A veteran businessman who successfully founded and grew multiple businesses in a variety of industries once observed, “No one wants to fail, but the toughest challenges emerge when you achieve your goal, not when you fall short.”

This counterintuitive idea—that success may be more difficult to handle than failure—is not the sort of thing we often hear. Yet, business history is littered with examples. In 1984, IBM posted a $6.58 billion profit, which at that time was the greatest after-tax profit any company in the world had ever recorded. But just eight years later, IBM reported a massive $5 billion loss, the most significant corporate loss ever recorded to that time, as observed by John Steele Gordon.

Or consider the rise and fall of Polaroid, a company that so dominated its market that everybody used to call instant photos “Polaroids.” The name was literally a household word. It
seemed everyone was snapping and shaking their Polaroid cameras—right up until the digital revolution passed the company by and Polaroid filed for bankruptcy protection in 2001, just like one of its instant photographs from decades gone by.

Or consider Yahoo! In 2005, it led the online advertising market. But after relying too heavily on its marketplace prominence and backing out of potential deals to purchase Google and Facebook, Yahoo! now finds itself in danger of completely disappearing.

In these three cases, and countless others, successful businesses achieved dramatic success and then failed—sometimes spectacularly, sometimes with barely a whimper. They achieved record profits and prominence, but as new challenges arose, they couldn’t, to use the unofficial U.S. Marine Corps slogan, “improvise, adapt, overcome.”

Political Success—or Failure?
It’s not so different in the political, policymaking arena. A few years back, a friend of mine was the majority leader of his state legislative chamber, with the duty—and great power—of selecting which bills to place on the legislative calendar for floor debate, vote, and passage. All others would suffer a swift demise.

During a legislative scheduling session, the majority leader identified an insurance bill that had been supported by key business interests, passed the appropriate committee, and appeared to be a solid, conservative bill for his Republican majority to consider. The majority leader invited an industry lobbyist to the capitol to discuss the impending victory.

After proudly announcing that the bill would move forward and almost certainly pass, he was stunned by the lobbyist’s response: “Do not bring the bill up for debate!”

The majority leader was utterly confused. Had the industry changed its opinion on the topic? No. Had new political opposition arisen? Nope. Had the state’s governor decided to oppose the bill? No.

What was the problem, then? The lobbyist was very clear: He asked if this bill were to pass in the current legislative session, what would he do next year? If he were to accomplish his lobbying goal, he might not be hired again. Success would mean there would be no further need for his services.

In politics, as in business, success can be perilous.

Heartland’s Successes
The Heartland Institute has achieved significant, measurable policy successes in recent years. One need look no further than Heartland’s two recent White House visits, which occurred almost exactly one year apart.

On June 1, 2017, Heartland’s Joe Bast joined President Donald Trump in the Rose Garden for the official announcement of the United States’ withdrawal from the horrendous Paris Climate Accord. “President Trump made exactly the right call by deciding to withdraw the United States from the Paris Climate Treaty,” Joe said at the time. “Staying in would make it impossible to implement his America First Energy Plan and result in U.S. taxpayers and consumers paying hundreds of billions of dollars in higher taxes and higher energy costs.”

The successes continued. In January 2018, Heartland’s government relations team planted boots on the ground in Wisconsin on numerous occasions, testifying and counseling lawmakers on the ins and outs of welfare reform. The result of Heartland’s hard work came on April 11, when Gov. Scott Walker signed a package of laws that brought conservative, commonsense, work-focused welfare reform to Wisconsin. We are now working to export these historic innovations to the other
In late June, U.S. District Court Judge William Allsup threw out a lawsuit brought by left-wing city officials in Oakland and San Francisco, who were attempting to hold five of the world’s largest oil companies financially liable for rising sea levels and other alleged damages from manmade global warming. In many cases, the supposed damages had not yet occurred—and probably never will.

Heartland Institute policy advisors joined an important *amicus curiae* brief answering the judge’s call for a “climate tutorial”; Heartland submitted a *Policy Brief*, “The Social Benefits of Fossil Fuels,” to answer Allsup’s questions about the benefits of fossil fuels; and Heartland experts published key op-eds—all of which helped to win the “Climate Trial of the Century.”

Ah, Winning. It Never Gets Old

But wait, there’s more: Remember when I said there were *two* visits to the White House? Almost a year to the day after Joe’s visit, I was invited to the White House to watch Trump sign into law the Right to Try bill. Right to Try is groundbreaking legislation promoted by The Heartland Institute that will help terminally ill patients and their families gain greater access to potentially lifesaving medications that have passed the Food and Drug Administration’s safety protocols and await full approval, providing hope to tens of thousands of families.

