

HOUSE BILL 476: ILLEGAL ATTACK ON FREE SPEECH
(Summary of Opposition Points)
November 29, 2016

TO: All House Members, Ohio General Assembly

House Bill 476 is a response to the Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) movement. It runs counter to the core values of the U.S. and Ohio constitutions. The bill punishes economic boycotts, which are entirely lawful acts of free speech. It interferes with US foreign policy and rampantly violates Ohioans' free speech rights.

BDS is a nonviolent campaign to pressure Israel to end its illegal occupation of Palestine and compel recognition of human rights for Palestinians. The BDS movement calls on people and organizations of conscience to oppose current Israeli policy by divesting all funds from Israel, or from any company that is complicit in the violation of Palestinian rights.

H.B. 476's "contracts" clause would require a loyalty oath from businesses of all sizes just to obtain mandatory unemployment insurance and workers' compensation coverage. It would impose a loyalty oath for court-appointed attorneys to be paid. It bases Medicare and Medicaid payments, food stamp acceptance, and Ohio Lottery vending on a business's promise not to question U.S. support of Israel. Every employer in Ohio, including hundreds of medical providers and retail grocery stores, would have to take an oath to Israel - a foreign nation - to secure these benefits.

By H.B. 476, the State of Ohio would punish business people who believe that the settlements in Palestine are illegal, a belief shared by much of the world, including numerous US administrations, pursuant to the Fourth Geneva Convention and international law principles.

H.B. 476 will create a blacklist of people and companies from doing business with the State, and might force some out of business. The Legislative Service Commission has warned that it may make purchases with taxpayer funds more expensive: "the state could pay more if the low bidder on a contract for the procurement of goods and services is eliminated from consideration as a result of the bill's prohibition."

The U.S. Constitution prohibits Congress and the states from denying freedom of speech or of the press. U.S. Const., Amendments I and XIV. The Ohio Constitution says that "Every citizen may freely speak, write, and publish his sentiments on all subjects, being responsible for the abuse of the right; and no law shall be passed to restrain or abridge the liberty of speech, or of the press." Ohio Const., Art. I, § 11. Also, it says that no "interference with the rights of conscience [shall] be permitted." Ohio Const., Art. I, § 7.

Boycotts aimed at bringing about political, social, or economic change, even if they might cause economic disruption, are protected expression under the First Amendment. *NAACP v. Claiborne Hardware Co.*, 458 U.S. 886 (1982).

The government may not condition a benefit on the requirement that a person give up a constitutional right, and the government may not deny a benefit to a person for exercising that right. *Rumsfeld v. Forum for Academic and Institutional Rights*, 574 U.S. 47, 59 (2006); *Board of Comm'rs, Wabauunsee Cty. v. Umbehr*, 518 U.S. 668 (1996). In other words, the government simply cannot take sides or choose whether the content of speech is admired or abhorred.

If passed, H.B. 476 will censor the political beliefs and motives, not just of BDS movement members, but of all Ohioans who are critical of Israel.

PUBLIC OPPONENTS' CRITIQUE OF HOUSE BILL 476

November 29, 2016 | Columbus, OH

TO: All Ohio Representatives and Senators, Ohio General Assembly

SUBJECT: Legal flaws permeate House Bill 476

H.B. 476 Background And Contents

House Bill 476 is a response to the Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) movement. While it is popular among Israel sympathizers, HB 476 runs counter to the core values of the U.S. and Ohio constitutions. In an attempt to suppress debate about the Palestinian crisis, the bill interferes with US foreign policy and rampantly violates Ohioans' speech-protective laws.

BDS is a nonviolent global grassroots campaign to advance fundamental human rights of Palestinians. The campaign aims to pressure the state of Israel to end its illegal occupation and to align with international law its policies toward, and treatment of, Palestinians. The BDS movement calls upon individuals and organizations of conscience, including businesses, unions, churches, universities, and academic associations, to express their opposition to current Israeli policy by divesting all funds from Israel, or from any company that is complicit in the violation of Palestinian rights. As a form of political and economic pressure, BDS calls for boycotts of Israeli goods and products.

The proponents of H.B. 476 equate the BDS movement with the Arab League boycott and an effort to isolate and "delegitimize" Israel.

H.B. 476 would prohibit a business from entering into or renewing a contract with the State of Ohio "for the acquisition or provision of supplies, equipment, or services, or for construction services." The broad use of "contracts" in the bill suggests that contracts for the provision of unemployment insurance, workers' compensation, court-appointed attorney fee payments, Medicare and Medicaid payments, food stamp acceptance, Ohio Lottery vending, etc. would be included. Hence every employer in Ohio, and hundreds of retail grocery businesses, would be required to declare opposition to, and refrain from, an economic boycott of Israel in order to have these state contracts.

H.B. 476 amounts to an oath to a foreign nation. Jeffrey Crowther, an attorney in Toledo and a veteran of the Vietnam war, who also served with the U.S. Department of State building legal systems in Iraq and Afghanistan, told the House Government Accountability and Oversight Committee: "This bill is un-American and demands that I shift my sole allegiance from the United States of America to that of a foreign power. This bill demands treason on my part to continue employment as a Public Defender with Lucas County, Ohio."

