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INTRODUCTION

Texas has rarely seen a time in which business interests were not the primary powerbrokers in the halls of government. Yet elected officials have also been building strong relationships with a powerful new special interest over the last two decades: religious conservatives. These officials are scattered throughout state government, including the executive branch, the judiciary, the Legislature and the State Board of Education.

Many are not tied exclusively to the religious right’s public policy agenda. They use their work with other powerful interests, particularly business, to build their credibility on conservative causes involving taxation, public education and criminal justice. But that credibility with major conservative constituencies helps them then push a socially conservative agenda. That agenda ranges from opposing abortion and homosexuality to limiting stem cell research, advocating private school vouchers and promoting other positions that reflect a narrow, hard-right perspective.

The Texas Freedom Network Education Fund’s Watch List for 2007 includes elected and appointed state officials who have emerged as leaders promoting the religious right’s agenda in state government. This is not an exhaustive list. No doubt, the religious right’s public policy agenda has received its greatest boost from having two key supporters in the state’s highest offices: Gov. Rick Perry and House Speaker Tom Craddick.

Gov. Perry rode to re-election in November 2006 with only 39 percent of the vote but almost certainly with the support of many religious conservatives. Speaker Craddick has also been a major ally of the religious right, opening the door to attacks on gay and lesbian families, helping limit women’s reproductive rights and pushing efforts – such as private school vouchers – that would weaken public education. Mr. Craddick’s autocratic management style and his efforts to bully House members to back a hard-right public policy agenda nearly cost him his speakership this year. While he has promised to ease his management style, it is unlikely that he will back away from his support for the religious right’s legislative efforts.

Below Gov. Perry and Speaker Craddick are a host of officials who promote or vote for public policies backed by religious conservatives. The officials on this year’s TFN Watch List are among the key policymakers carrying water for the religious right in 2007.

Pushing an Agenda on a Broad Front

The varied posts held by these officials indicates the broad front along which religious conservatives will push their divisive public policy agenda in state government this year. The executive branch, led by Gov. Perry, will continue to steer state policy-making to the right. Gov. Perry’s agenda includes increased efforts to shift public funding to churches and other faith-based providers of social services. The Legislature is again set to deal with hot-button issues such as private school vouchers, stem cell research, adoption and foster care by gay and lesbian families, and restricting reproductive freedom. The state Supreme Court has also shifted even farther to the right with the addition of Justice Don Willett. Justice Willett had no previous judicial experience when Gov. Perry appointed him to
### Watch List: 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization/Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Bradley</td>
<td>State Board of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Cargill</td>
<td>State Board of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Corte</td>
<td>Texas House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Chisum</td>
<td>Texas House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie Howard</td>
<td>Texas House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil King</td>
<td>Texas House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terri Leo</td>
<td>State Board of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Mercer</td>
<td>State Board of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Patrick</td>
<td>Texas Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Talton</td>
<td>Texas House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Weddington</td>
<td>OneStar Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Willett</td>
<td>Texas Supreme Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tommy Williams</td>
<td>Texas Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Zedler</td>
<td>Texas House</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The state’s highest court in 2005. But he certainly had the support of far-right leaders such as James Dobson of Focus on the Family, David Barton of WallBuilders and Kelly Shackelford of Free Market Foundation. That support came in no small part due to Justice Willett’s role as point-man for Gov. George W. Bush’s faith-based initiative in Texas in the 1990s and the White House’s faith-based program after Bush’s election as president.

The State Board of Education is also moving even farther to the right. Once a sleepy corner of state government, the state board began drawing attention as it shifted politically to the right with the election of a number of religious conservatives in the early 1990s. These culture warriors have sparked raging battles over issues such as teaching evolution and including medically accurate information on sex education in textbooks. After the 2006 elections, that far-right bloc has a majority of board seats for the first time. Among the leaders of that bloc are Terri Leo and David Bradley, who will now exert even stronger influence over what students learn in Texas public schools.

### Appendices

This report also includes a number of appendices that provide context for public policy debates this year.

- Legislative surveys provide a history of bills and amendments on private school vouchers, stem cell research, textbook adoptions and sex education since the early 1990s.

- A compilation of quotations illuminates the extremism of far-right leaders both in and out of government in 2006.

- An analysis of the 2006 Texas Republican Party platform once again highlights the grip that religious extremists have on the party.

- An index of far-right groups includes key information on the finances, leadership and activities of those groups.
Terri Leo:
DRAGGING PUBLIC SCHOOLS
INTO THE CULTURE WARS
Terri Leo: Dragging Public Schools into the Culture Wars

The State Board of Education (SBOE) was one of the first major targets in the religious right’s campaign to take control of government and direct public policy in Texas. Since at least the early 1990s, a series of far-right members have tried to use the SBOE to advance their own narrow religious agenda in public schools. That agenda has included promoting creationism and attacking evolution in biology textbooks; opposing medically accurate, age-appropriate sex education in health classes; attacking efforts to teach students about various religions and cultures; and undermining respect for the separation of church and state.

Today the most outspoken and ideologically driven culture warrior on the state board is Terri Leo, a Republican who hails from the Houston suburb of Spring. Since her election in 2002, Leo has emerged as the board’s leading rabble-rouser for the religious right. It is a position that suggests an appetite for the media spotlight and political ambitions that extend beyond the state board.

This once obscure homemaker enjoys a good deal of media attention in her fanatical quest to rescue schoolchildren from, among other things, what she sees as the dangerous influences of “liberal New York editors” who pen the textbooks that drive her obsession. As part of this mission, Leo seeks to expand the SBOE’s reach into the classroom to help further the religious right’s ultimate goal of controlling the education system – at the expense of taxpayers. Toward that end, Leo works to recruit like-minded men and women to run for board seats – even if that means working to defeat fellow Republican incumbents she deems as insufficiently conservative. In 2006, for example, she threw her support behind former state Rep. Ken Mercer of San Antonio in his successful bid to unseat Republican board incumbent Dan Montgomery of Fredericksburg in the GOP primary. Following the March primaries and November general election in 2006, she has in her grasp a long-sought goal – a far-right majority on the 15-member panel and control over what Texas schoolchildren learn.

In Leo’s view, it is not enough for SBOE members to be conservative Republicans. Rather, they must march in lock step with the rest of her flock in forcing textbooks to conform to the far right’s views on sex education and evolution and to steer away from environmentalism and multiculturalism.

“"In Terri Leo’s view, it is not enough for SBOE members to be conservative Republicans. Rather, they must march in lock step with the rest of her flock in forcing textbooks to conform to the far right’s views on sex education and evolution and to steer away from environmentalism and multiculturalism."”

The worst thing about such information, Leo told the group, is that teachers with less than five years of teaching experience are instructing their students directly from the textbooks. “Many of them unknowingly are..."
passing on this post-modernism,” she said. “Post-modernism,” of course, has become one of the religious right’s favorite slurs for attempts to understand the world through an insufficiently fundamentalist religious lens.

Interestingly, Leo has tempered her far-right rhetoric since galloping into the national spotlight in 1996 and again in 2000 as part of ABC News’ coverage of the Republican Convention in San Diego and Philadelphia. ABC interviewed Leo, a Harris County delegate at both conventions, about the “moral decay” in America. In the 2000 interview, the reporter noted that Leo had gone from calling herself a “Christian conservative” delegate in 1996 to a “social conservative” delegate four years later. Additionally, she had broadened her moral agenda beyond abortion. “When you talk about moral issues now, what are you encompassing?” she was asked. Leo replied: “Education, taxation, national security, pro-life, pro-family issues.”

---

### Pearls of Wisdom from Terri Leo

**Terri Leo on sex education**

“The human papillomavirus is the most deadly STD.”


**FACT:** “AIDS is, by far, the most deadly sexually transmitted disease.” (U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, http://www.cdc.gov/nchstp/od/latex.htm)

Leo agreed with a caller who repeated a long-discredited claim that the virus that causes AIDS can pass through naturally occurring holes in latex condoms. “Right. And that is actually the AIDS virus has been shown the one that condoms have been most effective in, so, you know, consider all the other STDs that have even lower rates of protection.”


**FACTS:** “Laboratory studies have demonstrated that latex condoms provide an essentially impermeable barrier to particles the size of STD pathogens.” "Latex condoms, when used consistently and correctly, are highly effective in preventing transmission of HIV, the virus that causes AIDS.” (CDC, http://www.cdc.gov/nchstp/od/latex.htm)

---

**Terri Leo on homosexuality**

“Opinions vary on why homosexuals, lesbians, and bisexuals as a group are more prone to self-destructive behaviors like depression, illegal drug use and suicide.”

— A passage Leo demanded that a publisher add to its teacher’s edition of a health textbook in 2004. The publisher declined to do so. “Board of Education has its mind on sex,” San Antonio Express-News, Nov. 5, 2004

“Asexual stealth phrases.”

— Leo’s description of phrases such as “individuals who marry” and “couples” in health textbooks. Leo claimed such wording — instead of saying explicitly “man and woman” or “husband and wife” — promotes same-sex marriage. “Marriage Wording to Change in Texas Books,” Associated Press, Nov. 5, 2004.

---

**Terri Leo on the SBOE’s role in textbook adoptions**

“Without SBOE authority to establish general textbook contents standards, editors and publishers are unaccountable and allowed to pursue personal agendas.”

— In Capitol Inside, April 3, 2003, ignoring the personal agendas that elected politicians bring to the state board.

“I just don’t think that liberal New York editors should be deciding the content of textbooks.”


**FACT:** Few textbook publishers are based in New York. Most are scattered across the country in states such as Florida, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Illinois and Texas.
Today, Leo’s Web site offers little information about her religious-right convictions and her personal history before landing in Texas in the early 1980s. She touts her educational background – she taught in Dallas and Garland school districts between 1982 and 1988 – yet she fails to mention that she and her husband Joe chose to educate their three children in private schools. Nor does she mention her stint as a lobbyist for the Houston chapter of the far-right Concerned Women for America. Originally from Nobles County, Minn., Leo graduated from the University of North Dakota in 1982 with a bachelor of science degree and obtained a master’s in education from Texas A&M University-Commerce in 1988. She also keeps an active calendar, judging from her memberships with conservative groups such as the Cherry Tree Republican Club, the Texas Tea Republican Women’s Club and the Daughters of Liberty.

**Taking Control of the State Board**

Leo’s position on the State Board of Education today is largely a result of the religious right’s long-term effort to take over what was once a quiet corner of state government. The state board began shifting to the far right in the 1990s, when über-conservative millionaire James Leininger reasoned that he could purchase a public entity beholden to his socially conservative beliefs by bankrolling the campaigns of selected candidates. Soon after, far-right members and their supporters were demanding hundreds of changes to public school textbooks submitted by publishers for adoption in Texas. In 1994 and 1995, for example, they demanded that publishers remove illustrations of self-exams for breast and testicular cancer found in new health textbooks. Such illustrations, they worried, would be too suggestive for teens. They launched their most caustic attacks on publishers for including information on homosexuality as well as condoms and other methods of responsible pregnancy and disease prevention. One publisher simply withdrew – at substantial financial cost – its health textbook from consideration by the state board rather than submit to the board’s demands.

Such efforts by religious extremists to censor textbooks so embarrassed the state that the Legislature in 1995 severely restricted the board’s authority over the textbook content. Today Leo and the rest of the board’s far-right faction are fighting to reclaim that power, despite formal opinions from two state attorneys general – a Democrat and a Republican – that have essentially affirmed those legislative restrictions.

At the same time, Leo and her far-right partners have sought loopholes in the 1995 law. That law forbids the board from rejecting any textbook so long as the book conforms to the state’s curriculum standards, is free of factual errors and meets manufacturing requirements. But far-right board members, largely led in recent years by Leo, have stretched the definition of “factual error” to the breaking point. For example, to them, biblical creationism – the idea that the earth literally was created in six days just 6,000 years ago – is a valid alternative to the scientific theory of evolution. The failure to include “creationism” in biology textbooks and to note what they claim are “weaknesses” in evolutionary theory are deemed “errors of omission.”

Other examples abound. The board has also attacked discussions of global warming in environmental science textbooks as “junk science.” They have criticized publishers for an “over-emphasis” on the negative aspects of slavery in history textbooks. In 2004, Leo claimed that proposed new health textbooks violated the state’s marriage statute by not explicitly defining marriage as a union of one man and one woman. She criticized terms such as “couples,” “parents” and married “individuals” as “asexual stealth phrases” that promoted homosexuality and same-sex marriage in a state where such unions are illegal. Instead, she argued, publishers should use terms such as “husband and wife,” “father and mother” and “man and woman.” She also demanded that publishers tell teachers that gay men and lesbians were more prone to “self-destructive behaviors” such as illegal drug use and suicide. (Attacking homosexuality, regardless of facts, is another of Leo’s obsessions.) Publishers agreed to define marriage in
The State Board of Education has constitutional authority to sign off on textbook content. Having been given the green light to examine the editorial content of textbooks, education board members now need to do just that.  

— Terri Leo, giving her interpretation in 2006 of a disputed opinion by the Texas attorney general

Their textbooks explicitly as a union of one man and one woman. They refused to make other revisions Leo wanted.

Leo now sees a 2006 opinion from the state’s Republican Attorney General Greg Abbott as giving the state board more power to control textbook content. Abbott mostly affirmed a 10-year-old opinion from former Democratic Attorney General Dan Morales that the legislative limits placed on the state board in 1995 were valid. Abbott’s new opinion, however, made two changes. Abbott said that the board could review and approve (or reject) supplementary instructional materials in addition to textbooks. In addition, he noted that state law requires the board to ensure that Texas schoolchildren learn about U.S. and Texas history as well as the free enterprise system.

That bone, no matter how slender, held just enough meat for Leo to chew on. Abbott’s opinion, she told the Houston Chronicle, “clarifies original legislative intent of existing law as it relates to textbook content dealing with fostering patriotism, U.S. citizenship and the free enterprise system.” She went on to call Abbott’s interpretation “a huge victory for the citizens of Texas in that it confirms the Texas board’s democratic check and balance over otherwise unaccountable textbook editors and publishers.” In an e-mail she sent to constituents, Leo made it clear that she would push the board to become even more aggressive in efforts to edit textbook content. “In the wake of the AG ruling, the issue is clear: The State Board of Education has constitutional authority to sign off on textbook content,” Leo wrote. “Having been given the green light to examine the editorial content of textbooks, education board members now need to do just that.”

Leo claimed all of this despite a troublesome fact: nowhere in the opinion did the attorney general agree that the board should have full authority over textbook content. Moreover, the opinion did not give board members authority to replace facts with their own personal and political agendas – which was exactly what the Legislature was trying to block when it limited the board’s authority over textbook content in 1995.

**Thriving on Controversy**

Leo’s twisted interpretation of Abbott’s opinion foreshadows looming battles on the state board in coming years. Those who have worked with Leo on both sides of the political and moral debates, however, describe her as someone who thrives on controversy. One could easily draw the same conclusion by following the lengthy trail of Leo-penned letters and opinion pieces that appear from time to time in both mainstream and conservative publications. She is also known to horn in on Web-based public forums and blogs, dismissing her critics with righteous, sometimes rude, responses that are surprising coming from an elected official – let alone someone who considers herself a good Christian.

In a dallasblog.com discussion last year on whether the SBOE should dictate the content of school textbooks, for example, Leo assumed a patronizing tone in what had otherwise been a relatively tame debate. In one response to the authors of separate postings, she wrote: “Let me try to enlighten Alex and Ed, since they are obviously clueless as to why we do not need to give liberal New York editors free reign to use our textbooks to promote their radical left wing agendas.”

Touting her moral-values credentials and her public education background (she served as a teacher and an administrative intern in Dallas and Garland school districts from 1982 to 1988, according to her Web site), Leo moved from relative obscurity to center stage in 1996 when she mounted her first bid for an SBOE seat. She waged a nasty fire-and-brimstone campaign to unseat incumbent Jack Christie, a conservative Republican who ran afoul of far-right party bosses on two crucial votes. In July 1995, he voted with the board’s majority for the state’s participation in a federal program that carried the promise of $29 million in federal dollars to boost the state’s academic program. That vote appalled Christian conservatives who see federal involvement in public education as particularly menacing. Christie further angered social conservatives
when he voted for adopting the “wrong” textbooks. In her campaign, Leo blasted the Houston chiropractor for voting for social studies and environmental science textbooks that, she claimed, “advocated the redistribution of wealth, speak negatively about the free enterprise system, and portray Western culture in a negative manner.”

As it happened, Leo narrowly lost the race to Christie – despite having financial backing and support from far-right big wheels. But she rebounded with a vengeance in 2002 to claim the seat, thanks to newly redrawn district boundaries and the financial support of social conservatives. (The district boundaries had been drawn by Vance Miller, husband of conservative SBOE member Geraldine “Tincy” Miller. A federal judge approved Miller’s plan over two alternatives. Grace Shore, the state board’s Republican chairwoman, and others charged that the new boundaries were drawn by social conservatives to purge moderates like them from the board. Sure enough, Shore subsequently lost her race for re-election and Tincy Miller became board chair at the same time Leo joined the board in 2003.)