Beyond the Zenith

As we roll through the summer of 2018, I am happy to report The Heartland Institute has reached the zenith of its success—so far.

There are many battles yet to be waged and wars to be won in the weeks, months, and years ahead.

Some might suggest that now is the time to rest, to take the foot off the pedal for a bit and enjoy the fruits of our labor. I’m guessing the executives at IBM, Polaroid, and Yahoo! might have thought the same thing, and look how that worked out!

Heartland’s attitude is markedly different from the attitudes of those businesses—and many other think tanks, too. It is perhaps best summed up by Heartland friend and retired U.S. Air Force Col. John A. Warden III, a Vietnam War combat pilot and the architect of the air campaign strategy in Operation Desert Storm. In his book written with business consultant Leland A. Russell, *Winning in Fast Time*, Warden lays out what many politicians, lobbyists, and businesses just don’t get about success: “When in doubt, attack. When you take the offensive, you have the opportunity to achieve exactly what you want because you set the agenda and the timetable.”

I promise you, we at Heartland will continue to press the attack in the war for America’s future, not rest on our laurels. We will work diligently to set the agenda and take the fight to those who oppose our personal liberties, not wait for their attacks. We will remain on the offensive, always looking for new successes, not simply defending our past victories. That’s how all vital wars are won, and nothing is more important than this war for freedom.

Tim Huelskamp, Ph.D. (*thuelskamp@heartland.org*) is president and CEO of The Heartland Institute.
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What’s in a Name …

You will probably have noticed the new name on the front page of our quarterly newsletter. The publication is now called *The Heartlander*—which was its moniker until a few years ago, when we changed it to avoid confusion with a Heartland website we have since renamed. (The terms, they are a-changin’.)

Now, when our newsletter arrives in your mail, you’ll know right away it’s from your friends and champions of the liberty movement in the nation’s heartland.

We’ve made some other changes, too, to help you better understand the work we do.

We’re providing published op-eds and other articles by Heartland staff demonstrating Heartland’s work and its effects. Going forward, we expect to provide updates on specific issues Heartland is working on, plus stories from Americans across the country showing how policies Heartland has worked for actually change people’s lives for the better. For example, we might tell the story of a charter school that is successfully rescuing low-income children from poor-performing government schools, how an individual rose out of poverty thanks to welfare work requirements, or occupational licensing liberalization policies that Heartland has fought for. These articles will demonstrate just how important Heartland’s work is and what your support for us makes possible.

We will still present our quarterly output numbers, in easy-to-read sidebar boxes throughout the publication, so that you can see how we’re deploying the resources you generously provide. And, of course, we’ll continue to feature a letter from Heartland President Tim Huelskamp.

We hope that you will enjoy and benefit from these changes. Please let us know what you think, either by U.S. mail (at the address on the back cover of this document) or by email to Heartland Development Director Gwendalyn Carver, at gearver@heartland.org.

—S.T. Karnick
During the Second Quarter of 2018, The Heartland Institute ...

- Published one booklet: *The Patriot’s Guide to Freedom and Firearms*, by Joseph L. Bast and Publius, printed 12,100 copies, and distributed 10,956.

- Published six print and digital monthly issues of *Budget & Tax News*, *Environment & Climate News*, and *Health Care News*.

- Produced 67 Research & Commentaries addressing issues in 25 states.

- Testified or submitted comments 11 times in six different states, bringing the year’s total up to 32 times in 17 states.

- Contacted elected officials 196,063 times, including 5,708 one-on-one contacts by phone, email, or in person.

- Generated at least 31 broadcast, 2,306 online, and 290 print media hits reaching more than 35.7 million subscribers.

- Added 195 blog posts to *Freedom Pub* and released 61 podcasts attracting a total listening audience of 791,929 people.

- Added 27 videos to our YouTube channel. Videos on the channel attracted a total of 12,630 viewers.

- Attracted 2,064,250 impressions on our Facebook page.

- Achieved 393,700 impressions for our tweets, an average of 4,366 impressions per day.

- Published and distributed five Policy Briefs on the social benefits of fossil fuels, child safety accounts, climate science, how to cure Pennsylvania’s health care crisis, and what the United States can learn from Japan’s pharmaceutical policies.