H.B. 476 contains many likely legal defects. It impinges on foreign policy or relations, a task reserved for the Federal government. The State of Ohio proposes to punish businesses which hold the view that the settlements in Palestine are illegal; yet the U.S. Government for some 40 years has held that the settlements are illegitimate. Further, H.B. 476 inhibits the economic decisions of businesses. Such governmental interference with business investment decisions as well as practical issues in enforcing such legislation raise numerous serious due process

concerns.

H.B. 476 will effectively create a blacklist of individuals and companies who would be barred from contracting with the State. And it may make purchases using taxpayer funds more expensive: the Legislative Service Commission admits in its fiscal analysis that “the state could pay more if the low bidder on a contract for the procurement of goods and services is eliminated from consideration as a result of the bill's prohibition.”

The central weakness of H.B. 476 is its apparent repression of settled First Amendment free speech and association rights, in clear illustration of the “unconstitutional conditions” doctrine.

Existing Legal Authority Suggests H.B. 476 Is Unlawful

Prevailing legal authority raises serious questions about the legality of H.B. 476 if it is passed into law. Existing law:

1) Prohibits Congress and, through the Fourteenth Amendment, any state from abridging freedom of speech or of the press. U.S. Const., Amendments I and XIV.

2) Provides that “Every citizen may freely speak, write, and publish his sentiments on all subjects, being responsible for the abuse of the right; and no law shall be passed to restrain or abridge the liberty of speech, or of the press.” Ohio Const., Art. I, § 11. Also, that no “interference with the rights of conscience [shall] be permitted.” Ohio Const., Art. I, § 7.

3) Holds that a nonviolent boycott to bring about political, social, or economic change, even though it may cause economic disruption, is protected expression under the First Amendment. *NAACP v. Claiborne Hardware Co.*, 458 U.S. 886 (1982).

4) Holds, under the unconstitutional conditions doctrine, that the government cannot condition a benefit on the requirement that a person forgo a constitutional right, and, as a necessary corollary, that the government may not deny a benefit to a person because he or she exercises a constitutional right. *Regan v. Taxation with Representation of Washington*, 461 U.S. 540, 545 (1983), citing *Perry v. Sindermann*, 408 U.S. 593, 597 (1958); *Speiser v. Randall*, 357 U.S. 513, 518-519 (1983); *Federal Communications Commission v. League of Women Voters*, 468 U.S. 364 (1984); *Legal Services Corporation v. Velazquez*, 531 U.S. 533 (2001); *Rumsfeld v. Forum for Academic and Institutional Rights*, 574 U.S. 47, 59 (2006); *O'Hare Truck Service Inc. v. City of Northlake*, 518 U.S. 712, 716-720, 116 S.Ct. 2353, 135 L.Ed.2d 874 (1996); *Sherbert v. Verner*, 374 U.S. 398, 403-406, 83 S.Ct. 1790, 10 L.Ed.2d 965 (1963); *Board of Comm'rs, Wabaunsee Cty. v. Umbehr*, 518 U.S. 668, 674-675, 685, 116 S.Ct. 2342, 135 L.Ed.2d 843 (1996).

A State Contract Is Not A Privilege

Proponents of the bill suggest that H.B. 476 does not violate the First Amendment because it would not prohibit anyone from engaging in a boycott; it would only provide that those who do so would forgo the privilege, not the right, to seek a government contract. This view is precluded by the “unconstitutional conditions” doctrine. The doctrine is especially relevant when the constitutional right is one of the “preferred rights” of the First Amendment. Since a government cannot prohibit speech directly, and the Supreme Court, in *Claiborne Hardware*, held a peaceful boycott to be protected speech, government cannot withhold a

government benefit to achieve that unconstitutional end indirectly.

H.B 476 Is A Bad Idea Which Is Legally Doomed

However sympathetic one may be to providing support for Israel, the constitutional rights to free speech and association cannot depend on whether the content of the speech is admired or abhorred. Nor can any governmental right to speak in aid of its interests outweigh the individual right of its people to disagree. Since the bill is motivated by opposition to the political beliefs and motives of the BDS movement and its critical stance on Israel, it is clearly a content-based, if not viewpoint-based, infringement on free speech rights. Just as the government may not exercise its sovereign power against its people in retaliation for their political speech, it cannot deprive them of valuable financial benefits to chill their speech on matters of public concern without a compelling governmental interest – and unquestionably not because it prefers another view.

To uphold the right to engage in a boycott is not necessarily to support its aims or objectives – just as to uphold freedom of speech is not to endorse the ideas expressed. But free speech and association rights outweigh any perceived benefit from this legislative proposal.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Linda Mansour-Ismail
Linda Mansour-Ismail, Esq.
Linda Mansour-Ismail Co.,LPA
2909 West Central Ave.
Toledo, Ohio 43606
419-535-7100
lindamansour@gmail.com

/s/ Terry J. Lodge
Terry J. Lodge, Esq.
316 N. Michigan St., Ste. 520
Toledo, OH 43604-5627
(419) 255-7552
tjlodge50@yahoo.com

Reem Subei
Reem Subei, Esq.
(419) 405-6061
reemsubei@gmail.com

Representing, Free Speech Coalition of Ohio and Northwest Ohio Free Speech Alliance

/s/ Benjamin G. Davis
Benjamin G. Davis, Esq.
Professor of Law
University of Toledo College of Law
(for identification purposes only)

/s/ Maria Lahood
Maria Lahood, Esq.
Center for Constitutional Rights

/s/ John Quigley
John Quigley, Esq.
Columbus, Ohio