**Recruiting a Board Majority**

Once on the board, Leo started her recruitment of other social conservatives to build a majority there. One of Leo’s recruits – former SBOE member Linda Bauer – quickly discovered that retribution is in order for those who don’t always vote with the religious-right faction. Bauer, a Republican from the Woodlands who served one term, says she and Leo met at a Christmas party at the home of Rep. Debbie Riddle, R-Tomball. At the time, Bauer was new to the area. She had taught public and private school in other states and was working on a doctorate in education while home-schooling her second-grade son. The home-schooling wasn’t necessarily a political statement, she explained, but more of a necessity because her son was ill at the time. She continued the home-schooling because she and her husband write food and travel books, which requires a fair amount of time on the road. In any case, Bauer continued, when Leo caught wind of her credentials, Leo urged her to run for a board seat. Bauer’s husband was very skeptical at the time. “We didn’t know any of the people,” Bauer recalled him saying of Leo and her social circle. “She’s too conservative.”

But Leo and SBOE member David Bradley, a Republican from southeast Texas, kept calling. In fact, Bauer said Bradley provided and delivered the check for the filing fee to the Secretary of State’s office before she had even decided to run. She said Leo and others essentially took charge of her campaign and initiated a negative campaign mailer against her opponent (Grace Shore, the board chair and another Republican who had run afoul of the religious right), comparing her to Hillary Clinton, Bauer said. “It was a total shock and a total turnover,” she said of her first introduction to political campaigns. She echoed similar observations of her experience on the board and what she called its conservative bloc of “Muppets.”

“If you’re there, you should be there for the best education for all children, whether they’re in public school or private school or home school,” Bauer said. “And you shouldn’t be telling people what to think and how to think.” While it’s one thing to be a conservative and a Christian, she said, “You need people on the board who care about doing the right thing for education.”

Bauer probably sealed her fate with the board’s religious-right bloc in 2003. That year she voted with the board majority to approve new biology textbooks that included no material on creationism or the “weaknesses” of evolution theory that far-right activists claim. Leo set about looking to replace her old recruit with a new recruit – Barbara Cargill of The Woodlands. Bauer, who said she was ready to leave the board after one term, couldn’t find a candidate to run for her seat, so she ran for re-election but lost to Cargill. Looking back, Bauer assesses her tenure on the board this way: “It was like being trapped in a bad Lifetime movie.”

That bad movie is still showing. Led by Leo, the far-right bloc that now controls the state board will soon begin revising all of the state’s curriculum standards. In fact, the board is already revising English-language arts standards. Revising science standards – including how evolution should be discussed in biology classes – will come soon after that, as well as standards for social studies and health. In reality, then, censors on the board may be able to control what publishers are required to put in or keep out of their textbooks as those books are written, not after the books are submitted for approval. As a result, Terri Leo is poised to win what the religious right has long wanted: a public school system focused more on promoting a narrow religious agenda – one not shared by all Christians, much less by all Texans – than the responsible education of Texas schoolchildren.
Dan Patrick: MARKETING THE RELIGIOUS RIGHT IN THE SENATE
Dan Patrick: Marketing the Religious Right in the Senate

By George Flynn

Potentially one of the most influential new legislators in 2007 will be freshman state Sen. Dan Patrick. Unlike other legislators, Patrick has ready access to mass media – he is the host of a popular radio talk-show in Houston and recently extended his media reach by buying a radio station in Dallas.

Sen. Patrick’s 2006 campaign platform largely paralleled the other major candidates in the Republican primary for the Texas Senate District 7 seat, a staunchly conservative area on Houston’s western and northwestern flanks. He and his opponents pushed hard for what political consultants called the two key issues in that race – property tax cuts and curbing the flow of illegal immigration from the south.

But months after handily winning that GOP primary and confident of prevailing in the general election, Patrick issued a press release in mid-August[15] detailing plans for his first piece of legislation. It had nothing to do with immigrants or caps on property taxes, or anything else specified in his formal campaign literature.

Patrick instead proposed a “trigger law” that would automatically outlaw abortion in Texas should the U.S. Supreme Court at some point overturn the landmark Roe v. Wade ruling.

Seven states have already passed similar bills, but Patrick promised that his version would be the toughest yet. “In the coming months, I will work with various pro-life groups to make certain that the Texas trigger law is the strongest in the nation and a model for other states,” he said in his press release.

His announcement prompted a Houston Chronicle editorial[16] that cited surveys showing a majority of state residents are pro-choice on abortion rights. “What most Texans want, though, doesn’t rate Patrick’s to-do list,” the editorial stated. “He’s got an election to win in a highly Republican district, so he’s chosen a strategy he hopes will appeal to the party’s extreme right.”

The editorial’s headline reflected its message: Patrick was engaging in a political “marketing ploy.” His proposal for the trigger legislation, however, came as no real surprise to those who have tracked Patrick’s political rise.

Known first by his given name of Dannie Scott Goeb, the one-time retailer of high school class rings[17] went on to market himself as an antic-laced sports anchor on television news. Seeing him made up in the blue-and-white body paint of the then-Houston Oilers wasn’t unusual for viewers.

When that shtick played out, Goeb morphed into a celebrity about town, parlaying his previous TV fame into a string of sports cafes and bars. When those fizzled and forced Goeb into bankruptcy with about $700,000 in unpaid debts,[18] he had another transformation. This time, Goeb became a radio talk-show host who mixed the preachings of far-right politics with those of unbending evangelical causes.
The Christian community always knows they can count on Dan Patrick to give them free air time, interviews and publicity on key faith-based moral issues facing all of us.

— Dan Patrick

God and Politics
Goeb formally changed his name to Dan Patrick prior to his entry into politics, for name recognition on the ballot. Just as he has remolded himself into a new image, Patrick now wants to remold state government along the same religious themes that helped jumpstart his media network.

His messages mix calls for a conservative political agenda and what Patrick says is the will of God, at least the God recognized by the hardcore Christian right.

As shown by his trigger law plan and other pronouncements, Patrick and his followers see him as a new standard bearer crusading to bring fundamentalist Christian views squarely into state government.

During his 2006 state Senate race, Patrick even snared movie star Chuck Norris for a campaign pitch. Norris peered into the camera and assured viewers they better vote for Patrick “if you want a strong committed conservative Christian in Austin.”

While he has broadened his messages into wider, mainstream tirades against taxes and undocumented migrants, the religious book he authored in 2002 – The Second Most Important Book You Will Ever Read – told of his core constituency:

“My number-one REASON for being alive on the earth today is to be a Christian.” Patrick said that the past several years, “I have not made a major decision without getting a green light from God.”

In his book, he said that the Lord even served as his alarm clock.

“I believe I actually heard His voice, very briefly one morning, arousing me out of a deep sleep so I wouldn’t miss a church breakfast speech I was scheduled to deliver,” Patrick wrote. “Maybe it was just a low-ranking angel with wake-up-call duty.”

Legislative Agenda
Patrick’s initial plans for the anti-abortion “trigger bill” clearly shows he will be the latest politician attempting to mount a crusade against reproductive rights for women.

“I have talked to various pro-life groups in Texas and I expect to have support from all of them,” Patrick said in his August press release on his proposed abortion trigger law.

According to Patrick’s campaign Web site, he already embraced the backing of key anti-abortion groups. He received the “Horizon Award” from Texas Right to Life and has “given hours of free air time to those who support pro life issues” on his KSEV radio station.

A full six Web pages were devoted to what his campaign site called “Dan’s Faith Foundation,” which indicates his radio station is an open-door to those wanting to deliver messages that appeal to far-right religious voters.

“The Christian community always knows they can count on Dan Patrick to give them free air time, interviews and publicity on key faith-based moral issues facing all of us,” the site announced. It cited the free access afforded to the campaign for the state constitutional amendment barring same-sex marriages.

His supporters don’t anticipate Patrick shelving his fundamentalist image as a state senator.

“It is time now to take his passion and conviction to the Texas State Senate where he will have an even greater impact in defense of those values,” said Dave Welch, executive director of an organization called the Houston Area Pastors Council.
Campaign contribution reports also reflect Patrick’s agenda and provide clues about other issues he will pursue in the state Senate. Dr. James Leininger, the wealthy San Antonio businessman who has poured millions of dollars into political races in his quest for private-school vouchers, anted up $25,000 to Patrick’s campaign in March. A voucher scheme has been a favorite of Christian conservatives, and Patrick is expected to be an ally in the latest attempt by Leininger to get such a measure enacted.

**Moving from Radio Host to Senator**

Interestingly, one problem Patrick may have is moving from the world of radio politics to a legislative world where making allies and building coalitions are key to getting things done. He may have gotten off on the wrong foot shortly after his March primary victory. Speaking at the Americans for Prosperity-Texas Taxpayer Summit in Austin in April, Patrick lashed out at Gov. Rick Perry’s business tax plan to reduce property taxes.

The governor – a fellow Republican – was just another target in Patrick tirades during nearly two decades as a talk-show host espousing far-right views with fundamentalist philosophy.

Some legislators are still smarting over another episode in 2003, when Patrick organized a caravan of supporters to the state Capitol to call for reducing caps on property appraisals. The sometimes unruly crowd he led shouted down a legislative committee in what critics said became a circus. In one Biblical reference, Patrick was reported to have accused the committee members of being “money changers.”

Now Sen. Patrick is part of a governmental body that he has frequently berated over recent years as inept and a pawn of lobbyists. His radio station and talk-show outbursts provided an activist platform for his political success, and he will be able to call on his audience – what he calls his “army of conservatives” – to support his legislative efforts. But his effectiveness in Austin ultimately may depend on being accepted as a colleague by many of his former targets.
Phil King:
PUSHING THE RIGHT’S AGENDA IN THE HOUSE
Phil King: Pushing the Right’s Agenda in the House

Two years ago social conservatives succeeded in pushing through the Texas Legislature two key parts of their agenda: a constitutional ban on same-sex marriage and civil unions and a bill requiring parental consent for minors seeking an abortion. In 2007, further restrictions on reproductive rights and new efforts to ban embryonic stem cell research are likely to top the religious right’s legislative agenda. As in 2005, state Rep. Phil King will again be a leader in pushing that agenda.

The Republican attorney from Weatherford, west of Fort Worth, won election to the House in 1998. Rep. King had a chance to shine in 2003, when he was the House sponsor of the Senate’s redistricting bill. He worked closely with House Speaker Tom Craddick to draw the map that targeted a half-dozen Democratic congressional incumbents for defeat.

Speaker Craddick rewarded Rep. King in 2005 by naming him chair of the newly created House Committee on Regulated Industries. That committee oversees powerhouse industries such as electric utilities, energy production and telecommunications. During the session that year, Rep. King was instrumental in pushing through legislation that allows telecommunications companies to set their own prices, bans cities from offering free or cheap wireless to residents, and removes the power of cities to negotiate their own telecommunications contracts, giving that power to the state.

Rep. King’s efforts have alarmed consumer advocates, but he has become a darling of the telecommunications lobby. Companies such as AT&T and Verizon Communications have given generously to his campaigns. Other contributions from other high-dollar industries that fall under his committee’s authority, such as construction and energy production, have also helped build King’s campaign war chest. He has, in short, earned a reputation as a strong supporter of business interests.

Limiting Reproductive Freedom for Women

Rep. King has used his reputation with business interests to enhance his influence in another area: carrying the legislative water for social conservatives who dominate the Republican Party and, by extension, state government today. In recent legislative sessions he has been particularly active in opposing the reproductive rights of women and attacking medical research involving embryonic stem cells.

While Rep. King believes whole-heartedly that deregulation is good for business, he is fully prepared to regulate the reproductive decisions of Texas women. Of the many anti-choice bills filed in 2005, Rep. King’s House Bill 1212 was one of the most draconian and came the closest to being passed on the House floor. His bill aimed to alter an existing state law that requires a pregnant minor to notify at least one parent before she can legally obtain an abortion, changing parental notification to parental consent.

The bill also introduced multiple red-tape barriers for a teen seeking a judicial by-pass to the consent requirement. It put a heavy burden of proof on pregnant teens, requiring them to present “clear and convincing evidence” of abuse – although what, if anything, might adequately constitute such evidence is up for interpretation. The bill would also have required minors to seek by-pass from a judge in their county of residence, making confidentiality nearly impossible for teens in rural areas and small towns. Additionally, it would have permitted courts to extend the delay for the judicial hearing from two days to five and to extend the delay for an appeal to ten days – delays that can mean...
the difference between a second- and a third-trimester abortion procedure (the latter being more severely restricted).

Perhaps most damningly, Rep. King would have made judges’ decisions to permit abortions a matter of public record. That provision would undoubtedly have made many elected judges who permitted by-passes targets for personal harassment and political attack. According to advocates for reproductive rights, the vast majority of minors seeking abortions do involve their parents in their decision. “Those who don’t are a very vulnerable population who may have experienced abuse or abandonment and need protection,” says Heather Paffe of the Texas Association of Planned Parenthood Affiliates.

Rep. King’s bill was struck down on a technicality on the House floor and eventually died in committee. But the parental consent provision of the bill (stripped of its other requirements) passed as an amendment to a routine bill reauthorizing the Texas Board of Medical Examiners, now the Texas Medical Board. The amendment required the board to create a parental consent form and enforce the use of the form by abortion providers.

“The far right’s strategy has been to chip away at the right to reproductive decision-making piece by piece, and Rep. King is an eager ally in that effort.”

As the Medical Board implemented the new parental consent measure, King pushed members to go beyond the language of the law and introduce even more hurdles and red tape into the process. He successfully pushed the board to include a provision requiring that the form be notarized and that a parent or guardian initial each page. The consent form will contain information about possible links between abortion and breast cancer, despite the fact that medical experts have refuted such links. Abortion providers will also be required to tell minors that abortions may make them infertile, although recent medical studies show safe, legal abortions, performed by trained personnel in a sterile environment, rarely if ever have such consequences.

The other measures in Rep. King’s bill were shelved for the time-being, but reproductive rights advocates expect those and other attacks to begin afresh in the 2007 legislative session. Indeed, the far right’s strategy has been to chip away at the right to reproductive decision-making piece by piece, and Rep. King is an eager ally in that effort.

**Attacking Stem Cell Research**

In public discussions of parental consent in the last legislative session, Rep. King was largely mum about his personal beliefs. He focused his public comments instead on what he said was the need to ensure the health and safety of minors and the integrity of parental rights. He was more forthcoming in debates on embryonic stem cell research, and he is one of the biggest opponents of this promising form of medical research.

Rep. King’s House Bill 864 in 2005 sought to criminalize most embryonic stem cell research, including techniques using colonies of unfertilized embryonic cells that could never develop into a viable fetus. His bill, which he called the “Regulation of Human Cloning Bill,” made no distinction between reproductive cloning and therapeutic cloning. Reproductive cloning is the attempt to produce a human clone, which is broadly condemned as unethical and unsafe. Therapeutic cloning replaces the nucleus of a donor egg cell with DNA from a patient’s cell; the cell divides in a Petri dish to become a source of stem cells and is never implanted in uterus to be grown into a human baby. Those stem cells can then be coaxed to grow into the type of cells needed to treat or cure the patient. Some scientists believe research using embryonic stem cells could one day lead to treatments for conditions such as Parkinson’s disease, diabetes, nerve damage, congenital heart defects and cancer.
Rep. King’s bill would have made this research a felony, with researchers subject to a fine of up to $500,000. The bill would have slapped the same civil penalties on patients who received treatment via embryonic stem cell techniques, even if the treatment were received in another state, and women who donated excess embryos from their own fertilization treatments for the purpose of scientific research. Though stem cell researchers point out that the cells they use in therapeutic research could never develop into normal fetuses, and though 55 percent of Texans support research using embryonic stem cells, Rep. King made his own views clear in debating the bill in committee. He described the entire process of human development from fertilization to adulthood for the benefit of any legislators who may have been unclear on the process. “If at any time that process had been ended, it would have destroyed your life,” he told the committee. “So I don’t see how you can say this isn’t destroying human life.”

**Pushing the Far Right’s Agenda**

Rep. King has also lent himself to other right-wing causes beyond opposing abortion and embryonic stem cell research. In the last two campaign cycles, he has received $1,950 in campaign contributions from WallBuilders, an organization that promotes a revisionist version of American history in which the Founding Fathers based the Constitution on the Bible. The WallBuilders Web site lists Rep. King as one of the group’s public speakers, touting his supposed expertise on stem cell research. He was named Outstanding Legislator of the Year by the Texas Alliance for Life, which made a $150 contribution to his campaign in 2004. He received the honor of “Defender of Life” in 2006 from the anti-choice Justice Foundation and the “Freedom and Family Award” from the far-right Eagle Forum in 2001.

