



The Phyllis Schlafly Report

VOL. 50, NO. 9

P.O. BOX 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

APRIL 2017

100 Reasons to Celebrate the First 100 Days

There are at least 100 reasons to like what President Trump has achieved in his first 100 days. For someone so new to the “swamp” in D.C., Trump has accomplished far more than his counterparts down Pennsylvania Avenue on Capitol Hill.

For starters, Trump has issued 37 marvelous executive orders, memoranda, and other directives. His order requiring federal agencies to eliminate two regulations every time they issue a new one is a brilliant curtailment of the overbearing regulatory state. His memorandum requiring a 30-day review of military readiness is splendid. So is his memorandum instructing the Secretary of Defense to develop a plan to defeat ISIS.

Liberals have sued to block several of President Trump’s finest initiatives, such as his Executive Order limiting visas from Muslim-majority countries associated with terrorism. Judicial supremacy has prevented several of his Executive Orders from going into effect, but the vast majority of Trump’s actions have already benefited our Nation.

Trump rescinded the inane action by the Obama Administration to open up girls’ restrooms and locker rooms in public schools to any and every boy who decides that he wants to be girl. Trump also reinstated the “Mexico City policy” to stop spending federal taxpayer dollars on groups that advocate and refer for abortion in other countries.

Then there are President Trump’s 35 wonderful nominations and appointments within the Executive Branch. With Jeff Sessions as Attorney General, Trump’s Cabinet is probably the most conservative in American history.

There has also been the “Trump effect,” which is voluntary, beneficial behavior by others in recognition of the pro-American winds that Trump has sailed with into the White House. This includes at least a half-dozen major companies deciding to keep jobs in the United States despite plans to move them offshore, the drop by 40% in illegal immigration during the first month of the Trump presidency, and the bull market on Wall Street.

Next are the half-dozen meetings Trump has held with leaders of other countries, such as his sit-down with Angela Merkel, Prime Minister of Germany, during which Trump bluntly told her that Germany needs to start paying its fair share of defense costs. In addition was the performance by Treasury Secretary Steve Mnuchin at the G20 Summit, where he held firm that we do not endorse the phony “free trade” deals any longer.

Then there are the roughly dozen rallies and visits by Trump outside the Beltway of D.C. since he became president. This included the unexpected recitation of the Lord’s Prayer to a massive crowd in Florida by the First Lady, Melania Trump.

Finally, for the 100th reason to like Trump’s first 100 days, Trump’s use of Twitter as a president to go over the heads of the media and directly to the American people has taken power away from the media, much as Reagan successfully did a generation ago with television. Trump’s decision to hold a rally in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, rather than attend the White House Correspondents’ Dinner, is icing on the cake.

Polling shows that 72% of likely voters favor Trump’s “Buy American, Hire American” approach. Moreover, according to the *Washington Post*, if the recent presidential election were held today, Trump would defeat Hillary Clinton by 43-40% in the popular vote.

Now let’s take a peak at what these first 100 days would look like if Donald Trump had not embarked on his unprecedented campaign for president, which means we would be stuck with Hillary. Imitating the movie classic *It’s a Wonderful Life* starring Jimmy Stewart, we look at what life would be like without Trump as president.

Hillary Clinton would have encouraged more places to become “sanctuary cities” to welcome illegal aliens and frustrate federal efforts to deport those who commit crimes. She would have ended any hope for building a border wall to stem the flow of illegal aliens into our

country. Hillary would have spent more taxpayer dollars on abortion, especially in other countries, and she would have extended Obamacare instead of replacing it.

Hillary would have eroded our American sovereignty and weakened the strength of our Armed Forces. She would have embraced more of the phony “free trade” deals that have cost Americans millions of jobs, while pandering to globalist elite in the D.C. The media would be fawning over her, regardless of what she said and did, while our Nation would be spiraling in decline.

Jimmy Stewart’s favorite movie role was that of George Bailey in *It’s a Wonderful Life*, when the depressed man was given a glimpse of how terrible life would have been for others without him. Likewise, our Nation would be in a dreadful state without President Donald Trump and his first 100 days.