- Released 34 issues of four weekly e-newsletters: *Climate Change Weekly*, *School Choice Weekly*, *Heartland Weekly*, and *The Leaflet*.

- Spoke at 19 events, which had a total attendance of 1,424 people.
By Joseph L. Bast and Peter Ferrara
In June, U.S. District Judge William Alsup, presiding in the case of The People of the State of California v. BP PLC et al., asked legal counsels of both parties for help weighing “the large benefits that have flowed from the use of fossil fuels” against the possibility that they may be causing global warming.

Today, we sent the judge and posted online a 24-page document we hope will fill the judge’s need. The benefits he alluded to are huge indeed, though rarely reported by the media or admitted by environmental activists seeking to regulate and tax fossil fuels out of existence.

First, fossil fuels are lifting billions of people out of poverty, reducing all the negative effects of poverty on human health. In the words of distinguished historian Vaclav Smil, “The most fundamental attribute of modern society is simply this: Ours is a high energy civilization based largely on combustion of fossil fuels.”

Fossil fuels, chiefly coal, provided the energy that produced nearly all the revolutionary technologies of the Industrial Revolution, as well as today’s high-tech manufacturing and mobile computer devices. “Without cheap supplies of electricity produced from coal, the ongoing revolution in information technology, as well as the age of biotech and nanotech, simply wouldn’t be possible,” wrote energy journalist and author Robert Bryce.

Virtually all economists agree there is a negative relationship between energy price increases and economic activity. The best available research suggests a 10 percent increase in the price of electricity in the United States results in a loss of approximately 1.3 percent of gross domestic product, about $233 billion in 2015 dollars.

Second, fossil fuels are vastly improving human well-being and safety by powering labor-saving and life-protecting technologies, such as air conditioning, modern medicine, and cars and trucks. While it is popular...
“The most fundamental attribute of modern society is simply this: Ours is a high energy civilization based largely on combustion of fossil fuels.”

VACLAV SMIL
HISTORIAN

To claim prosperity fuels resource depletion and environmental destruction, data show the opposite is true.

As Ronald Bailey wrote in his book The End of Doom, “It is in rich democratic capitalist countries that the air and water are becoming cleaner, forests are expanding, food is abundant, education is universal, and women’s rights respected. Whatever slows down economic growth also slows down environmental improvement. By vastly increasing knowledge and pursuing technological progress, past generations met their needs and vastly increased the ability of our generation to meet our needs.”

Electricity from existing fossil-fuel generation is considerably less expensive than electricity from new alternative energies. According to energy economists Thomas Stacey and George Taylor, electricity from new wind capacity costs nearly three times as much as existing coal generation and 2.3 times as much as combined-cycle gas.

Third, fossil fuels are dramatically increasing the quantity of food humans produce and improve the reliability of the food supply. Fossil fuels revolutionized agriculture throughout the world, making it possible for an ever-smaller part of the population to raise food sufficient to feed a growing global population without devastating nature or polluting air or water.
One of the greatest achievements in human history is the discovery of a way to make ammonia from natural gas, thereby enabling farmers to add it to their soil and dramatically increase crop yields. In 2014, American farmers applied 19 million tons of man-made ammonia-based fertilizer to their fields, creating huge increases in yields without needing to convert wildlife habitat into new cropland.

Fourth, fossil-fuel emissions are contributing to a “Greening of the Earth,” benefiting all the plants and wildlife on the planet. The carbon dioxide (CO2) released when fossil fuels are burned is the basic “food” of essentially all terrestrial plants. Long-term studies demonstrate numerous growth-enhancing, water-conserving, and stress-alleviating effects of elevated atmospheric CO2 on plants.

A 2016 article in *Nature Climate Change*, titled “Greening of the Earth and its drivers,” reported increased vegetative growth from 1982 to 2009 in more than 25–50 percent of the global vegetated area, whereas less than 4 percent of the globe showed browning. A 2017 study in *Nature* found the global mass of land plants grew by 31 percent during the twentieth century. Deserts in Africa are blooming thanks to our use of fossil fuels.

Finally, if fossil fuels are responsible for a significant part of the global warming recorded during the second half of the twentieth century, something disputed by many scientists, then they should also be credited with saving lives by reducing deaths due to cold weather.

The medical literature shows warmer temperatures and a smaller difference between daily high and low temperatures, as occurred during the late-twentieth and early-twenty-first centuries, reduce mortality rates as well as illness and mortality due to cardiovascular and respiratory disease and stroke occurrence.