In the months leading up to the November 2005 referendum on same-sex marriage, Rep. King co-chaired the far-right Marriage Alliance and appeared in a video spot on the organization’s Web site. He assured viewers that “Texas is a better state because we believe in traditional marriage…a marriage between a man and a woman gives us the strength to grow and prosper.”
Others to Watch
Others to Watch

David Bradley, State Board of Education
While not as high-profile as Terri Leo, David Bradley has worked for the past decade to censor public school textbooks that don’t conform to his religious and politically conservative beliefs. Bradley, who homeschooled his children, won election to the State Board of Education in 1996 and has been one of the board’s most combative members. He has been backed by a list of far-right groups, including Concerned Women for America, Texas Eagle Forum and Right to Life of South East Texas. Far-right sugar daddy James Leininger of San Antonio has also been a key financial supporter. Bradley has been unapologetic in promoting religious beliefs in public school textbooks. “Promoting Christianity? That’s a crime? America was founded on Christian principals,” Bradley said when far-right groups were criticized in 2002 for the religious-based changes they wanted to make to proposed new public school textbooks. He also worries about textbooks published by British-owned companies: “I wouldn’t want the Japanese writing the history of World War II, and I have concerns about the British writing American history.”

Barbara Cargill, State Board of Education
Barbara Cargill won election to the State Board of Education in 2004, defeating Republican incumbent Linda Bauer. Bauer had served just two years on the board but earned the anger of the religious right by refusing to support efforts to water down discussions of evolution in proposed new biology textbooks in 2003. Cargill – who supports those anti-evolution efforts – has emerged as an outspoken member of the state board’s far-right bloc. That should come as no surprise since her supporters include prominent religious-right figures such as James Leininger, Free Market Foundation, Texas Eagle Forum, Susan Weddington (former state Republican chairwoman and current head of the OneStar Foundation), and the Texas Home School PAC.

State Rep. Warren Chisum
Once described by Texas Monthly as a “demagogue” (and relegated to that magazine’s Worst Legislators list), state Rep. Warren Chisum is one of the most conservative members of the Texas House. One of his overriding obsessions is sex – particularly preventing the gay version. He has opposed repeal of the state’s sodomy statute (later ruled unconstitutional by the U.S. Supreme Court), the inclusion of sexual orientation as a category in the state’s hate crimes law (because gay people “put themselves in harm’s way”), and permitting gay and lesbian families to adopt children or become foster parents. In 2005 he authored the state’s constitutional amendment banning same-sex marriage and civil unions (even though state law already banned such marriages). Rep. Chisum also opposes embryonic stem cell research and a woman’s right to choose to have an abortion. In 1995, Rep. Chisum sought to restrict public funding for artistic projects deemed “sexually explicit” – a term left undefined by the legislation. His litmus test: “If you show the genitals, that’s probably sexually explicit. If they just show the breast of a woman, I’m not sure you can make the case for that.”

He has also authored legislation that would have given the State Board of Education effective authority to censor textbook content based on the political and personal beliefs of a majority of board members.

State Rep. Frank Corte
State Rep. Frank Corte, R-San Antonio, accurately describes himself as a religious conservative. He has served as state representative since 1992 and has consistently authored and supported legislation backed by the religious right, especially efforts to pass private school vouchers and to undermine the reproductive rights of women. For example, Rep. Corte authored a 2003 law that requires the Texas Department of Health to distribute a booklet titled “A Woman’s Right to Know.” The booklet includes misleading and unsubstantiated information from anti-abortion sources. For instance, the booklet states that women who abort their pregnancies have a higher risk of breast cancer, a claim the National Cancer Institute has discredited. Additionally, Rep. Corte tried, unsuccessfully, to pass a bill in 2005 that would have permitted pharmacists to refuse to dispense birth control pills or emergency contraceptives if the pharmacists believed taking them would cause an abortion. Rep. Corte proposed the legislation after he said he was approached by some “religious-affiliated groups” and pharmacists. His proposed voucher bill in 2005 would have drained potentially hundreds of millions of dollars from neighborhood public schools in the state’s largest
districts. The money would have been used instead to pay for tuition at private and religious schools. He has filed similar legislation for the 2007 session.

**State Rep. Charlie Howard**

Texas Monthly magazine once described state Rep. Charlie Howard, R-Sugar Land, as having “dropped off the right side of the political spectrum.” More than once the magazine has listed Rep. Howard as one of the state’s worst legislators. (Wearing the distinction as a badge of honor, Howard even lobbied to be placed on the magazine’s 1999 list. The magazine obliged.) Since his election to the House in 1994, Rep. Howard has led the charge for conservative causes on issues ranging from abortion to the Children’s Health Insurance Program (which he once warned would lead to socialism). Among his pet causes has been trying to restore to the State Board of Education full authority over content in public school textbooks. The highly politicized board lost that authority in 1995 after its far-right members embarrassed the state by demanding hundreds of changes to proposed health textbooks that failed to conform to their personal and political beliefs. Howard, a home-schooling parent, is also a strong supporter of private school voucher schemes.

**State Rep. Robert Talton**

Texas Monthly has said state Rep. Robert Talton, R-Pasadena, pushes a “legislative program that consists primarily of trying to enact his prejudices into law.” Indeed. Rep. Talton, first elected to the House in 1992, orbits in the outer fringes of the far right in the Legislature. He is particularly infamous for his divisive and mean-spirited attacks on gay and lesbian Texans. Among his biggest obsessions is barring gay and lesbian families from serving as adoptive or foster parents (lest those children become gay, which Talton says is a “learned behavior”). In 2005 he tried to enact such a ban by amending a major overhaul of Child Protective Services, nearly torpedoing the legislation before the amendment was stripped out in conference. He also took to the House floor to denounce the highly respected International Baccalaureate program, which attracts honors students at many high schools in the state. Why? The program, he thundered, promotes “internationalism” instead of “traditional American values.” Proof? The diploma was created, he said, in English and – gasp! – French. Expect to see more attacks on gay Texans – and probably the French – from Rep. Talton in 2007.

**Ken Mercer, State Board of Education**

Ken Mercer, R-San Antonio, is the second of two new members of the State Board of Education in 2007. The former one-term state representative defeated Republican incumbent SBOE member Dan Montgomery in the March 2006 primary. Deeming Montgomery not conservative enough for their tastes, far-right groups such as Texas Eagle Forum, Texans for Life Coalition and Texans for Better Science Education (which supports teaching creationism in science classes) all backed Mercer. San Antonio businessman James Leininger poured $35,000 into Mercer’s SBOE campaign – far more than his opponent spent from all sources in his re-election effort. Mercer has expressed his support for watering down discussions of evolution and including information on the creationist-based concept of “intelligent design” in biology classes. He also supports government-sponsored prayer in public schools and has opposed funding for the National Endowment for the Arts because, he says, the endowment supports “anti-Christian” art.

**Susan Weddington, OneStar Foundation**

Gov. Rick Perry named Susan Weddington executive director of his OneStar Foundation in 2004. Weddington, a former activist for the far-right Concerned Women for America, had served as chairwoman of the Republican Party of Texas from 1997 until her appointment as head of OneStar. OneStar is a quasi-public nonprofit foundation that manages the state’s mentoring and volunteerism programs. It also houses the Governor’s Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, which distributes public funds to churches and faith-based groups that provide social services. A 2006 study by the Washington Post found that the federal faith-based program under President Bush has funneled millions of public dollars to organizations run by political and ideological allies of his administration. It remains a question whether the OneStar Foundation, headed by a dedicated partisan like Weddington, will follow the same path in Texas. Early signs are troubling. OneStar released $500,000 in grants in 2006, months before the gubernatorial election. Weddington refused a
subsequent request from the Texas Freedom Network for information about the process for awarding those grants. She claimed that the foundation, despite administering public funds, is not subject to the state’s law on open records.

**Texas Supreme Court Justice Don Willett**

Don Willett was elected to the Texas Supreme Court in 2006 by touting his conservative Christian credentials, rallying the religious right to his side. Despite little courtroom and no judicial experience – a Houston Chronicle editorial labeled Willett an “embarrassingly unqualified candidate” – he was first appointed to the Texas Supreme Court by Gov. Rick Perry in 2005. Willett practiced law for three years before accepting a senior fellow position with the Texas Public Policy Foundation, James Leininger’s think tank, in 1996. After masterminding the creation of then-Governor Bush’s faith-based initiative in Texas (including drafting the bill that allowed the troubled Roloff Homes to return to Texas), he worked on the Bush-Cheney presidential campaign in 2000. He was rewarded for his service with a position in the White House Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, where he said he did not intend to “merely duplicate the weaknesses of government style aid.” Rather, he explained, “we are trying to create a safe harbor for explicitly religious programs.”

In his campaign for the Texas Supreme Court, he received endorsements from James Dobson, founder of Focus on the Family; David Barton, founder of WallBuilders; and Kelly Shackelford, Free Market Foundation, among other national and state religious-right leaders.

**State Sen. Tommy Williams**

Elected to the state Senate in 2002, Sen. Tommy Williams, R-The Woodlands, is a favorite among anti-abortion groups. He has sponsored various legislation that imposes restrictions on access to reproductive services, including abortion. In 2005 he authored an “alternatives to abortion” bill that shifted millions of dollars in funding from traditional women’s health care providers to crisis pregnancy centers that offered no family planning services. As a result, thousands of low-income Texas women lost access to critical health services that had nothing to do with abortion and that, in many cases, had been geared toward preventing pregnancy in the first place. In 2003 Sen. Williams won passage for a bill requiring a 24-hour waiting period for women seeking to obtain an abortion. The bill mandated that those women be provided with information about the medical risks of the procedure, fetal development and adoption services. It also required the information to include the claim that abortion might increase a woman’s risk of breast cancer. The American Cancer Society and the American Medical Association dispute such claims.

**State Rep. William Zedler**

State Rep. William Zedler, R-Arlington, has been one of the Legislature’s most conservative members, though only marginally consequential, since joining the Texas House in 2003. He is a reliable vote for much of the religious right’s agenda, however, particularly on anti-abortion and anti-gay legislation. He has proposed legislation (which has not passed) requiring that doctors report to the state information on patients who suffer from complications due to abortions. In 2007 Rep. Zedler is carrying a bill that would establish so-called “covenant” marriages under state law. Although such unions would be voluntary, license fees for covenant marriages would cost less than those for traditional marriages. Couples in a covenant marriage would be prohibited from terminating that marriage unless, after counseling, both parties agreed. Opponents of such legislation, particularly groups that work with victims of domestic violence, warn that covenant marriages endanger spouses who are victims of abuse. Even so, enshrining covenant marriage in state law has long been a key goal for the religious right.
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Appendices
Vouchers
A LEGISLATIVE SURVEY IN TEXAS

Vouchers are tax dollars shifted from public education to pay for tuition at private and religious schools. Voucher proponents have been pushing such schemes since at least the mid-1980s in Texas. Each legislative session they file bills and offer amendments that would drain hundreds of millions of dollars from neighborhood public schools to pay for tuition vouchers. Some lawmakers have tried to distinguish between so-called “free schools” (defined as nongovernmental schools that would accept vouchers) and private schools (nongovernmental schools that would not accept vouchers or any other public funding). Those lawmakers filed bills that limited the schools that could accept vouchers to either public schools or “free schools.” In effect, however, any private or religious school could declare itself a “free school” and begin accepting vouchers.

In any case, the Texas Legislature has never passed a voucher scheme. After the voucher lobby’s most recent attempt to pass such legislation in 2005, voters the next year threw out of office more than a half-dozen pro-voucher House members. This was followed by a revolt against Speaker Tom Craddick, who had pressured lawmakers to vote for the voucher scheme in 2005. Even so, pressure from wealthy voucher proponents like San Antonio businessman James Leininger is likely to keep vouchers high on the legislative agenda.

1993 – 73rd Legislature, Regular Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Final Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HB 91</td>
<td>Carona</td>
<td>No action taken in Public Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 743</td>
<td>Cuellar, others</td>
<td>Left pending in Public Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 920</td>
<td>Grusendorf, others</td>
<td>Left pending in Public Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1375</td>
<td>Ratliff</td>
<td>No action taken in Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HB 91 would have created a system of open enrollment, with some limits, in the state’s public schools and would have authorized publicly funded vouchers worth $3,000 for each child enrolling in a private or parochial school. Private and parochial schools participating in the program were required to offer a course of study in good citizenship and comply with federal nondiscrimination standards. The state was required to have a private entity evaluate the effectiveness of the voucher program annually.

HB 743 would have created an “education tuition grant demonstration program” for students eligible for enrollment in the national school lunch program in 14 Texas public school districts. Each private school voucher would be worth $4,000. Participating private schools would be required to provide transportation for students to and from school.

HB 920 would have created a voucher (“education scholarship”) program in up to 60 public school districts for educationally disadvantaged students (those enrolled in the national school lunch program). Under the bill, nongovernmental schools accepting vouchers in lieu of tuition would be designated “free schools.” The designation “private school” would apply to those schools that chose not to accept vouchers or any other public funding.

SB 1375 would have created a voucher program for “educationally disadvantaged children” attending “free schools” (the latter defined as in HB 920). The bill required that the program include at least 60 public school districts.

During debate over a major school finance reform bill meant to meet court rulings on equitable funding, Rep. Ron Wilson, D-Houston, offered an amendment creating a private school voucher program for students eligible for the national school lunch program. The amendment failed on an 80-62 vote.

1995 – 74th Legislature, Regular Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Final Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SB 92</td>
<td>Leedom</td>
<td>Referred to Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 301</td>
<td>Grusendorf, others</td>
<td>Left pending in Public Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 1315</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Left pending in Public Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SB 92 would have created a private school voucher program for families in which the head of the household had an income that did not exceed three times the federal poverty line.

HB 1315 offered students who had been expelled or were at risk of dropping out of a public school a voucher to attend private school.

HB 301 would have created a voucher program for students eligible for the national school lunch program. The program would have been available in 60 public
school districts. The bill explicitly relieved schools accepting the vouchers from having to meet the educational regulations and statutes to which all state public schools were subject.

A House-Senate conference committee working on an education overhaul bill refused to include a Senate-backed provision creating a voucher program for low-income students in 20 public school districts.

1997 – 75th Legislature, Regular Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Final Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HB 318</td>
<td>Cuellar, others</td>
<td>Signed by the governor on 6/17/1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 656</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>Referred to Revenue &amp; Public Education Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 1110</td>
<td>Cuellar</td>
<td>Referred to Revenue &amp; Public Education Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1206</td>
<td>Bivins, Nelson</td>
<td>Reported favorably as substituted by Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HB 318 dealt with public education grants allowing students at low-performing public schools to attend a public school in another district. State Rep. Ron Wilson, D-Houston, offered an amendment permitting such grants to be used also for attending private schools. A move to table the amendment failed on a 68-68 vote, but Wilson withdrew the amendment as other House members – particularly opponents – arrived on the floor to vote on its passage.

HB 656 called for a voucher program that would allow any student to attend a private school or any public school inside or outside a district. Transportation requirements were the same as under SB 1206.

As with HB 656, HB 1110 would have created a voucher program allowing students at low-performing public schools to attend any other public or private school.

SB 1206, as amended in committee, would have established a pilot voucher program for students not performing at a satisfactory level and assigned to attend low-performing schools. School districts would have been required to provide transportation between home and the assigned public school. The school accepting the voucher would provide transportation to and from the assigned public school. The bill also called for public education grants that would allow students to transfer from a low-performing school to another public school within the same district. This bill included an elaborate breakdown of eligibility requirements for both students and schools accepting vouchers.

1999 – 76th Legislature, Regular Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Final Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HB 709</td>
<td>Krusee</td>
<td>Left pending in Public Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 10</td>
<td>Bivins</td>
<td>Passed by Education, placed and then withdrawn from Senate intent calendar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HB 709 called for a “public education scholarship program” that would provide vouchers to educationally disadvantaged students in large urban school districts. Once eligibility was established and a student attended a private school, the student could continue receiving a voucher until his or her graduation from high school or 21st birthday.

SB 10 would have created a “public education scholarship program” for educationally disadvantaged students in counties with populations of at least 575,000.

Legislators also beat back proposed amendments to other bills that would have established voucher programs. Proponents failed in an effort to add vouchers to SB 4, an education bill increasing teacher pay, reducing local school property taxes and devoting money to early and ninth-grade education. In addition, Rep. Ron Wilson, D-Houston, was unsuccessful in his attempt to add a voucher scheme to a telecommunications bill (SB 560) on the House floor. The program would have covered students in the third, fifth and eighth grades who failed state assessment tests in reading and mathematics.

2001 – 77th Legislature, Regular Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Final Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HB 1240</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>Referred to Public Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 2666</td>
<td>Krusee</td>
<td>Referred to Public Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HB 1240 would have created a pilot private school voucher program for educationally disadvantaged students in the state’s six largest urban school districts. Vouchers would also have been available to students who performed poorly on state assessment tests or who attended a low-performing school.