Trump Battles the ‘Shadow Government’

The president of the United States is often called the most powerful man in the world, but the forces arrayed against Donald Trump are unprecedented. To the 63 million Americans who voted for him, the campaign to undermine President Trump is downright frightening.

The first sign of trouble came when the President’s national security adviser, Mike Flynn, was forced to resign. A telephone call between General Flynn and the Russian ambassador was wiretapped by one of our intelligence agencies, and its contents were leaked to the press. We still don’t know if the Flynn wiretap was properly authorized by a court order, and Judicial Watch is suing to find out. But we do know that whoever leaked its secret contents to the press is guilty of a felony.

With blood in the water, the so-called deep state went to work to against Trump’s other appointees, such as Attorney General Jeff Sessions. As Rush Limbaugh commented, “They’re trying to isolate Trump from the people he trusts . . . from the best people around him.”

The term “deep state” was coined to mean the permanent governing class, the people who really exercise power regardless of who is elected. Also known as the shadow government, the deep state includes our intelligence collecting agencies such as the CIA, the NSA, and the FBI.

On his way out the door in January, Barack Obama made a drastic change in the way these intelligence agencies operate. As reported by the *New York Times* on March 2, Obama wanted to make sure that raw intelligence was widely shared across many government agencies, where it could then be easily leaked to the press.

With Obama’s support, according to the *Times*, “there was a push to process as much raw intelligence as possible, and to keep the reports at a relatively low level of classification, to ensure as wide a readership as

possible across the government.” This had the effect of leaving a “trail of bread crumbs,” a term borrowed from the children’s story of Hansel and Gretel, which “could be easily unearthed by investigators.”

The “bread crumbs” of unverified information were then leaked to the mainstream media, a vast industry devoted to generating “fake news” against President Trump and his supporters. As Steve Bannon said to the White House press corps, the media have become “the opposition party” to this president.

Barack Obama did not leave Washington for private life, as all of his recent predecessors have done. He remains on the scene to help lead the insurgency against Trump.

Barack and Michelle Obama moved into a \$5 million mansion at 2446 Belmont Road, N.W., two miles from the White House. The house, which has 9 bedrooms and 9 bathrooms, is owned by Joe Lockhart, who was White House press secretary when Bill Clinton was impeached by the House in 1998.

Before moving in, contractors built a beautiful brick wall between the house and the street. The wall will protect the Obamas from anyone illegally entering their new home as they work to stop President Trump from building a “big, beautiful wall” on our southern border.

The Obamas’ new neighbors include Tony Podesta, brother of Hillary Clinton’s campaign chairman John Podesta, who lives two doors away at 2438 Belmont Road, N.W. The Islamic Center of Washington, one of the largest mosques in the Western hemisphere, is a block and a half away.

Then came the news that Valerie Jarrett has also moved in with the Obamas. She stayed at the White House for much of the last eight years, and President Obama reportedly didn’t make a major decision without her input.

As the centerpiece of his post-presidential life of leading the resistance to Trump, Obama has restarted Organizing for Action, which was formed out of his 2012 reelection campaign. With its stated mission of “mobilizing and training the next generation of progressive organizers,” OFA claims 32,525 volunteers operating from more than 250 offices nationwide. “OFA is dedicated to empowering progressive talent at every level. From first-time student organizers to organizing professionals and community leaders, we’re here to equip folks with the skills and tools that can help them turn their passion into action.”

We’ve seen what happens when leftwing community agitators “turn their passion into action.” On college campuses from Berkeley, California to Middlebury, Vermont, conservative scholars have been assaulted and property has been damaged by mask-wearing anarchists.

Working with Indivisible, another radical resistance group whose co-founder Angel Padilla is funded by George Soros, OFA’s volunteers helped disrupt town hall meetings held by Republican members of Congress this year. According to a training manual uncovered by journalist

Paul Sperry, OFA advised young progressives “do not all sit together” but spread out in pairs in order to “reinforce the impression of broad consensus” of constituents opposed to Republican ideas.

