the Trump agenda is designed to attack Progressivism and hopefully rid the nation of its excesses.

Many of the ideas in *Big Agenda*, particularly with regard to Progressive philosophy, were first enunciated in Horowitz's 2014 book *Take No Prisoners: The Battle Plan for Defeating the Left*. *Prisoners* was written well before Donald Trump delved into politics, and in *Big Agenda* Horowitz makes it clear that he believes Pres. Trump is well positioned to implement sound policies for defeating the Progressive agenda.

Horowitz describes Progressivism as a utopian movement that believes society is perfectible. "To progressives," he says, "the world is a fallen place – beset by racism, sexism, homophobia, and the rest – that must be transformed and made right." This redemption is now called *socialism* or *social justice*.

To understand Progressives, Horowitz says one must "understand that they have tremendous hatred in their hearts for those who oppose them." Progressivism is inherently an anti-Christian movement. That is, Christians know that only God can offer redemption, while Progressives believe that the world can redeem itself with the right ideas and leadership – led of course by elite Progressive thinkers.

The political Left follows principles from the book *Rules for Radicals* by the political organizer Saul Alinsky. "The Alinsky activist breaks the rules when-

ever doing so advances the progressive cause," Horowitz explains. "The ends justify the means."

Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton are both admirers and followers of Alinsky's teachings. Horowitz summarizes the guidelines for modern Progressives and the Democratic Party: "The quest for power as the first priority, the need to conceal one's true agenda, and the assurance that the rules don't apply to radicals who break them in service to the cause make up the core message of Alinsky's teaching." Horowitz gives several examples of Progressive subterfuge:

Obamacare. "Obamacare was a plan to redistribute wealth by transferring income from young people to old and through subsidies to those who could not afford it paid by those who could." The plan was designed to fail so that a single-payer option would be needed – that payer being the U.S. government.

The environment. Horowitz says the endpoint of Progressive schemes is "a totalitarian infrastructure, in which the life of every individual comes under government scrutiny and control." Environmentalism is mostly about power, not protecting the Earth. "The environment provides the perfect pretext for progressives in Washington to expand their control over the lives of Americans."

Systemic racism. "Democrats have spent the last 50 years reintroducing racial categories into virtually every aspect of public life and creating bureaucracies to enforce race-based privileges for designated groups." This is done in the name of "social justice." The trouble with this strategy, says Horowitz, is that "there is no systemic racism in America's institutions, and if there is, it is already illegal and easily remedied."

Immigration. Horowitz says the "erasure of the American republic is the core agenda of the Democratic Party." Part of the plan to do this is the diminishment of the traditional American culture. "Assimilation into America's culture and allegiance to its constitutional framework were once obligations of immigrants coming to these shores. No longer." The Progressive plan "is the replacement of *assimilation* as a goal with *integration* – a concept designed to emphasize the preservation of the cultural and linguistic differences of immigrants' origins." The real purpose of integration is to promote "oppressed" groups against "oppressor" groups. The Left wants to undermine "America's unique culture that has made the nation prosperous and great."

Radical Islam. "The Democratic Party has never been comfortable with the war against radical Islam or willing to acknowledge its religious nature." Horowitz refers to Islam as a "supremacist religion of domination and submission." Under Obama, the U.S. government avoided such terms as *Islam*, *Muslim*, *jihad*, *sharia*, *Al-Qaeda*, and *Hamas*. Instead politically correct terms like

continued on next page

Page 7



Big Agenda (continued)

violent extremism and *overseas contingency operations* were used. Democratic policies of appeasement and retreat have led to such failures as the surrender of Iraq to ISIS, the ongoing wars in Syria and Afghanistan, a betrayal of Israel, and a fateful nuclear deal with Iran.

Horowitz then goes on to outline a strategy for taking on the Progressives. “The goal is to put Democrats on the defensive,” he says. To do this we need to “expose their hypocrisy and turn their firepower against them.” This approach requires one to confront the adversary head on – which is unnatural for many conservatives. “Unlike progressives,” Horowitz reports, “conservatives are constrained by temperament and precept from engaging in politics as a form of warfare.”