HB 2666 called for a “public education scholarship program” that provided state-funded vouchers to students who were already using a federally funded voucher or scholarship to attend a private school.
### 2003 – 78th Legislature, Regular Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Final Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HB 293</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>Referred to Public Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 658</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>Left pending in Public Education Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 1554</td>
<td>Grusendorf</td>
<td>Defeated on House floor at 2nd reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 2465</td>
<td>Grusendorf, others</td>
<td>Passed public education; considered in Calendars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 3474</td>
<td>Castro</td>
<td>Referred to Public Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 933</td>
<td>Shapiro</td>
<td>Passed Senate; passed House Public Education; referred to House Calendars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1822</td>
<td>Van de Putte</td>
<td>Referred to Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HB 2465 called for an “education freedom pilot program” that would have provided private school vouchers to students from low-income families in 11 of the state’s largest school districts. Access to the program would have been expanded to all of the more than 1,000 Texas school districts in 2005.

HB 293 and HB 658 would have established a pilot private school voucher program for educationally disadvantaged students in the state’s six largest public school districts. The bills’ provisions were essentially the same as in HB 1240 in 2001.

SB 933 and companion HB 1554 would have created a “virtual charter school” pilot program allowing the University of Texas at Austin and one other state university to educate up to 2,000 home-schooled students. State funds would have been used to pay for student computers, Internet access, online classes, instructional materials and certified teachers who would monitor student progress. Opponents criticized the bills as creating “virtual vouchers” that would drain money from the state’s public schools.

SB 1822 and companion HB 3474 called for a study of the effectiveness of a privately funded private school voucher program in Edgewood Independent School District in San Antonio. The bills’ authors sought to determine the beneficial or harmful results on participating students, students remaining in public schools and on the district’s taxpayers. The bills failed to get even a hearing in committee.

Rep. Grusendorf also filed HB 1133, which wasn’t a voucher bill but would have required the State Board of Education to provide textbooks to private school students at state expense. The bill was left pending in the House Public Education Committee.

### 2005 – 79th Legislature, Regular Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Final Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HB 12</td>
<td>Corte</td>
<td>Left pending in Public Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 1263</td>
<td>Harper-Brown, others</td>
<td>Reported favorably out of Public Education, sent to Calendars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 1445</td>
<td>Madden, others</td>
<td>Placed on General State Calendar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 3042</td>
<td>Riddle</td>
<td>Left pending in Public Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HB 12 would have established pilot voucher programs for educationally disadvantaged students in the state’s six largest urban school districts. HB 3042 called for a statewide private school voucher program open to nearly all students in any school district. HB 1263 would have created a pilot program in the state’s largest school districts. Students would be eligible for a voucher if, among other requirements, they were at risk of dropping out of school, were victims or siblings of victims of school violence, had limited proficiency in English or were in low-income families.

None of the bills received a vote on the floor. The House Public Education Committee incorporated much of HB 1263, however, into a bill reauthorizing the Texas Education Agency (SB 422). Wealthy voucher proponent James Leininger and House Republican leaders pressured representatives to pass SB 422 as amended. Just days later, however, opponents succeeded in gutting the voucher provision in a dramatic series of close votes on the House floor. A 74-70 vote stripped private schools from the bill, permitting vouchers to be used to attend only other public schools. House leaders then killed the bill.

HB 1445 would have created a “virtual school network” to provide education through electronic means to students across the state. Critics warned that the bill would create a “virtual voucher” program by using tax dollars to pay for educating private school and home-schooled students.
## APPENDIX B

### Sex Education

**A LEGISLATIVE SURVEY IN TEXAS**

Texas has one of the highest teen birthrates of all the 50 states – alternating with Mississippi in recent years for the highest. In addition, half of all new sexually transmitted diseases (STDs), including HIV/AIDS, occur among young people under the age of 24. Not surprisingly, then, state and national polls have shown overwhelming support among parents for giving high school students comprehensive, medically accurate information about responsible pregnancy and disease prevention. Religious conservatives, on the other hand, have been increasingly successful in eliminating such critical information from health classes and textbooks and in pushing programs that focus exclusively on encouraging only abstinence until marriage.

**1993 – 73rd Legislature, Regular Session**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Final Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HB 1163</td>
<td>Hill</td>
<td>Left pending in Human Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 2582</td>
<td>Hirschi, others</td>
<td>Referred to Public Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 487</td>
<td>Uher, others</td>
<td>Left pending in Human Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 924</td>
<td>Uher</td>
<td>Left pending in Human Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 938</td>
<td>Chisum, others</td>
<td>Referred to Public Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 151</td>
<td>Shelley, others</td>
<td>Education Committee testimony, referred to special subcommittee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 20</td>
<td>Moncrief</td>
<td>Referred to special subcommittee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 996</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>Public hearing in Education Committee, referred to special subcommittee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HB 938 and SB 996 were companion bills that would have required local school district to “devote substantially more attention to abstinence from sexual activity than to any other behavior.” Schools would have been required to teach students that abstinence is the preferred choice of behavior, the expected standard in terms of public health and the only method that is 100 percent effective in preventing pregnancy, sexually transmitted diseases, infection with HIV and “the emotional trauma associated with adolescent sexual activity.” Discussions on contraception and condom use would present effectiveness based on “reality rates” rather than “theoretical laboratory rates.” SB 996 would have also required schools to get written consent from parents before admitting students to classes with instruction on sex education.

HB 2582 would have required students in teacher education programs to complete no less than three semester hours in human sexuality and would have authorized grants to school districts for “comprehensive sexuality and self-responsibility programs.” Course materials would have been required, among other things, to include instruction in postponement of sexual activity, the importance of family and personal values and the development of decision-making skills. In addition, the bill called for sex education materials for public schools to be reviewed by a committee of health experts appointed by the State Board of Education.

SB 20 would have required the teaching of comprehensive sex education (including “self-development and life skills” as well as instruction on pregnancy and disease prevention) in Texas public schools. The bill would have authorized school districts to establish local advisory committees to advise board trustees in the selection, development and implementation of the district’s program on sex education.

HB 487, HB 924, HB 1163 and SB 151 all sought to abolish the Pregnancy and Parenthood Advisory Council. The Legislature created the council in 1987 to study and help prevent teenage pregnancy. In 1993 the council became a lightning rod for religious conservatives opposed to comprehensive sex education. Critics charged – falsely – that the council was promoting policies such as teaching 5-year-olds about “deviant sexual behaviors,” masturbation, abortion and homosexuality. The coordinated assault by far-right groups overwhelmed the council’s supporters. Although all four bills seeking the council’s abolition failed, the Legislature closed it down by cutting off funding.

**1995 – 74th Legislature, Regular Session**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Final Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HB 162</td>
<td>Kamel, Allen</td>
<td>Referred to Public Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 397</td>
<td>Chisum</td>
<td>Referred to Public Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 2469</td>
<td>Coleman</td>
<td>Referred to Public Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1</td>
<td>Ratliff</td>
<td>Signed by Governor 5/30/05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SB 1, a major education reform bill, included a provision requiring that public schools emphasize abstinence over any other method of sex education. Public schools are required to emphasize that abstinence is the preferred behavior for all unmarried persons and “the only 100 percent effective in preventing pregnancy, sexually transmitted diseases, infection with human immunodeficiency virus or acquired immune deficiency syndrome, and the emotional trauma associated with adolescent sexual activity.” The provision does not forbid school districts from offering comprehensive sex education. The provision requires that districts appoint and consider the recommendations of a local health advisory council before making any changes to the local sex education curriculum. School districts that do offer instruction on contraception and condom use must discuss the effectiveness of those methods “in terms of human use reality rates instead of theoretical laboratory rates.” School districts may not distribute condoms in connection with sex education instruction, and parents have the right to remove their children from a school’s sex education program.

HB 162 would have required high school students to learn that abstinence is the only “certain means” of avoiding out-of-wedlock pregnancy, STDs, HIV/AIDS and other health problems associated with sex.

HB 397 would have required that abstinence be presented to students as the preferred choice of behavior for unmarried people and that it was 100% effective in preventing pregnancy, STDs, HIV/AIDS and “emotional trauma” that might accompany sexual activity. The bill required that, when taught in high schools, contraception and condom use be taught in terms of “human use reality rates” instead of “theoretical laboratory rates.”

HB 2469 called for local school health education advisory councils to assist in recommending changes to the health education curriculum, including information about sex education.

1997 – 75th Legislature, Regular Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Final Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HB 648</td>
<td>Coleman, Maxey, Chisum</td>
<td>Passed by Public Education, report sent to Calendars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HB 648 would have established membership requirements for local school health education advisory councils to advise board trustees on sex education programs. A majority of council members would still be parents of students in the district. The bill also required that councils include at least one public school teacher, public school administrator, district student, health care professional, businessperson, law enforcement official, senior citizen, clergyperson and representative from a nonprofit health organization.

1999 – 76th Legislature, Regular Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Final Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HB 1122</td>
<td>Coleman, Najkhtat, Chisum</td>
<td>Left pending in Public Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 2797</td>
<td>Delisi</td>
<td>Left pending in Public Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As with HB 648 in 1997, HB 1122 would have established membership requirements for local school health education advisory councils to advise board trustees on sex education programs.

HB 2797 would have required that abstinence-only courses emphasize, among other things, monogamous married relationships, perceived “harmful psychological and physical consequences” of premarital sex and the harmful consequences of having children born outside of marriage.

2001 – 77th Legislature, Regular Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Final Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HB 814</td>
<td>Coleman</td>
<td>Referred to Public Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 2393</td>
<td>Coleman</td>
<td>Referred to Public Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 19</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>Signed by Governor in 6/14/2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 580</td>
<td>Van de Putte</td>
<td>Sent to Calendars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As with HB 648 in 1997, HB 1122 and companion SB 580 would have established membership requirements for local school health education advisory councils to advise board trustees on sex education programs. The advisory councils could recommend the amount of instruction time in health education and whether the curriculum and methods of instruction were appropriate for a specific grade level. HB 2393 had similar language but included a section on course materials dealing with general health issues and preventative health care.
SB 19 dealt with health and physical education for public school students. Rep. Coleman succeeded in amending the bill to give local school health education advisory councils authority to assist school districts “in ensuring that local community values are reflected in the district’s health education instruction,” not just instruction on sex education. The amendment also required that the local councils include at least one public school teacher, public school administrator, district student, health care professional, businessperson, law enforcement official, senior citizen, clergy person and representative from a nonprofit health organization.

2003 – 78th Legislature, Regular Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Final Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SB 1357</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>Effective on 9/1/03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SB 1357 made various minor adjustments to the requirement for health advisory councils in local school districts.

2005 – 79th Legislature, Regular Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Final Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HB 1354</td>
<td>Villarreal</td>
<td>Referred to Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 1658</td>
<td>Farrar, others</td>
<td>Referred to Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 2520</td>
<td>Coleman</td>
<td>Referred to Public Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 3134</td>
<td>Castro</td>
<td>Referred to Public Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HB 1354 called for, among other provisions, grants to public and private entities to establish or expand teenage pregnancy prevention programs. The programs would include comprehensive sexuality education.

HB 1658 would have required that health textbooks for public high school students include “specific, age-appropriate information” on all methods of contraception, teen dating violence, sexual assault, the importance of prenatal care services during pregnancy and the importance of well-woman exams.

HB 2520 would have required that the Department of State Health Services develop a fact-based, age-appropriate curriculum regarding AIDS and the prevention of HIV for public school students.

HB 3134 would have revised the state’s health education curriculum requirements, including provisions requiring that students who are and remain sexually active be given instruction on the benefits of a healthy, monogamous sexual relationship. Such students would also receive detailed information on testing for and preventing transmission of sexually transmitted diseases, medically accurate information about contraception and condom use, and the legal rights of and help for victims of sexual assault, including sexual abuse. Such students would also receive instruction on local services for pregnant teens and adolescent mothers.

During debate on the general appropriations bill, SB 1, state Rep. Farrar offered several amendments related to sex education and abstinence-only programs. One amendment would have required that agencies receiving general revenue funds for abstinence education report to the Department of Health on their success at reducing the number of teen pregnancies and sexually transmitted diseases. Another authorized the Department of Health to contract with agencies or programs that provide abstinence-based sexuality education that includes age-appropriate, medically accurate information about contraception. Neither amendment won adoption.
Stem Cell Research

A LEGISLATIVE SURVEY IN TEXAS

Many scientists believe that stem cell research could one day lead to cures for debilitating diseases such as Parkinson’s and diabetes. Some believe that so-called embryonic stem cell research holds the most promise for such cures in the future. Embryonic stem cells can be obtained in at least two ways: from embryos that grow from human eggs fertilized by sperm (such as through in vitro fertilization) or from replacing the nucleus of a human egg with the nucleus of another human cell other than sperm and then allowing the resulting product – called a blastocyst – to divide into cells. Some scientists believe the latter procedure can also be used to create a cloned human being if the blastocyst is implanted into a uterus. Most scientists oppose human cloning.

In embryonic stem cell research, however, the growth of the blastocyst is stopped very early – just a few hundred microscopic cells – so that stem cells may be removed. This form of therapeutic cloning does not involve the creation of a cloned human being. Even so, some people oppose this form of embryonic stem cell research. Legislation promoting, restricting or even criminalizing embryonic stem cell research in its various forms has been offered in the Texas Legislature since at least 2001. No legislation related to stem cell research has yet passed the Legislature.

2001 – 77th Legislature – Regular Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Final Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SB 102</td>
<td>Nelson, West</td>
<td>Passed the Senate; referred to House Civil Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1209</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>Referred to Jurisprudence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SB 102 would have banned human reproductive cloning. The bill did not address stem cell research and would not have prohibited using cloning technologies for scientific research or therapies.

SB 1209, introduced by West, would have barred all forms of human cloning. As written, however, this bill would also have had the effect of restricting some forms of embryonic stem cell research.

2003 – 78th Legislature, Regular Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Final Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SB 1034</td>
<td>Shapleigh</td>
<td>Referred to Jurisprudence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 1175</td>
<td>P. King, others</td>
<td>Placed on General State Calendar in the House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 156</td>
<td>Nelson, others</td>
<td>Referred to Jurisprudence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SB 1034 would have kept legal research involving embryonic stem cells, human embryonic germ cells, and human adult stem cells but would have criminalized human reproductive cloning.

HB 1175 and SB 156 would have banned human reproductive cloning as well as therapeutic cloning for embryonic stem cell research.

SB 610 related to grants for federally funded health centers. Rep. Phil King failed to amend the bill so that it barred grants to facilities that engaged in or were likely to engage in human reproductive cloning or even in therapeutic cloning intended for stem cell research.

SB 1652 related primarily to financing and administration at higher education institutions. Rep. Phil King failed in attempts to amend the bill so that it barred funding for institutions engaged in human cloning, even procedures needed for therapeutic embryonic stem cell research.
2005 – 79th Legislature, Regular Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Final Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HB 1929</td>
<td>Woolley, others</td>
<td>Left pending in State Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 2081</td>
<td>Paxton</td>
<td>Left pending in State Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 2269</td>
<td>Woolley, others</td>
<td>Left pending in Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 2329</td>
<td>Morrison, Herrero</td>
<td>House-Senate Conference Committee report filed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 2469</td>
<td>Thompson; Noriega</td>
<td>Left pending in State Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 2948</td>
<td>Swinford, Noriega</td>
<td>Referred to State Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 3076</td>
<td>Naishtat</td>
<td>Left pending in State Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1041</td>
<td>Janek</td>
<td>Referred to Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 864</td>
<td>P. King, others</td>
<td>Left pending in State Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HJR 71</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td>Left pending in State Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HJR 96</td>
<td>Naishat</td>
<td>Referred to Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1164</td>
<td>Shapleigh, Ellis</td>
<td>Left pending in Health and Human Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1733</td>
<td>Shapleigh</td>
<td>Referred to Health and Human Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 943</td>
<td>Armbrister</td>
<td>Left pending in Health &amp; Human Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HB 3076 would have established a stem cell research program of up to $295 million, including grants and loans, with regulatory standards and oversight bodies for institutions of higher education.

SB 1041 and HB 2269 would have funded an adult stem cell research center at the University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston. The bills didn’t address embryonic stem cell research.

HB 2469 would have established a Texas Institute for Regenerative Medicine and a committee to provide oversight. Research could include using human embryonic stem cells, human embryonic germ cells, and human adult stem cells.

With some differences, SB 128, SB 1164, SB 1733, HB 1929, HB 2948 would have banned human reproductive cloning but not therapeutic embryonic stem cell research. Unfertilized blastocysts could not be maintained for more than 14 days at higher education facilities unless frozen. The bills established general guidelines for stem cell research but did not bar therapeutic embryonic stem cell research at higher education facilities provided that the egg or unfertilized blastocyst was donated instead of purchased.

HB 2329 would have authorized the issuance of tuition revenue bonds or other obligations to fund capital projects at public institutions of higher education. The bill would have provided the University of Texas Health Center at Houston with $41.1 million for an adult stem cell research center. This center could have used the funds for stem cell and “related biomedical” research. The bill failed to pass in this session.