Judges Join the ‘Resistance’

“Resist!” has become the rallying cry for those who failed to defeat Trump at the ballot box last year. The well-funded Center for American Progress, which employs people connected with Hillary Clinton’s failed presidential campaign, said it hoped to be “the central hub of the Trump resistance.”

Resistance to Trump began on November 9, the day after the election, when the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) threatened to “see him in court” where it promised to unleash its “full firepower” to stop Trump. Resistance is the theme of the anarchists who sparked violent protests against Trump, including smashed windows and fires, from Berkeley, California to Washington, D.C.

Inspired by Judge James Robart of Seattle, whose political decision against Trump was upheld by three judges of the Ninth Circuit on February 9, Judge Leonie Brinkema of Alexandria, Virginia became the next federal judge to join the “resistance” to Donald Trump. Like Judge Robart before her, Judge Brinkema did not bother to cite any relevant law to support her opinion against Trump’s executive order being carried out. Instead, her opinion complained that campaign speeches by Trump and one of his surrogates, Rudolph Giuliani, revealed the President’s “religious prejudice” against Muslims.

Both judges falsely claimed there’s no “evidence” that suspending travel from 7 Muslim countries would protect Americans from terrorism, and Judge Robart even said that no visitor or refugee from any of the 7 countries had ever been arrested for terrorism. In fact, 72 individuals from those 7 countries have been convicted of terror-related crimes since September 11, 2001.

The list of 72 individuals, including at least one from each of the 7 countries on Trump’s list, was compiled last year by a Senate subcommittee led by former Senator Jeff Sessions, who is now our Attorney General. At least 17 of the convicted arrived in the United States as refugees, and at least 25 of them eventually became U.S. citizens.

In October of last year, an Iraqi refugee who came here in 2009 was convicted of trying to help ISIS by setting off bombs at two shopping malls in Houston. “I want to travel to be with those who are against America,” the Iraqi refugee wrote. “I am against America.”

The opinions of the two federal judges, Robart and Brinkema, constituted overreaching beyond the legitimate constitutional boundaries of the federal judiciary. That’s why the “disheartening” remark reportedly made by

Trump’s nominee to fill Justice Scalia’s seat on the Supreme Court, Circuit Judge Neil Gorsuch, was a cause for concern among conservatives.

Justice Scalia would never have whined that criticism of judges was “disheartening” or “demoralizing,” another wimpy word from Judge Gorsuch. Scalia himself often used scathing language about other judges, such as the time he wrote that “I would hide my head in a bag” rather than join an opinion of his colleague, Justice Anthony Kennedy.

President Trump has at least one appointee vocal on this topic, White House policy adviser Stephen Miller, who did a round of Sunday interviews on February 12. Miller astutely observed that Judge Robart’s decision was a “judicial usurpation of power” because “it is a violation of judges’ proper role in litigating disputes.” Defending Trump’s Twitter attack on “the opinion of this so-called judge,” Miller said: “We don’t have judicial supremacy in this country. Of course one branch can criticize another branch of government.”

Twenty years ago, Phyllis Schlafly wrote against the growing problem of judicial supremacy in *The Phyllis Schlafly Report*. “The most important duty of the 105th Congress is to protect America from judicial usurpation and restore our constitutional balance of powers among the three branches of our government,” she wrote then in words that are just as timely for the 115th Congress today. “The Senate and House Judiciary Committees should hold extensive hearings on various proposals to stop the usurpation of power by the federal courts.”

Fourth Circuit ‘Lawyers Up’ Against Trump

“Lawyer up” is a term that refers to hiring a bunch of lawyers to address an emerging dispute. An example was when President Bill Clinton “lawyered up” to deal with the Monica Lewinsky scandal.

The entire U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit has “lawyered up” in order to take on Donald Trump’s second travel ban, Executive Order 13,780, on its appeal from a federal district court in Maryland. The Fourth Circuit convened an *en banc* (full sitting) of its lawyers-turned-judges to consider this standoff between the courts and the President of the United States.