This is where the political *incorrectness* of Donald Trump comes in. Trump was not afraid to call Hillary Clinton a crook and a liar. He was not afraid to tackle controversial issues like illegal immigration, healthcare policy, law and order, environmental overreach, judicial activism, energy independence, and tax reform. Trump’s combativeness and honesty energized a wide segment of neglected Americans who believed it when the candidate pledged to “make America great again.”

Horowitz lists a number of issues on which Progressives can be attacked and put on the defensive:

Inner cities. Horowitz says the Achilles’ heel of the Democratic Party is “its monopoly control of the inner cities of America and its responsibility for the misery and suffering inside them.” Trump has offered a “New Deal” for African-Americans and other inner-city dwellers. He promises: “First, for ‘law and order’ and therefore for ‘safe communities’; second, for a \$130 billion scholarship program that would provide inner-city kids with quality educations; and third, for high-paying jobs, which a safe environment and good education would go a long way toward making possible.”

War on men and women. The Democrats have long indicted Republicans for their so-called “war on women” in such areas as healthcare, equal pay, and domestic violence. Horowitz claims these charges are ludicrous and unfounded. For example, the U.S. “government already *requires* employers to provide equal pay for equal work and has done so for the last 60 years.” Democratic policies in recent years have forced women out of the workforce, thrown many into poverty, increased the welfare rolls, and abetted crimes against women by illegal aliens.

Obstructionism. Horowitz reports that “Democrats accuse Republicans of being obstructionists.” This tactic works when the “Republicans back off because they fear the negative reviews in the Democrat-dominated press.” By surrendering these battles over time, the Republicans lose the war. In truth, “Demo-

crats have made themselves the masters of obstruction.” A prime example has been the difficulty in obtaining Senate confirmations of judicial appointments by Republican presidents. One reason Trump won the election was the frustration that voters felt over obstructionism by establishment politicians in both parties. “If Republicans care about the Constitution,” Horowitz proclaims, “they have to find the courage to say *no* or lose their constituencies and ultimately their cause.”

Universities. “To say that our universities now engage in systematic miseducation and indoctrination would be an understatement.” Progressive policies in colleges are evident in the growth of ethnic and women’s studies, the emergence of “diversity” offices, the purging of conservatives from college faculties, and the destruction of academic freedom and intellectual diversity. Professors routinely espouse Progressive themes and denigrate conservative viewpoints. This defeats the purpose of going to college. Horowitz says “the function of an education in a democratic society is to teach students how to think, not to tell them what to think.” The key to reform, at least in public universities, is for state legislatures to “use their leverage to restore academic standards and democratic values.” Republicans now have majorities in most state legislatures, so they have the power to exert their influence through control of the purse strings. They can demand reform.

Government unions. Horowitz says “government unions are the most important funding base of the Democratic Party and provide the lion’s share of its troops.” He says the “ability of government unions to act politically represents an unacceptable conflict of interest.” Horowitz believes Republicans should take the lead in outlawing government unions. He points to the success of Gov. Scott Walker in Wisconsin as an example of what should be done.

The final chapters of *Big Agenda* list priorities for the Trump administration and Republican Congress. Since these items have been in the news since Pres. Trump took office, there is no need to go into detail here. Horowitz highlights a number of agenda items, including repealing and replacing Obamacare, renegotiating foreign trade deals, developing American energy sources, challenging environmental overreach, questioning climate change, enforcing immigration laws, vetting immigrants, defunding sanctuary cities, appointing conservative judges, expanding school choice, restoring law and order, developing inner cities, rebuilding our infrastructure, strengthening the military, and reforming the tax system. Pres. Trump is determined to fulfill his campaign promises. Overall, Horowitz concludes that “we must fight to defend liberty in order to bequeath it to the next generation.” **Page 8**