Amendments to SB 1, a general appropriations bill, that would have authorized funding for stem cell research failed to gain approval.

2005 – 79th Legislature, First Called Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Final Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HB 6</td>
<td>Morrison</td>
<td>Passed the House; died in the Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 75</td>
<td>Shapleigh</td>
<td>Referred to Health and Human Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 80</td>
<td>Ogden</td>
<td>Left pending in Finance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HB 864 and SB 943 would have prohibited human reproductive cloning and therapeutic embryonic stem cell research involving unfertilized blastocysts – effectively barring most embryonic stem cell research. A person violating the law – including patients – could have been fined between $500,000 and $1 million.

HB 2081 would have prohibited the use of state money for research on embryonic stem cells.

HJR 96 was a proposed constitutional amendment authorizing the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board or its successor to issue general obligation bonds in an amount up to $295 million for stem cell research.

HJR 71 was a proposed constitutional amendment establishing the Texas Institute for Regenerative Medicine to make grants and loans ($900 million over six years) to institutions of higher education and advanced medical research facilities in Texas for stem cell research and related facilities. The amendment would also have protected responsible embryonic stem cell research.
HB 6 and SB 80 would have authorized the issuance of tuition revenue bonds or other obligations to fund capital projects at public institutions of higher education. Both would have allowed up to $41.1 million in funds to establish, acquire, purchase, construct, improve, renovate, enlarge or equip facilities at the University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston for stem cell and “related biomedical” research.

SB 75 would have banned human reproductive cloning but not therapeutic stem cell research involving unfertilized blastocysts. Unfertilized blastocysts could not be maintained for more than 14 days at higher education facilities. The bill did not bar therapeutic embryonic stem cell research at higher education facilities provided that the egg or unfertilized blastocyst was donated instead of purchased.

SB 12 related to the issuance of revenue bonds for higher education. This bill would have allowed higher education institutions to establish, acquire, purchase, construct, improve, renovate, enlarge or equip facilities at the University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston for stem cell and “related biomedical” research. Bonds would be issued for financing purposes, not to exceed $41.1 million.

SB 28 would have banned human reproductive cloning but not therapeutic stem cell research involving unfertilized blastocysts. Unfertilized blastocysts could not be maintained for more than 14 days at higher education facilities. The bill did not bar therapeutic embryonic stem cell research at higher education facilities provided that the egg or unfertilized blastocyst was donated instead of purchased.

2005 – 79th Legislature, Second Called Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Final Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SB 12</td>
<td>Zaffirini</td>
<td>Referred to Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 28</td>
<td>Shapleigh</td>
<td>Referred to Health and Human Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Textbook Adoptions
A LEGISLATIVE SURVEY IN TEXAS

Among the State Board of Education’s responsibilities are adopting curriculum standards for Texas public schools and approving textbooks that local public school districts may purchase using state money. Efforts by state board members to edit textbook content based on their own personal and political beliefs have a long history. In 1994-95, for example, board members demanded that publishers make hundreds of changes to proposed new health textbooks. Among those changes were the removal of illustrations for self-exams for breast and testicular cancer, which some board members thought were too stimulating for teens. They also attacked medically accurate information on responsible prevention of pregnancy and sexually transmitted diseases. Embarrassed by these efforts, Texas legislators moved in 1995 to restrict the power of the state board over textbook content. Since then, lawmakers have tried to further limit the board’s authority or abolish the body altogether. Board members have challenged that 1995 provision before the state attorney general and by trying to pass new legislation restoring their authority.

1995 – 74th Legislature, Regular Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Final Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SB 1</td>
<td>Ratliff</td>
<td>Signed by the governor May 30, 1995</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SB 1, a major education reform package, included a provision that limited the State Board of Education’s authority over content in public school textbooks. Under the new provision, the state board could reject a proposed textbook only if the textbook did not meet state curriculum standards, if it included factual errors or if it did not meet manufacturing standards. Official opinions from two state attorneys general, a Democrat and a Republican, have generally upheld the provision’s limits on the state board’s authority.

1997 – 75th Legislature, Regular Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Final Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HJR 114</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Referred to Public Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 3351</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Referred to Public Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 3396</td>
<td>Sadler</td>
<td>Referred to Public Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 792</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>Committee Report sent to Calendars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legislators filed multiple bills to abolish or transfer duties away from the State Board of Education. HJR 114 proposed a constitutional amendment that would abolish the State Board of Education. This amendment and HB 3351 would have placed the board’s duties under the state’s education commissioner. HB 3396 would have limited the board’s authority essentially to oversight of management and investments into the Permanent School Fund. The fund pays for textbooks and some other costs. HB 792 would have limited the number of board meetings throughout the year, reducing meetings from 10 per year to 4 regular meetings and 2 possible special meetings. The bill’s author argued that fewer meetings were more in line with the board’s reduced responsibilities under SB 1, which was passed in 1995.

1999 – 76th Legislature, Regular Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Final Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SB 1707</td>
<td>Ellis</td>
<td>Referred to Education Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SB 1707 would have replaced the elected State Board of Education with an appointed panel. The appointments would have been made by the governor with the advice and consent of the Senate.

2001 – 77th Legislature, Regular Session

Although there was quite a bit of discussion regarding the state board’s oversight of the permanent school fund in 2001, there were no bills seeking changes in the textbook approval process or in the board’s authority over textbook content.

2003 – 78th Legislature, Regular Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Final Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HB 1172</td>
<td>Madden, others</td>
<td>Passed House, placed on Senate intent calendar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 1447</td>
<td>Howard, others</td>
<td>Passed by Public Education, considered in Calendars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 1448</td>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>Referred to Public Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 1917</td>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>Referred to Public Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HB 1172 would have returned some authority over textbook content to the State Board of Education by setting subjective standards for the study of U.S. and Texas history and giving board members authority to determine whether those subjective standards had been met. The bill included requirements on the importance
of patriotism, the free enterprise system and democratic values. Existing statute already included similar language, however. On the other hand, the bill also required that historical events addressed in public schools meet “a reasonable test of historical significance,” although no guidelines for determining what was “a reasonable test” were included. The bill also required that “the public school curriculum reflects an overall tone that portrays the United States as a country that has overcome its mistakes and emerged as the freest, most democratic nation in the history of the world.” Yet no guidelines for evaluating whether this standard was met were provided to the State Board of Education. The House Public Education Committee passed a completely different substitute bill that eliminated much of the original language. Passed by the House and then the Senate Education Committee, the bill ultimately died in the Senate.

HB 1447 would have completely restored to the State Board of Education the power to censor textbooks. Among its sweeping provisions was a novel definition of “factual errors” as “including errors of commission or omission related to viewpoint discrimination or special interest advocacy on major issues, as determined by the State Board of Education.” That provision would have permitted, for example, board members to reject biology textbooks that “omitted” discussion of creationism as an alternative “theory” to evolution in biology textbooks.

HB 1448 and HB 1917 would have essentially required the State Board of Education to determine whether textbooks sufficiently promoted patriotism, free enterprise and basic democratic values and to reject those textbooks judged not to do so. The bills never made it out of committee. A 2006 state attorney general’s opinion acknowledges the state board’s responsibility (under existing statute) to foster the teaching of U.S. and Texas history and the free enterprise system.

House Bill 220, as with HB 1447 in 2003, would have completely restored to the State Board of Education the power to censor textbooks. It included the same definition of “factual errors” as “including errors of commission or omission related to viewpoint discrimination or special interest advocacy on major issues, as determined by the State Board of Education.” That provision would have permitted, for example, board members to reject biology textbooks that “omitted” discussion of creationism as an alternative “theory” to evolution in biology textbooks.

HB 2534 and HB 973 would have established subjective textbook standards and left it to the highly politicized state board to determine whether those standards had been met. The bills would have required textbooks and curriculum to be “consistent with fundamental American principals” (HB 973) and promote “citizenship, patriotism, understanding of the essentials and benefits of the free enterprise system” (HB 2534). Both bills would have given the state board responsibility over ensuring the public school curriculum emphasized an overwhelmingly positive view of the United States.

HB 1658 would have required that health textbooks for public high school students include “specific, age-appropriate information” on all methods of contraception, teen dating violence, sexual assault, the importance of prenatal care services during pregnancy and the importance of well-woman exams.

HB 253 would have required that both the student and teacher editions of textbooks cover all state curriculum standards for a particular grade and course. Currently, a textbook can be judged as conforming to state curriculum standards if either the student edition or teacher edition covers those standards. In 2004 the state board approved health textbooks even though required material on responsible pregnancy and disease prevention could be found only in teacher editions. As a result, Texas high school students today will find in their health textbooks no information about contraception or methods of preventing sexually transmitted diseases except through abstinence-only-until-marriage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Final Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HB 220</td>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>Left pending in Public Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 253</td>
<td>Naishtat</td>
<td>Left pending in Public Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 973</td>
<td>Madden</td>
<td>Referred to Public Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 1658</td>
<td>Farrar, others</td>
<td>Referred to Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 2534</td>
<td>Chisum</td>
<td>Left pending in Public Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
They Really Said It...

The War on Science

“It should not be necessary for the top executive of NASA, Michael Griffin, to remind his agency's 19,000 employees that their scientific research and conclusions are not subject to the approval of politically appointed public affairs officials. But it was necessary, and that fact should embarrass the administration of President Bush.”

The Austin American-Statesman, editorializing against Bush administration efforts to control the flow of scientific information that contradicts the administration’s positions on controversial issues.

Austin American-Statesman, February 8, 2006

“...This is really shameless of Michael J. Fox. Either he didn’t take his medication or he’s acting.”

Far-right radio talk-show host Rush Limbaugh, saying Fox, an actor, was exaggerating the severe effects Parkinson’s disease has had on him while appearing in television commercials for candidates supporting stem cell research. Limbaugh later apologized but attacked Fox again.

Dallas Morning News, October 25, 2006

Evolution

“To put it simply, no Darwin, no Hitler. Hitler tried to speed up evolution, to help it along, and millions suffered and died in unspeakable ways because of it.”

Religious-right honcho D. James Kennedy of Coral Ridge Ministries, explaining his perception of Hitler as advancing Darwinian evolution.

WorldNetDaily.com, August 22, 2006

“Intelligent design is a valid scientific theory. He believes it should be taught as well.”

Kathy Walt, spokesperson for Texas Gov. Rick Perry, affirming Perry’s support for teaching the religion-based concept of “intelligent design” alongside evolution in public schools.

Dallas Morning News, October 24, 2006

Separation of Church and State

“America is a Christian nation. We pledge to exert our influence toward a return to the original intent of the First Amendment and dispel the myth of the separation of church and state.”


“From my standpoint, separation of church and state is in the Soviet constitution that the Bolsheviks wrote. Separation of church and state is not [written] a single time in the American Constitution.”

Reverend Russell Johnson, senior pastor at Fairfield Christian Church and the chairman of the religious-right Ohio Restoration Project.

Religion and Ethics Newsweekly, August 18, 2006

“If you’re not electing Christians, then in essence you are going to legislate sin.”

Rep. Katherine Harris, R-Fla., in an interview with the Florida Baptist Witness. She cited abortion and gay marriage as examples of that sin.

Washington Post, August 26, 2006

Bible Classes in Public Schools

“We can change the course of our country. And God knows we need it.”

Actor Chuck Norris, stumping for the far-right National Council on Bible Curriculum in Public Schools’ sectarian and controversial Bible-education program.

CBS News, April 16, 2006
“Since Odessa is going to start offering Bible as an alternative course of study, I thought maybe there might be an interest in this.”

**Benny Keck, education minister at the Sixth & Jackson Church of Christ**, in an effort to support Ector County ISD’s recent approval of a Bible course has asked a well-known creationist speaker to hold a seminar in Odessa.

*Odessa American, August 5, 2006*

“My hope is the end result is they read their Bible and start asking questions elsewhere and they become Christians. That’s the hope of the community, too.”

**Dr. Bill Welsh, a Church of Christ minister**

*who teaches a class about the Bible in Big Springs (West Texas) Independent School District.*

*Abilene Reporter-News, September 14, 2006*

---

**Textbook Censorship**

“I reject the teaching of comprehensive sex education in public schools. When health books were adopted in 2004, I voted for abstinence-based books that follow the state-mandated curriculum, and I spoke out against ancillary materials provided by publishers that contain graphic information about contraception.”

**Dan Montgomery, an incumbent State Board of Education member, clarifying his views on sex education in Texas schools. Montgomery lost his primary election battle to a far-right challenger anyway.**

*Austin American Statesman, February 28, 2006*

“I just don’t think that liberal New York editors should be deciding the content of textbooks.”

**Terri Leo, a far-right member of the Texas State Board of Education, on why she believes the SBOE should have more authority over content in the state’s public school textbooks.**

*San Antonio Express-News, September 18, 2006*

---

**Religious Freedom**

“We have a way of doing things here, and it’s not going to change to accommodate a very small minority. If they feel singled out, they should find another school or excuse themselves from those functions. It’s our way of life.”

**Kenneth R. Stevens, a Georgetown, Del., businessman who disagrees with some local families’ complaints about Christian prayer in public schools.**

*New York Times, July 29, 2006*

“Forgive me, but America should not give a hoot what Keith Ellison’s favorite book is. Insofar as a member of Congress taking an oath to serve America and uphold its values is concerned, America is interested in only one book, the Bible. If you are incapable of taking an oath on that book, don’t serve in Congress.”

**Dennis Prager, a far-right radio commentator and writer, speaking about Keith Ellison, a Muslim who was recently elected to Congress and wanted to take his oath to office on the Koran rather than the Bible.**

*Townhall.com, November 28, 2006*

---

**Religion and Politics**

“If you live your life and don’t confess your sins to God almighty through the authority of Christ and his blood, I’m going to say this very plainly, you’re going straight to hell with a nonstop ticket.”

**Far-right evangelical pastor John Hagee, during a Sunday service at which he introduced Gov. Rick Perry to his congregation, two days before the governor faced voters in his bid for re-election. Asked later if he agreed with Hagee’s comment about non-Christians going to hell, Gov. Perry replied: “In my faith, that’s what it says, and I’m a believer of that.”**

*Dallas Morning News, November 6, 2006*

“My main point was that this country was built on morals and religion. Our greatest leaders were very strong believers. There is a connection between religion and politics, and religion and government. There has to be for this country to have accomplished all it’s accomplished and for its future. How many times have the great leaders—Ronald Reagan, Roosevelt, Lincoln, George Washington—have said there is a connection between morals and religion. And there has to be. The people that go to church understand that a country has to be based on some sort of religion and fear of God because they understand that.”

**Then-U.S. Rep. Tom DeLay, R-Sugar Land, in an interview with TIME magazine.**

*TIME.com, April 3, 2006*

“We have been chosen to live as Christians at a time when our culture is being poisoned and our world is being threatened. The enemies of virtue may be on the march, but they have not won.”

**Then-U.S. Rep. Tom DeLay, at a “War on Christians” conference in Washington this week, urging religious conservatives to stay on the attack against hostile forces out to get Christians like, well, Tom DeLay.**

*Dallas Morning News, March 30, 2006*
“It has been told by the prophets in the land that there is a president coming out of Texas, a Burning Bush. He will deal with abortion in the land. We ask you to give him an executive order and mantle him and give him a mandate with the fear of the Lord.”


_The Washington Post_, January 24, 2006

“He (God) is the chairman of this party.”

_Texas Republican Party leader Tina Benkiser_ assuring attendees at the state’s Republican Convention over the weekend that God was watching over the two-day confab.

_Dallas Morning News_, June 4, 2006

“This message that has been sent out to Christians for a long time now: that Jesus came primarily for a political agenda, and recently primarily a right-wing political agenda - as if this culture war is a war for God. And it’s not a war for God, it’s a war for politics. And that’s a huge difference.”


_CBS News’ “60 Minutes”_, October 15, 2006

“This is a battle between the forces of righteousness and the hordes of hell . . . This is to elect values candidates.”

_Rev. Russell Johnson_, creator of the Ohio Restoration Project, an organization that is attempting to enlist 2,000 pastors to commit themselves to registering 300 new voters each by the end of 2006. A similar organization, the Texas Restoration Project, has been formed in Texas to promote religious-right candidates.

_Talk to Action_, July 25, 2006

“We urge them to avoid legal entanglement, but there are times in a pastor’s life when he needs to take a biblical stand. Our higher calling is to Christ.”

_Rick Scarborough_, head of the far-right Vision America, based in the East Texas city of Lufkin

“If the pastor is doing the right job, the people will automatically vote for the right person.”

_Gale Wollenberg_, who belongs to a conservative evangelical church in Topeka, Kan. Scarborough and Wollenberg were speaking about the religious right’s all-out drive to get far-right Christians from pew to voting booth in the November election.

_Los Angeles Times_, October 1, 2006

“Right now, I wouldn’t vote Democratic if Jesus Christ was running.”

_Judy Deats, a Texas Republican_, who was standing by then-U.S. Rep. Tom DeLay in his re-election bid despite the fact that the congressman’s association with corrupt lobbyist Jack Abramoff.