It is nearly unheard of for a court to convene *en banc* to consider an initial federal appeal. More than 99% of federal appeals are heard by a three-judge panel chosen at random from among the judges who sit on that particular federal appellate court. But there are several reasons why the Fourth Circuit broke from tradition and insists on all its active judges hearing this case from the get-go. The current composition of this appellate court reveals why.

From its headquarters in Richmond, the Fourth Circuit presides over Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia and North and South Carolina. Historically the Fourth was one of the most conservative circuit courts, featuring judges

handpicked by Senators Jesse Helms (R-NC) and Strom Thurmond (R-SC). But today the Fourth is one of the most liberal of the 13 federal circuit courts, stacked with 10 Democrats against only 5 Republicans on active service, and no vacancies. President Obama placed 6 judges on the Fourth Circuit, all in his first term alone.

By going *en banc* at the outset, this Democrat-dominated court ensured that Trump would not draw a Republican majority on a three-judge panel, which was possible under the ordinary process. Instead, Trump would be second-guessed by a group of judges more liberal than the voters of California, where Trump lost by 62-32%. Another likely reason why the Fourth Circuit took this extraordinary step was to muscle up for its stand-off with the commander in chief. It's easier to rule against the Chief Executive with the support of ten judges (more than the entire U.S. Supreme Court) than with only two or three.

At issue is a mere 90-day pause in travel to the United States by citizens of Iran, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, and Yemen. One wonders why foreigners even have a right to challenge an order of the President of the United States restricting their entry into our country.

Other plaintiffs included immigrants already living here, who want to bring in their relatives from the six designated countries. Those plaintiffs claim they will be injured if their relatives cannot visit them here. But why don't they visit their relatives over there instead?

Or, better yet, why don't they seek a waiver as allowed by Trump's Second Executive Order? Finding that "the waiver process imposes an additional hurdle that would delay reunification" of these families, the court allowed the relatives here to sue on behalf of their kin there. The court also found that Muslims already here could sue because of the "fear, anxiety, and insecurity" they suffered on account of Trump's allegedly anti-Muslim views.

Like the other federal judges who ruled against Trump, Judge Theodore Chuang said that statements made by candidate Trump, before he became president, revealed an anti-Muslim "animus" that rendered his Executive Order invalid. The district court issued its injunction nationwide, even though it sits only in Maryland.

As Phyllis Schlafly observed a decade ago in *The Supremacists*, "Textbooks still say that we have three balanced branches of government — but textbooks are badly behind the times because one branch has assumed authority over the other two."



Trump Acknowledges Phyllis Schlafly's Support

On January 19, 2017, the night before he was sworn in as our 45th president, Donald Trump spoke for 17 minutes to his campaign donors and supporters at a formal banquet in the main hall of Washington's Union Station. The president-elect wore a tuxedo and his wife Melania was stunning in a glittering gold evening gown.

At 9:07 p.m. ET, midway through his remarks, Mr. Trump said:

"Phyllis Schlafly — the great Phyllis Schlafly; you know who that is (applause). She was a great woman. Passed away six months ago. I went to her funeral in St. Louis.

"And she came out against all of her fellow conservatives. And she said, 'I am not endorsing anybody else but Donald Trump. I don't care what exactly he is, he's like an unknown quantity, but he's going to win.'

"And I want to thank Phyllis, because she went through hell, I'm telling you (applause). Phyllis went through hell in that last third of a year. And she turned out to be right."

The Phyllis Schlafly Report

PO Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002 • ISSN0556-0152

Published monthly by the Eagle Trust Fund, PO Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002. Periodicals Postage Paid at Alton, Illinois.

Postmaster: Address Corrections should be sent to the Phyllis Schlafly Report, PO Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002. Phone: (618) 462-5415.

Subscription Price: \$20 per year. Extra copies available: 50¢ each; 10 copies \$4; 30 copies \$8; 100 copies \$15; 1,000 copies \$100.

www.phyllisschlafly.com

www.pseagles.com