_MSNBC_, March 20, 2006

“Despite all the spiritual shortcomings of the Jewish people, according to scripture — and those criticisms come not from Christians but from the Old Testament. Just look in Deuteronomy, where Jews are referred to as a stiff-necked and stubborn people — despite all of that, God has chosen to bless them as his people. God chose to bless Abraham and his seed not because they were a perfect people any more than the rest of the human family.”

_James Dobson_, head of the far-right Focus on the Family, explaining one reason evangelical Christians support Israel.

_New York Times_, November 14, 2006

**Public Education**

“As much as the politically correct crowd would like to talk around it, the market for alternative schools is the direct result of government-forced integration of the public schools. The demise of the public schools has followed on the heels of federal courts mandating integration about as directly as any example of cause-and-effect in social policy in American history.”


_Lakewood Advocate_, May 2000

**Civil/Equal Rights**

“I am exactly where my God put me to tell you plainly, that you are going to hell, and there’s nothing you can do about it.”

_Shirley Phelps-Roper_, daughter of minister Fred Waldron Phelps, Sr., head of Westboro Baptist Church in Kansas, a church that regularly protests the funerals of soldiers because, the group claims, their deaths are God’s revenge on a sinful America. The above quote was made during a heated discussion with Fox News host Julie Banderas, who called Phelps-Roper “the devil” and apparently condemned her to hell as well.

_WorldNetDaily.com_, June 11, 2006
“(H)as the social agenda of the GOP been stalled by homosexual members and or staffers? When we look over events of this Congress, we have to wonder. ... The GOP will have to decide whether it wants to be the party that defends the traditional moral and family values that our nation was built upon and directed by for two centuries. Put another way, does the party want to represent values voters or Mark Foley and friends?”

Tony Perkins, president of the far-right Family Research Council, speaking after revelations that former U.S. Rep. Mark Foley, R-Fla., had been sending erotically charged e-mails for congressional pages.

Tony Perkins’ Washington Update, October 9, 2006

“The mind-set that invites a couple to use contraception is an antichild mind-set. So when a baby is conceived accidentally, the couple already have this negative attitude toward the child. Therefore seeking an abortion is a natural outcome. We oppose all forms of contraception.”

Judie Brown, president of the American Life League, an organization that has battled abortion for 27 years but that, like others, now has a larger mission—demonizing contraception.

Judie Brown, president of the American Life League, May 7, 2006

“God is punishing this nation with a grievous, smiting blow, killing our children, sending them home dead, to help you connect the dots. This is a nation that has forgotten God and leads a filthy manner of life.”

Shirley Roper-Phelps, spokeswoman for Westboro Baptist Church of Topeka, Kan. and its leader, Fred Phelps’s, daughter, explaining why their group applauds the death of American soldiers as divine retribution.

New York Times, April 17, 2006

“They are racists, murderers, sexual deviants and supporters of Al-Qaeda—and they could be teaching your kids! ... These guys are out and out communists, they are radicals, they are, you know, some of them killers, and they are propagandists of the first order ... you don’t want your child to be brainwashed by these radicals, you just don’t want it to happen. Not only brainwashed but beat up, they beat these people up, cover them into submission. AGGGHHH!!!”

Rev. Pat Robertson, attacking “radical” liberal professors on the March 21 episode of his show, The 700 Club.

People for the American Way Web site

“I’ve got a Mercedes, my wife has a Mercedes, my daughter has a Mercedes. It all belongs to God and he’s letting me use it.”

Keith Butler, prosperity preacher at Word of Faith and candidate for U.S. Senate in Michigan.

Bartholomew’s notes on religion – Salon Blog, February 7, 2006

“Soy is feminizing, and commonly leads to a decrease in the size of the penis, sexual confusion and homosexuality. That’s why most of the medical (not socio-spiritual) blame for today’s rise in homosexuality must fall upon the rise in soy formula and other soy products.”

Jim Rutz, a columnist writing in the far-right WorldNetDaily, arguing that soy is a “devil food” that has caused a rise in homosexuality.

WorldNetDaily, December 12, 2006

“It takes a real man to confess Jesus as Lord and Savior. I’m not talking about no faggot or no sissy.”

Bishop Alfred A. Owens Jr., a pastor in Washington, D.C., giving a Palm Sunday sermon.

Washington Post, May 18, 2006
2006 Texas GOP Platform: Using Politics to Divide People of Faith

Texas Republicans have once again demonstrated that their party is now solidly under the control of extremists determined to use politics to divide people of faith in Texas. Tina Benkiser, re-elected at the convention as the state party’s chair, even claimed God has partisan loyalties. “He is the chairman of this party,” Benkiser told cheering conventionneers. It should be no surprise, then, that the 2006 party platform adopted on June 3 in San Antonio mirrors previous GOP platforms that threaten religious freedom and other values important to mainstream Texans. (Page numbers from the platform are in brackets below.)

Attacking Religious Freedom
The state party renewed its assault on religious freedom and constitutional protection of that freedom for all people of faith. In fact, extremists leading the party’s dominant far-right wing once again promoted their own personal religious views ahead of the faith perspectives of other Texans.

- “America is a Christian nation, founded on Judeo-Christian principles.” [P-15]
- “We pledge to exert our influence toward a return to the original intent of the First Amendment and dispel the myth of the separation of church and state.” [P-15]
- “We support school subjects with emphasis on the Judeo-Christian principles upon which America was founded and which form the basis of America’s legal and its political and economic systems.” [P-14]
- The party platform calls for revising the federal tax code to sweep away limits on politicking by clergy and religious organizations. It does not address past efforts by Republican campaigns to obtain church membership rolls for electoral purposes. [P-4]
- Despite problems such as abuse of clients and financial mismanagement that have plagued such programs in the past, Republicans call for less government oversight and regulation of faith-based providers of social services. [P-15]

Undermining Public Education, Science and Medical Research
State Republicans reaffirmed their support for programs that undermine public schools. In addition, the party’s far-right extremists continued their aggressive campaign to promote political and religious ideology above science and medical research.

- The party supports draining millions of dollars from public schools to fund private and religious schools through vouchers. It opposes requiring that private and religious schools – even those receiving tax-funded vouchers – meet any state standards and other regulations set for public schools. [P-12]
- The party also calls for special rights for students in private and religious schools, including exemptions from ordinances that set daytime curfews for all students. [P-13]
- Republicans would undermine the teaching of evolution in science classes by including material on creationism, often deceptively called “intelligent design” by its supporters. [P-14]
- Republicans oppose teaching students with age-appropriate, medically accurate sex education that includes information on abstinence, birth control and prevention of sexually transmitted diseases and HIV. The party would require schools to teach that abstinence-only-until-heterosexual-marriage is the only “safe and healthy” way to prevent unintended pregnancy and sexually transmitted diseases. [P-13]
- They support giving the heavily politicized State Board of Education full authority to set standards for and approve the adoption of public school textbooks. [P-12] Doing so would return Texas to the days when publishers were forced to make hundreds of changes to their textbooks to meet the personal, political and religious objections of censors on the State Board. The Legislature limited the SBOE’s authority in 1995.
- The party calls for “maximizing” local control over public schools, which would eviscerate statewide quality education standards that have helped more students succeed over the past two decades. [P-12]
- Republicans call for the abolition of the U.S. Department of Education and government-sponsored programs that deal with early childhood development. [P-13]
- The party opposes a promising form of medical research into embryonic stem cells. [P-9]
threatening Judicial independence and Civil/Equal Rights

The state GOP remains hostile to an independent judiciary and to protecting the civil and equal rights of all Texans.

- The party would limit the ability of judges to determine the constitutionality of laws and end Supreme Court jurisdiction in cases involving abortion, religious freedom and the Bill of Rights. It calls for the impeachment of judges who, through the subjective judgment of others, “abuse their constitutional authority or are no longer acting on good behavior.” [P-5]
- The platform opposes federal court jurisdiction in cases involving family law and calls for the passage of a federal constitutional amendment that forbids any state from permitting marriage or civil unions for same-sex couples. [P-7]
- Republicans assail any suggestion that committed same-sex partners constitute a family of their own, and they oppose “any granting of special legal entitlements, recognition, or privileges, including, but not limited to, marriage between persons of the same sex, custody of children by homosexuals, homosexual partner insurance or retirement benefits.” [P-8] The party would also forbid adoption of children by gay parents. [P-10]
- The party supports sodomy laws, which criminalize consensual and private sexual intimacy between adults. Republicans also call for removing from federal courts any jurisdiction in cases involving sodomy. [P-8]
- The party supports repeal of the state’s hate crimes statute (which increases penalties for those crimes committed because of bias toward a person’s “race, color, disability, religion, national origin or ancestry, age, gender or sexual preference”). [P-15]
- Republicans oppose allowing gay men and lesbians to serve in the nation’s armed forces. They also oppose permitting women to serve in any combat role. [P-22]
- The party opposes no-fault divorce and supports “Covenant Marriage,” which would make it harder for abused spouses to escape a violent marriage. [P-7]
- Republicans oppose any right of a woman to choose whether or not to continue a pregnancy. They call for appointing U.S. Supreme Court justices who will overturn Roe v. Wade and for passage of a federal constitutional amendment banning abortion. [P-8] The party also opposes emergency contraceptives such as the “morning after pill.” [P-9]

The party opposes the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. [P-10]
- Republicans oppose measures, such as all “Motor Voter” laws and the “Help America Vote Act,” that make it easier for Americans to exercise their right to vote and help ensure that their votes are counted correctly. They also would require citizens to have a government-issued photo identification to vote. [P-5] (The platform doesn’t note that federal courts have likened similar legislation elsewhere to an unconstitutional poll tax.)
- The party would gut the Americans with Disabilities Act by excluding “from its definition those persons with infectious diseases, substance addiction, learning disabilities, behavior disorders, homosexual practices and mental stress.” [P-12]

Trashing Good Government

- The platform calls on the state Legislature “to immediately” transfer from the Travis County Public Integrity Unit to another body the powers and funding needed to investigate and prosecute charges of government corruptions (such as those currently pending against former U.S. House Majority Leader Tom DeLay, R-Sugar Land). [P-6]
- The party opposes mandatory vaccination programs for infectious diseases that endanger children in public schools. [P-12]
- Republicans call for the elimination of the Social Security tax and privatization of that vital retirement program. [P-11] The party also wants to abolish the Internal Revenue Service and federal taxes on earned income, inheritance, gifts, capital gains and corporate income. Republicans would replace such taxes with a regressive sales tax. [P-17]
- Republicans reaffirmed their hostility to international cooperation by calling for U.S. withdrawal from the United Nations and the World Trade Organization. They also oppose measures that protect Earth’s environment, including the Kyoto Agreement, the Biodiversity Treaty and the Endangered Species Act. [P-24]
- The party supports the repeal of minimum wage laws. [P-19]
Organizations of the Religious Right in Texas

Following is a list of organizations that advance the agenda of the religious right in Texas. Most financial data comes from tax information nonprofit organizations must file with the Internal Revenue Service (Form 990). The data shown is for the most recent year available. Information on leadership, including board members, comes from both IRS filings and Web sites for each group. Because some organizations do not update their Web sites regularly, some information about leaders may be out of date. Even so, this appendix represents a compilation of data that was available at the end of 2006.

Christian Coalition of America – Texas Chapter
501(c)(4) nonprofit

Christian Coalition of America – Texas Chapter was established in 2006, replacing the defunct Texas Christian Coalition (CCTX, Inc.), which moved from the North Texas city of Bedford to Sugar Land near Houston in 2005. The new Texas chapter of Christian Coalition of America, headquartered in Duncanville near Dallas, is apparently as partisan as ever, listing itself as a coalition affiliate of GOPUSA (http://www.ccoatx.com/affiliates.htm, as of 12/15/06). GOPUSA describes itself as an organization that strives “to be the first source Republicans and conservatives turn to for news and information, both at the state and national levels.” (http://gopusa.com/company/mission.shtml, as of 12/15/06.)

Founded by Pat Robertson, the Christian Coalition was once the best-known religious-right organization. In 1997, Fortune listed the organization as the seventh most influential lobbying group in our nation’s legislative system. The Christian Coalition’s highly partisan electoral activities, however, got it in trouble with the Internal Revenue Service. In 1999, the IRS revoked the group’s tax-exempt status, recognizing the partisan nature of the group. The Christian Coalition’s membership and fundraising has been in decline ever since.

From the Web site: http://www.ccoatx.com

Mission:
“The Christian Coalition of America - Texas Chapter offers people of faith the vehicle to be actively involved in shaping their government - from the County Courthouse to the halls of Congress.

Today, Americans are bombarded with countless political messages from across the ideological spectrum. Because of this, it is becoming increasingly difficult to separate truth from fiction and right from wrong. The Christian Coalition of America-Texas Chapter is committed to representing the pro-family agenda and educating Texans on the critical issues facing our society. Whether it is the fight to end Partial Birth Abortion or efforts to improve education or lower the family’s tax burden, your chapter stands ready and able to work for you.

Our Chapter will work to have a full time staff, lobby our elected officials from local to National office holders, so that Texans voices can be heard. During this upcoming election we will provide non-partisan guides to give voters a clear understanding of where various candidates stand on the issues importance to them. With this knowledge, voters can go to the polls to make their decision. We shall not stop with voters guides we will host events, grassroots training schools around the State to draw pro-family supporters.

If you are interested in having a positive pro-family impact on your government, the Christian Coalition of America - Texas Chapter is your organization. Your involvement is paramount to our efforts. After deciding how you want to be involved, please contact us by letter, phone or email so we can send you the information you need to be successful. In politics, every voice counts.”

Leadership: Buck Werner, Executive Director

Board of Directors: Unknown

Revenue: Unknown

Board Members:
Stuart Lane
Betty Anderson

Data for defunct Texas Christian Coalition (CCTX, Inc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue 2003</th>
<th>Revenue 2004</th>
<th>Assets 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$80,343.00</td>
<td>$98,974.00</td>
<td>$287</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact Information:
P.O. Box 380206
Duncanville, TX 75138
Phone: (972) 709-5871
Email: administrative@CCOATX.com
Council on Faith in Action (CONFíA)
501(c)(3) nonprofit

CONFíA seeks to build a “Hispanic values movement” linked with other fundamentalist Christian evangelical groups. The group opposes abortion, embryonic stem cell research, same-sex marriage and euthanasia. CONFíA has also worked to build support in the Hispanic community for a publicly funded voucher program open to any “public, private or Christian school.”

From the Web site: http://confianow.com

Mission:
“Council on Faith In Action is a 501(c)3 organization educating Hispanics on the importance of Civic Involvement.

The acronym CONFíA comes from the Spanish word Confiar - to put one’s trust or faith in someone. CONFíA is putting our trust in God. And we are putting our faith into action.

CONFíA’s vision is to equip and mobilize Hispanics in America to uphold justice, righteousness and truth. We are a non-profit organization dedicated to train Hispanics – of all ages and from all walks of life - to uphold our Christian worldview in the civic arena.

CONFíA is committed to developing a strong, informed Hispanic grassroots network. We will do this by:
• Encouraging Hispanics to exercise their vote responsibly
• Educating Hispanics on the basics of civic involvement
• Providing resources through our seminars, newsletter and website”

Leadership:
Daniel Garza, President and CEO
Mark Gonzales, Field Director
David Contreras, Texas Director

CONFíA Task Force:
Maria Hernandez Ferrier
Beto Gonzales
Marta Guevara
Juan Carlos Hernandez
Ana Maria Hernandez
Tomas Lares, Jr.
Abel Lopez
John Mendez
Alice Patterson

In response to a request for the group’s IRS Form 990, a CONFíA official said the group’s income did not meet the $25,000 income threshold for filing such a form in 2005.

Contact Information:
P.O. Box 461488
San Antonio, TX 78246
Phone: (210) 617-4684
Email: info@CONFIAnow.com
Educational Research Analysts
501(c)(3) nonprofit
EIN: 75-1407723

Educational Research Analysts is likely to play a role in the revision of public school curriculum standards over the next few years. Mel and Norma Gabler of Longview (Texas), who started the organization, began reviewing textbooks in the 1960s. The Gablers and their successors have criticized textbooks for, as they see it, coverage of evolution, failure to promote phonics-based reading instruction, insufficient support for principles of free enterprise, a failure to promote a strict interpretation of the U.S. Constitution, a lack of respect for Judeo-Christian morals, failure to emphasize abstinence-only-until-marriage instruction in health textbooks, and the “politically correct degradation of academics.”

The group’s “reviews” are often really political documents in which many textbook “errors” are simply ideological objections to content. In 2004 the group attacked proposed new health textbooks in Texas as somehow promoting homosexuality and same-sex marriage. Yet the student textbooks included no discussions of sexual orientation, and the teacher editions barely touched on the topic. But Educational Research Analysts argued that the books promoted same-sex marriage through the use of “asexual stealth phrases,” such as “married couples” and “married people,” rather than using language making it clear that marriage is a union of a man and a woman.

In recent years the group has appeared to adopt a tactic of releasing reviews of textbooks after the State Board of Education has already voted on approving or rejecting those books. For example, the group announced on its Web site that reviews and rankings for new math textbooks would be available in January 2007, two months after the SBOE approved those textbooks for adoption by the state’s public schools. This tactic seems to fit into an overall strategy by Educational Research Analysts to discredit public school textbooks altogether rather than help ensure that the state’s public schools have the best choices available to them.


From the Web site: http://www.textbookreviews.org

Mission:
“We are a conservative Christian organization that reviews public school textbooks submitted for adoption in Texas. Our reviews have national relevance because Texas state-adopts textbooks and buys so many that publishers write them to Texas standards and sell them across the country.

Our unique 45 years’ experience gives us expertise equal to or beyond that of the education establishment itself in all phases of the public school textbook adoption process, and in that our standard review criteria spell out what public school textbooks often censor on certain topics.

Publisher’s market textbooks — and many teachers select them — based on convenience of their teaching aids. Unlike them, we review textbooks for academic content only. Parents, teachers, and school board members can all profitably use our materials.”

Leadership:
Neal Frey, senior textbook analyst

Board Members:
Neal Frey
Judith S. Frey
Richard Gibson
Mrs. Mel Gabler
Elsie Livers

Revenue 1998: $158,780.00
Revenue 2005: $97,971.00
Assets 2005: $348,118.00

Contact Information:
P.O. Box 7518
Longview, Texas 75607-7518
Phone: (903) 753-5993
Fax: (903) 753-8424
E-mail: info@textbookreviews.org
Free Market Foundation
A 501(c)(3) nonprofit
EIN: 75-1403169

The Free Market Foundation has increasingly looked to organizing conservative Christian pastors as a strategy in advancing its political agenda. In 2005, the group’s head, Kelly Shackelford, created Texans for Marriage, a political action committee that made outreach to conservative pastors a key part of its efforts to pass a state constitutional ban on same-sex marriage and civil unions. Shackelford has also been a prominent organizer of the Texas Restoration Project, a network of conservative Christian pastors. Just days before the November 2006 election, Shackelford – a member of Gov. Rick Perry’s re-election steering committee – participated in a statewide get-out-the-vote conference call to conservative pastors identified by the Texas Restoration Project.

The Free Market Foundation serves as the statewide policy council for the far-right Focus on the Family, a national organization based in Colorado. The Free Market Foundation was created by Richard Ford, a high-level far-right political donor and organizer in Texas. Ford supports private school vouchers and also founded FreePAC (now Heritage Alliance PAC; see below), a political action committee that used its contributions to try to unseat moderate Republican state legislators in Texas and replace them with candidates aligned with the religious right.

Today the head of the Free Market Foundation is Shackelford, an attorney who previously worked for the Rutherford Institute. The Rutherford Institute specializes in suing the government and public entities in “defense of religious liberty.” Shackelford also serves as chief counsel for Liberty Legal Institute, a litigation arm of the Free Market Foundation.

Shackelford has also supported state workers who removed a child from her mother’s custody because she was involved in a lesbian relationship. Shackelford contended that the state should “not knowingly place children in homes where they know there is ongoing criminal sexual activity.” Shackelford reasoned that state’s the sodomy law (since then struck down by the U.S. Supreme Court) meant that the state can’t “place children in homosexual households.”

The Free Market Foundation has supported failed legislation permitting religious organizations to ignore civil rights laws. The group also produces one of the most widely distributed religious-right voter guides in Texas, typically covering issues such as private school vouchers, same-sex marriage and teaching creationism in science classes. In addition, the Free Market Foundation has demanded that judicial candidates state their affiliations with various organizations ranging from the Christian Coalition and Eagle Forum to the American Civil Liberties Union and Planned Parenthood. The group also created the Texas Physicians Resource Council, a statewide network of Christian physicians and dentists interested in local and state public policies involving such issues as abortion rights, homosexuality, parenting and sexuality education.

From the Web site: http://www.freemarket.org

Mission:
“To protect freedoms and strengthen families throughout Texas by impacting our legislature, media, grassroots, and courts with the truth. To do this we are guided by the principles, which limit government, promote free enterprise and Judeo-Christian values.”

Leadership:
Kelly J. Shackelford, President, Chief Counsel of the legal division (Liberty Legal Institute)
Mark E. Swafford, Execute Vice-President
Hiram S. Sasser III, Director of Litigation

Board Members:
Mr. & Mrs. W.W. Caruth III, Dallas, chairman
James R. Lightner, Dallas (not in the hardcopy of the 990)
Mr. & Mrs. Tim Dunn, Midland
Mr. & Mrs. Kelly Rogers, Frisco
Mr. & Mrs. Al Angel, Dallas
Cindy Asche, Frisco
Mark Cover, Houston
William Crocker, Austin
Mr. & Mrs. Dale Brown, Midland
Mr. & Mrs. James Robertson, Plano
Mr. & Mrs. Archer Bonnema, Plano
Deborah & Ken Carlson, Dallas
Dr. Linda Flower, Tomball
Judge & Paul Pressler, Houston

Revenue 1997: Revenue 2005: Assets 2005:
$314,004.00 $1,327,064.00 $770,526.00

Contact Information:
Free Market Foundation
903 East 18th Street, Suite 230
Plano, Texas 75074
Phone: (972) 423-8889
Fax: (972) 423-8899
E-mail: programs@freemarket.org
Heritage Alliance
A 501 [c][4] nonprofit
EIN: 73-1164337

Founded by Richard Ford, the Heritage Alliance and the Heritage Alliance PAC were once known as the Free Market Committee and the Free Enterprise PAC, or FreePAC. Funded by conservative donors such as San Antonio businessman Dr. James Leininger, FreePAC backed a slate of far-right candidates in the 2002 state elections. In an attempt to purge moderates from the ranks of Republican elected officials, FreePAC also distributed mailers attacking a half-dozen GOP House members and senators during the party primary elections that year. Some of the inflammatory mailers included photos of two men kissing. The mailers painted their moderate Republican targets as, among other sins, being anti-family and supportive of teaching children about gay sex. They also attacked lawmakers for supporting women’s reproductive rights, including access to abortion services. The attacks drew condemnation from newspapers and other Republican officials from across the state, and all six of the targeted Republican moderates won their primaries. In 2005 the Heritage Alliance PAC worked to pass a state constitutional ban on same-sex marriage and civil unions.

From the Web site: http://www.heritagealliance.com

Mission:
“Heritage Alliance seeks to empower the handful of citizens necessary to restore principles of free enterprise, limited government, limited taxation, and our traditional Judeo-Christian heritage in government.

Our founders believed in electing legislators of character and ability to represent principles on behalf of the common good, not simply to pander to public opinion. We believe that God entrusted us with the right to vote. When we choose not to vote or to not vote intelligently, we forfeit our responsibility to choose just legislators.

It is amazing how few people it takes to influence a legislator or an election! Only 50 emails, letters, or phone calls will influence a legislator on a particular bill. And only 5,000 voters will change the outcome of a primary election.

Your voice and your vote really do make a difference. Heritage Alliance serves to help you use your voice and vote wisely to hold our legislators accountable and ensure traditional values for our children and grandchildren.”

Leadership:
Richard Ford, President
M. Clare Jones, Vice-President

Board Members:
Dale Brown, Midland
Robert Carrel, Bonham
Richard Ford, Dallas
Greg Lamb, Dallas
J. Keet Lewis, Dallas, director
Tom Miller, Dallas, director
Robert Schoolfield, Austin
Cindy Sullivan, Galveston

Revenue 2004: $49,580.22
Assets 2004: $8,119.15

Contact Information:
P.O. Box 741777
Dallas, TX 75374
info@heritagealliance.com
Justice at the Gate

Justice at the Gate encourages conservative Christians to engage in political affairs, supports the appointment of "godly judges," and includes targeted outreach to minority communities in its activities. According to its Web site, the group has coordinators in at least nine states, including Texas. The group also gets involved in voter registration and other electoral activity. In 2005, for example, Justice at the Gate campaigned for passage of a constitutional ban on same-sex marriage and civil unions in Texas.

The group’s Web site includes detailed information about legal issues involving political work by churches and religious leaders. Much of the information is useful, but some of the advice might endanger the tax-exempt status of a church or other house of worship. For example, Justice at the Gate suggests that pastors may personally endorse or oppose a candidate from the pulpit. The Internal Revenue Service, however, has been investigating specific instances in which such activities may have, in fact, put the tax-exempt status of a church or other house of worship at risk.

Justice at the Gate also seeks to build a political machine based on local organizers. Its Web site invites visitors to volunteer for such positions as "civic awareness coordinators" and city or county coordinators. Coordinators distribute election material and facilitate voter registration efforts.

From the Web site: http://www.justiceatthegate.org

Mission:
"Building strategic partnerships to mobilize Christians to pray effectively and to vote righteously.

Empowering believers in God’s presence through reconciliation and education to impact our nation through focused prayer for our judiciary and through the power of the ballot by purposing to:

- Build strategic partnerships to connect with key ethnic leaders
- Prepare a place of healing in God’s presence by continuing the reconciliation work of black and white abolitionists
- Empower Christians to impact our nation by connecting their faith values to electoral choices, evidenced by the power of the ballot
- Open doors of access to government by educating and connecting the faith community to dedicated believers serving in government
- Mobilize governmental prayer by connecting an intercessor to every judge in America, from the county to the federal level"

Leadership:
Alice Patterson, founder and president

Board Members:
Unavailable

Contact Information:
P.O. Box 681148
San Antonio, TX 78268
Phone: (210) 677-8214
Fax: (210) 677-8201
Email: justiceatthegate@aol.com
The Justice Foundation
A 501(c)(3) nonprofit
EIN: 74-2676958

The Justice Foundation (formerly known as the Texas Justice Foundation) has been working to elevate its profile at the national level. Through its program called Operation Outcry, TJF has circulated to public policymakers around the country affidavits from 2,000 women who say they have been harmed by abortions they had. The group has strongly supported so-called abortion “trigger laws,” which would automatically ban abortion in a state—often with no exceptions—should the U.S. Supreme Court overturn its landmark Roe v. Wade ruling from 1973. In November 2006, however, TJF and its allies suffered a stinging defeat when South Dakota voters repealed such a draconian trigger law in their state. Shortly after winning election to the Texas Senate in the same month, Republican Dan Patrick of Houston announced that he would file a similar trigger bill in the 2007 Legislature.

TJF was formed as a spin-off of the far-right Texas Public Policy Foundation to litigate on behalf of what TJF considers “good government practices.” TJF has filed legal briefs in support of the right of people under restraining orders to bear arms, the right of students to impose their religious beliefs on others, and the religious right’s campaign for “parental rights.”

TJF has been active in the campaign for private school vouchers in Texas by arguing for parental rights and vouchers in front of the Texas Supreme Court, sponsoring a “Putting Children First” private school choice conference at the Capitol, and “evaluating” charter schools for the State Board of Education.

In 2000, TJF filed an amicus brief to the U.S. Supreme Court in Santa Fe ISD v. Doe, arguing in support of school prayer at Texas high school football games. The Justice Foundation also has represented both Norma McCorvey, formerly “Roe” of Roe v. Wade, and Sandra Cano, the “Doe” of Doe v. Bolton, in the effort to overturn the two landmark cases that protected a woman's right to choose whether or not to have an abortion.

Attorney Allan Parker leads TJF and is a former Bexar County Christian Coalition president. Parker and former directors of TJF have been familiar names in other pro-voucher organizations. Fritz Steiger, president of CEO America (now Children First America), was a TJF director. Thomas W. Lyles, who is on the board of directors for CEO America and TPPF and was involved with Texans for Governmental Integrity, a political action committee founded by Dr. Leininger, served as TJF’s secretary.

From the Web site: http://www.txjf.org

“The Justice Foundation (formerly the Texas Justice Foundation) was founded in 1993 to protect the fundamental freedoms and rights essential to the preservation of American society. The Foundation represents clients free of charge in cases in the areas of limited government, free markets, private property, parental school choice, parental rights in education, and enforcing laws to protect women’s health. The Justice Foundation is a nonprofit, public-interest litigation firm supported by tax-deductible contributions.”

Mission:
“The Justice Foundation seeks to mobilize citizens, through financial and service contributions to provide free legal representation in landmark cases to protect and restore justice.

We seek to protect, through litigation and education, those fundamental freedoms and rights essential to the preservation of American society.”

Leadership:
Allan E. Parker Jr., President
Linda Schlueter, Vice President of Legal Affairs
Clayton Trotter, General Counsel
Anne Newman, Director of Communications

Board Members (From IRS Form 990, 2004):
Fritz Steiger
Thomas W. Lyles Jr.
Allan E. Parker Jr.
Charles A. Staffel
James R. Leininger

Revenue 1998: $796,915.00
Revenue 2005: $1,072,764.00
Assets 2005: $189,147.00

Contact Information:
Texas Justice Foundation
8122 Datapoint, Suite 812
San Antonio, Texas 78229
Phone: (210) 614-7157
Fax: (210) 614-6656
E-mail: info@txjf.org
Liberty Legal Institute
A 501(c)(3) nonprofit

An arm of Free Market Foundation – itself the Texas outpost of politician-pastor James Dobson’s Focus on the Family – Liberty Legal is a litigation group that attempts to insert religion into the public sphere through lawsuits. The organization specializes in blowing local controversies into legal battles over religious freedom. In March 2006, for example, Liberty Legal helped a student Bible-study group sue the Plano Independent School District for the right to post an organizational description of the group on the district’s Web site. In April the group threatened to sue a Fort Worth-area school over whether a religious student group should have to pay a fee to host a rally – including a sound system and a Christian rock band – in a school gym.

In August of 2005, Liberty Legal provided work for the National Council on Bible Curriculum in Public Schools (NCBCPS). The NCBCPS had come under fire following a Texas Freedom Network Education Fund report detailing blatant sectarian bias, numerous errors and plagiarism in a Bible curriculum the National Council is aggressively marketing to public schools around the country.

From the Web site: http://www.libertylegal.org

“Liberty Legal Institute (LLI) is a 501(c)(3) organization that was founded in 1997 to protect religious freedoms and First Amendment rights for individuals, groups and churches. LLI offers its assistance pro bono to ensure all individuals and groups can thrive without the fear of governments restricting their freedoms.

Liberty Legal consists of staff attorneys and a network of over 120 dedicated litigators committed to successfully battling in the courts for:

- Religious freedoms
- Student’s rights
- Parental rights
- The definition of family

These litigators donate their professional expertise and time to fight for these sacred freedoms. Liberty Legal Institute is headquartered in Plano, Texas with affiliate offices located in Dallas, Houston, Austin, Midland, Lubbock and San Antonio.”

Mission:
“To achieve expanded religious freedom and family autonomy through litigation and education designed to limit the government’s power, increase the religious rights of citizens and promote parental rights.”

Leadership:
Kelly Shackelford, Chief Counsel
Hiram Sasser, Director of Litigation
Jonathan M. Saenz, Director of Legislative Affairs

1997 Expenses: $6,797.00
2005 Expenses: $418,661.00

Contact Information:
Liberty Legal Institute
903 E. 18th Street, Suite 230
Plano, TX 75074
Phone: (972) 423-3131
Fax: (972) 423-8899
E-mail: libertylegal@libertylegal.org
Life Dynamics
A 501(c)(3) nonprofit
EIN: 75-2436409

Founded in 1992, Life Dynamics opposes the right to abortion in all circumstances, including to save the life of the mother. The group has backed its extreme position with extreme tactics, including the distribution of literature with “jokes” suggesting that doctors who perform abortions should be shot. The group also distributed a video charging that clinics were engaged in an illegal underground trafficking of fetal tissue. When members of a Congressional committee pointed out discrepancies between the statements of a spokesman in the video and statements on an affidavit by the same individual, the spokesperson answered: “I would go by the affidavit, when I was under oath I told the truth. Anything I said on the video when I was not under oath, that is a different story.” (Roll Call, 3/13/2000)

From the Web site: http://www.ldi.org

Mission:
"The official Life Dynamics position is that no action should be legally permissible if its intent is to take the life of an innocent human being.

Therefore, in recognition of the biological reality that human life begins at the moment of fertilization, the unborn child is entitled to the protection of the law under all circumstances and at every stage of pregnancy. In those extraordinarily rare instances in which a pregnancy poses an immediate and life threatening risk to the mother, she should be allowed to direct her physician to perform any medical procedure that is necessary to save her life. In that effort, however, the physician must always do whatever is possible to save the life of both mother and baby. If as an unintended consequence of saving the mother’s life, her unborn child loses its life, that should be viewed as a profoundly regrettable but lawful outcome."

Motto:
"Pro-Life: without compromise, without exception, without apology."

Leadership:
Mark Crutcher, founder and president

Board Members:
Mark Crutcher
Tulane Crutcher
B.J. Posey
Louise Coleman
Cherie Johnson
Terrance Anderson
Arden Morley

Revenue 1998: $914,657.00
Revenue 2005: $660,821.00
Assets 2005: $1,015,950.00
(Fair Market value)

Contact Information:
Life Dynamics Incorporated
204 Cardinal Drive
Denton, TX 76209
Phone: (940) 380-8800
Fax: (940) 380-8700
Texas Alliance for Life
A 501(c)(4) nonprofit
EIN: 74-2505952

Texas Alliance for Life Trust Fund
A 501(c)(3) nonprofit
EIN: 74-2727699

Texas Alliance for Life was created in 1988 by Joseph Pojman as the Greater Austin Right to Life Committee. In 1999, the organization adopted another name: Texas Coalition of Parents’ Rights. Finally, in 2002, the organization became known as Texas Alliance for Life, but it can still operate under any of the assumed names. Texas Alliance for Life holds anti-abortion rallies around the state and opposes a woman’s right to choose whether or not to have an abortion; embryonic stem cell research; and the expansion of Planned Parenthood facilities. Although officially nonpartisan, the group has made its support for certain political candidates – especially Gov. Rick Perry – obvious. “The pro-life vote, generated with the help of Texas Alliance for Life, gave Perry a strong margin of victory,” the group wrote after the governor’s re-election in November 2006 (“TAL Update 12/4/06, http://texasallianceforlife.org/TAL%20Updates/TAL%20Update%202006_12_04.htm.)

From the Web site: http://texasallianceforlife.org

Mission:
“Texas Alliance for Life is a nonprofit organization made up of people. We are committed to protecting the fundamental right to life of all innocent human beings and to promoting respect for their value and dignity from the moment of conception until natural death. We therefore oppose the advocacy and practice of abortion (except to preserve the mother’s life), infanticide, euthanasia, and all forms of assisted suicide.”

Organization’s purpose, from records filed with the Texas Secretary of State’s Office:
A. To promote respect for the worth and dignity of all human life, including the unborn child, from the moment of fertilization through the moment of natural death.
B. To combat, curb, and eliminate abortion, infanticide, and euthanasia and any other medical practice that support the taking of innocent human life or involuntary experiments upon human beings.
C. To organize and conduct educational and public-relations programs directed at advising the public of the true nature of the aforementioned medical practices: which is that these are profane attacks upon the foundations of our society; that these are cruel violence illegally visited upon the victims of such practices; and that they are crimes against humanity.
D. To provide alternatives to abortion, infanticide, and euthanasia through care and comfort to needy pregnant women, elderly persons, and other potential victims of perverted medical science so as to curb the aforementioned medical practices.
E. To engage only in peaceful actions not prohibited by law for implementing the aforementioned purposes.

Leadership, Texas Alliance for Life Trust Fund:
Joseph Pojman, Executive Director
Patty Fennessey, Project Director
Amy Potenski, Data Entry
Jayme Bennett, Director of Volunteers
Mary Shearer, Director of Administration
Jill Davis, Special Assistant to Director
Christine DeLoma, Comm. Director
Jennifer Stratton, Comm. Director

Board Members:
Christopher Maska

Leadership, Texas Alliance for Life, Inc:
Joseph Pojman, Executive Director
Mary Shearer, Director of Administration
Kristin Jones, Director of Communications
Alexis Dobson, Director of Community Development
Christine DeLoma, Comm. Dir.
Jill Davis, Special Assistant
Patty Fennessey, Project Director
Jennifer Stratton, Comm. Dir.

Board Members:
Jean Cullen...
Scott Gilmore...
Chris Munson...
Robert O’Donnell...
Jack Selman...
Pastor David Smith...
Clara Urias... Brandon Frye...
Christopher Maska...
Beverly Nuckols, M.D....
Kayo O’Keefe...
Jim Shaw...
Davida Stike...

Texas Alliance for Life 501(c)(4)
Revenue 2005: $72,361
Assets 2005: ($5,876)

Texas Alliance for Life Trust Fund 501(c)(3)
Revenue 1999: $72,994.00
Revenue 2005: $124,542.00
Assets 2005: $14,841.00

Contact Information:
Texas Alliance for Life
2026 Guadalupe Street, Suite 220
Austin, TX 78705
Phone: (512) 477-1244
Fax: (512) 472-6246
E-mail: info@texasallianceforlife.org
The Texas Eagle Forum is a branch of the national Eagle Forum, which is headed by founder Phyllis Schlafly. Texas Eagle Forum has been active at the State Board of Education (SBOE) on textbook and curriculum issues. The group’s lobbyists have held positions on the SBOE writing team for English/Language Arts and the curricular review committee for Careers and Technology. In addition, the group’s director, Cathie Adams, can often be seen at SBOE hearings testifying on textbook content. Her testimony has opposed the inclusion of references to Cesar Chavez, pictures of Mexican-American cowboys in history textbooks, and recipes to illustrate measurement and fractions in mathematics textbooks.

The group has been a staunch opponent of any instruction on AIDS prevention or pregnancy prevention in Texas high schools other than through an abstinence-only-until-marriage curriculum. It also opposes immunizations requirements, school-based health centers and school nurses, and School-to-Work programs.

From the Web site: http://texaseagle.org

Mission:
“Texas Eagle Forum’s mission is to enable conservative and pro-family men and women to participate in the process of self-government and public policy-making so that America will continue to be a land of individual liberty, respect for family integrity, public and private virtue, and private enterprise.”

Leadership:
Cathie Adams, President
Marilyn Statler, Secretary
Texans for Life Coalition

A 501(c)(3) nonprofit
EIN: 75-1908415

Texans for Life (formerly Texans United for Life) is involved in religious-right politics throughout Texas. The organization has opposed comprehensive sex education in Texas health textbooks, embryonic stem cell research, reproductive choice and physician-assisted suicide. Though the organization supported Harriet Miers in her run for a Dallas City Council seat in 1989, it turned against her in 2005 when President Bush nominated her to as an associate justice on the U.S. Supreme Court.

From the Web site: http://www.texlife.org

Leadership:
Kyleen Wright, President
Betty Garcia, Assistant Director
Terri McLaughlin, Education Coordinator
Dot Hogue, Treasurer

Board Members:
Casey Burke
David Edmonson
Betty Garcia
Dr. Jack Hatcher
Dot Hogue
Dr. Patrick J. McCarty
Jeffrey Stewart
Kyleen Wright

Revenue 2001: $168,565.00
Revenue 2005: $141,171.00
Assets 2005: $16,754.00

Contact Information:
Texans for Life Coalition
P.O. Box 177727
Irving, TX 75017-7727
Phone: (972) 790-9044
E-mail: webservant@texlife.org
Texas Public Policy Foundation
A 501(c)(3) nonprofit
EIN: 74-2524057

While its work today is not based explicitly on conservative religious principles, the Texas Public Policy Foundation (TPPF) has played an increasingly influential role in shaping public policy in Texas from a far-right perspective. In fact, many Republican lawmakers attend TPPF’s “policy orientation” events, and TPPF leaders and staff members advise Gov. Rick Perry and other elected officials on public policy. The group has supported censorship of school textbooks in the past, opposes funding for the Children’s Health Insurance Program and promotes policies – such as private school vouchers and school “deregulation” – that threaten public education in the state.

San Antonio businessman Dr. James Leininger founded TPPF in 1989, using the Heritage Foundation as a model for a conservative “think tank.” The organization writes and disseminates supportive reports on issues long important to Dr. Leininger, especially private school vouchers and tort reform.

From the Web site: http://www.texaspolicy.com

“The Texas Public Policy Foundation is a 501(c)3 non-profit, non-partisan research institute guided by the core principles of individual liberty, personal responsibility, private property rights, free markets and limited government.

The Foundation’s mission is to improve Texas by generating academically sound research and data on state issues, and by recommending the findings to opinion leaders, policymakers, the media and general public.

Funded by hundreds of individuals, foundations and corporations, the Foundation does not accept government funds or contributions to influence the outcomes of its research.

The public is demanding a different direction for their government, and the Texas Public Policy Foundation is providing the ideas that enable policymakers to chart that new course.”

Leadership:
Brooke L. Rollins, president
Michael Quinn Sullivan, vice president
Byron Scholmack, chief economist
Mary Katherine Stout, Director of Center for Health Care Policy Studies
Nathan Thompson, Director of Operations
Marc Levin, Director of Center for Effective Justice
Jamie Story, Education Policy Analyst
Shari Hanrathan, Director of Development
Nancy Druart, Interim Director of Communications
Donna Peterson, Development Associate
Bill Peacock, Director of Center for Economic Freedom
Talmadge Helfin, Visiting Research Fellow
Arlene Wohlgemuth, Visiting Research Fellow

Board Members:
Phil Adams, Bryan
Tim Lyles, San Antonio
Ernest Angelo, Midland
William A. McMinn, chairman, Houston
Tim Dunn, vice chairman, Midland
Vance C. Miller, Dallas
Ramiro Galindo, Bryan
Wendy Gramm, Helotes
Brenda Pejovich, Dallas
George W. Strake Jr., Houston
Bill Jones, Austin
Brooke L. Rollins, Dallas
Dale Laine, Austin
Jeff Sandefer, Austin
James R. Leininger, MD, San Antonio
Fritz Steiger, Bentonville, Ark.
Michael Stevens, Houston

Revenue 1997: $810,456.00
Revenue 2004: $1,268,923.00
Assets 2004: $333,581.00

Contact Information
Texas Public Policy Foundation
900 Congress Ave. Ste. 400
Austin, TX 78701
Phone: (512) 472-2700
Fax: (512) 472-2728
E-mail: info@TexasPolicy.com

APPELLIX G { 51 }
The Texas Restoration Project, a network of conservative Christian pastors, is part of a growing web of similar organizations in various states. Most of those states are key electoral battlegrounds, including Ohio, Pennsylvania, Florida, Minnesota, Iowa and Colorado. Most of the networks have been established since 2004. Prominent supporters have included Rod Parsley – a fundamentalist evangelical pastor from Ohio – and David Barton, the former vice chair of the Texas Republican Party and the founder and head of WallBuilders, a Texas-based group that opposes separation of church and state.

The Texas group played a key role in helping pass Proposition 2, a state constitutional ban on same-sex marriage, in November 2005. The Texas Restoration Project has also been closely tied to Gov. Rick Perry. In fact, Gov. Perry was the only elected official to speak at all of six so-called “Pastors’ Policy Briefings” hosted by the Texas Restoration Project in 2005. (“Pastors’ Policy Briefings” have been typical organizing tools for Restoration Projects around the country. These statewide events host hundreds of pastors and their spouses, who attend at no charge for food and accommodations.) The Texas group also sponsored a get-out-the-vote conference call for conservative pastors in the state just days before the November 6, 2006, election. After the election, the group called on pastors to join together in Austin to celebrate Gov. Perry’s re-inauguration in January.

**Mission (From Texas Restoration Project literature):**

“The Texas Restoration Project was established to mobilize pastors and pews to restore Texas and America to our Judeo-Christian heritage. We strive to provide the resources necessary for Churches to educate their members on the moral issues facing our society and encourage them to participate in the democratic process.”

**Leadership:**

Rev. Dr. Laurence White, chairman
David Lane, executive director

**Board Members:**

Unknown

**Revenue:**

Unknown

**Assets:**

Unknown

**Contact Information:**

P.O. Box 200222
Austin, TX 78720-0222
Phone: (800) 491-9032
restoration@sanjacintogroup.com
Vision America
501 (c)(3)
EIN: 76-0572974

Founded in 1994, the Lufkin (Texas)-based group calls on pastors — so-called “patriot pastors” — to promote a conservative political agenda in their congregations. That agenda is virulently anti-gay and includes opposition to abortion rights, comprehensive sex education and embryonic stem cell research. One of the members of the group’s board of directors is the Rev. Dr. Laurence White, who serves as chairman of the Texas Restoration Project — another organization whose mission is to mobilize pastors into a conservative political force.

The president of Vision America is Rick Scarborough, a former Southern Baptist pastor who is a prominent leader in the far right’s campaign to undermine an independent judiciary. In fact, the group has called for the impeachment of “activist judges” whose rulings it opposes. Scarborough has been one of the loudest voices proclaiming that “activist judges” are engaged in a “war on Christians” and people of faith. In March 2006, Vision America hosted a national conference in Washington, D.C., called “The War on Christians and Values Voters.” The event featured a long list of heavy hitters on the far right, including U.S. Rep. Tom DeLay of Texas, U.S. Sen. John Cornyn of Texas, Phyllis Schlafly of Eagle Forum, and former Republican presidential candidate Alan Keyes.

From the Web site: http://www.visionamerica.us

Mission:
“Our mission is to inform, encourage and mobilize pastors and their congregations to be proactive in restoring Judeo-Christian values to the moral and civic framework in their communities, states, and our nation.”

Leadership:
Rick Scarborough, President
William Gattis, Vice-President

Board Members:
Randall Odom
Jeannie Gonzales
Roger Bridgewater
William Gattis
Mike Riddle
Dr. Laurence White, Co-Chairman

Revenue 1998: $131,826.00
Revenue 2004: $811,080.00
Assets 2004: $72,515.00

Contact Information:
Vision America
P.O. Box 10
Lufkin, Texas 75902
Phone: (866) 522-5582
E-mail: mail@visionamerica.us
WallBuilders

EIN: 75-1627779

Headquartered in the North Texas town of Aledo, WallBuilders is an “educational” organization with a distinct ideological perspective – that the United States is a Christian nation, founded on Christian principles and that its laws should be based on conservative Christian biblical teaching. The group has an increasingly partisan agenda as well. Its founder and president, David Barton, was vice chair of the Republican Party of Texas from 1998 to 2006. He remains a prominent speaker before Republican and other conservative groups around the country.

In 2004, Barton served as a political consultant for the Republican National Committee, traveling the country and speaking at about 300 RNC-sponsored lunches for local evangelical pastors. During these lunches, he presented a slide show of American monuments, discussed his view of America’s Christian heritage – and encouraged pastors to endorse political candidates from the pulpit.

Barton has published several books and produced several videotapes calling for the restoration of “America’s Christian values.” In these works Barton argues that the separation of church and state is a myth foisted on the country when the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that government-sponsored prayer in the public schools was unconstitutional. The United States, Barton insists, was founded by Christians and was intended to be a fundamentalist-style “Christian nation.” In fact, Barton argues that the Supreme Court’s ruling against state-sponsored prayer in schools is directly tied to the erosion of morals in this country and is just one example of “renegade federal judges who too often impose their own personal values on communities.”

To achieve the group’s desired influence on government, WallBuilders’ ProFamily Legislative Network monitors and collects information on so-called “pro-family” legislation from various states, including on such issues as marriage, abortion, education, gay and lesbian rights, public morality, gambling and parental rights. This information is then made available to other states where far-right lawmakers can introduce similar bills and spread far-right legislation across America.

Barton’s publications and videos are widely distributed through other religious-right organizations, such as Focus on the Family and Rev. Jerry Falwell’s Liberty University bookstore. WallBuilders’ has also marketed materials in public schools as a “Biblical History of the Middle East.” When parents in a Mississippi public school asserted that the course designed by Barton was a ruse for teaching fundamentalist Christianity, a federal court ruled that materials like Barton’s video “America’s Godly Heritage” were inappropriate for use in public schools. The U.S. district judge acknowledged that the films are an attempt to indoctrinate students in religious beliefs under the ruse of “Mid-East History.” Even so, the North Carolina-based National Council on Bible Curriculum in Public Schools recommends Barton’s materials for teachers who use the NCBCPS’s own curriculum.

From the Web site: http://www.wallbuilders.com

“WallBuilders is an organization dedicated to presenting America’s forgotten history and heroes, with an emphasis on the moral, religious, and constitutional foundation on which America was built – a foundation which, in recent years, has been seriously attacked and undermined. In accord with what was accurately stated by George Washington, we believe that “the propitious [favorable] smiles of heaven can never be expected on a nation which disregards the eternal rules of order and right which heaven itself has ordained.

WallBuilders’ goal is to exert a direct and positive influence in government, education, and the family by (1) educating the nation concerning the Godly foundation of our country; (2) providing information to federal, state, and local officials as they develop public policies which reflect Biblical values; and (3) encouraging Christians to be involved in the civic arena.”

Leadership:
David Barton, founder and president
Cheryl Barton, Secretary and Treasurer

Board Members:
Jeff Fisher
Richard Watson
Rose Barton
Stephen McDowell

Revenue 1997: $424,949.91
Revenue 2005: $1,263,591.00
Assets 2005: $1,294,745.00

Contact Information:
WallBuilders
P.O. Box 397
426 Circle Drive
Aledo, TX 76008-0397
Phone: (817) 441-6044
Email: info@wallbuilders.com
The Texas Freedom Network Education Fund supports research and education efforts that promote religious freedom and individual liberties.