Medical researchers William Richard Keatinge and Gavin Donaldson state “since heat-related deaths are generally much fewer than cold-related deaths, the overall effect of global warming on health can be expected to be a beneficial one.” They report the predicted rise in temperature in Britain over the next 50 years would reduce cold-related deaths by 10 times the number of increased heat-related deaths.

Similarly, the research clearly show climate has exerted only a minimal influence on recent trends in vector-borne diseases such as malaria, dengue fever, and tick-borne diseases.

In short, fossil fuels have produced huge benefits for humankind, not just in the past but to this very day. Yet somehow these benefits never appear in the “social cost of carbon” calculations produced by advocates of alternative fuels like wind and solar.

Thankfully, President Donald Trump and Republicans in Congress seem to understand the huge benefits of fossil fuels should be weighed against future costs that are likely to be small, if they exist at all. Their decision to end the “war on fossil fuels” conducted by Barack Obama and Democrats in Congress is good for everyone, and indeed all living things on Earth.

"In 2014, American farmers applied 19 million tons of man-made ammonia-based fertilizer to their fields, creating huge increases in yields without needing to convert wildlife habitat into new cropland."

*A revised version of this article was published on June 17 by The Wall Street Journal.*
JOIN THE FIGHT FOR ENERGY FREEDOM

Radical environmental groups, greedy investor-owned utilities, and liberal billionaires are working together to shut down perfectly good coal-powered electricity generation across America. This “premature retirement” of the nation’s coal fleet is causing electricity prices to rise and will lead to rolling blackouts in many parts of the country. It must be stopped before America’s best-in-the-world energy system is permanently crippled.

Trump Is Ending the War on Coal

While running for president in 2008, then-candidate Barack Obama told the editorial board of the San Francisco Chronicle that under his cap-and-trade proposal, anyone who wanted to build a coal-fired power plant could do so, but it would bankrupt them. Obama said “electricity rates would necessarily skyrocket” under his plan.

As part of his America First Energy Plan, President Donald Trump has vowed to end the war on coal and work instead to protect and expand energy freedom. His administration has taken important steps in that direction, including revoking or reconsidering unnecessary environmental regulations, withdrawing from the Paris Climate Accord, and retracting the deeply flawed “social cost of carbon” estimates used to justify regulations.

Importantly, the Trump administration also dissolved the inter-agency group that has produced the highly biased and alarmist National Climate Assessments and is placing independent scholars on the Environmental Protection Agency’s scientific review boards, replacing some members who have financial conflicts of interest.

Read more at Heartland.org/Center-Energy/Coal

We Need Your Help

You can help end the war on coal and other fossil fuels by getting informed, educating your friends, writing or calling your elected officials, or by donating.

Make a special tax-deductible contribution to The Heartland Institute so we can continue our educational efforts on this important issue. Donate today at ....

Heartland.org/Donate
By Jesse Hathaway

This year, Major League Baseball’s (MLB) opening day is the earliest it’s been in the modern history of the game. On March 29, 29 MLB teams kicked off their 2018 season, and calls of balls, strikes, and home runs will be heard throughout the nation through the end of September. Fans will cheer and boo as their teams’ fortunes rise and fall over the next few months, but there’s one call that should echo in every hallway of our nation’s statehouses: a call to end taxpayer-funded corporate welfare for sports teams.

Elected officials often justify using taxpayer money to pay for the construction or renovation of sports stadiums by arguing it helps to create local economic growth. In reality, corporate welfare is a losing proposition for the very people elected officials claim to be helping: the taxpayers.

In one study on the effect of sports stadium subsidies, University of Maryland at Baltimore County economics professors Dennis Coates and Brad Humphreys found the construction or renovation of sports stadiums can have a negative impact on local wage growth.

“Interestingly, Humphreys and I found that the overall sports environment—which […] includes the presence of franchises in

"Instead of greasing the palms of lawmakers seeking a handout, sports teams should be emulating the taxpayer-friendly model used by a National Football League team with an extensive history of success: the Green Bay Packers."

By Jesse Hathaway
Research Fellow
Managing Editor
Budget & Tax News

Originally Published at Washington Examiner

Fan Ownership, Not Stadium Welfare, Would Be Best for Sports Fans and Taxpayers
multiple sports, the arrival or departure of teams, and stadium construction—in a given area reduced per capita personal income by about $10,” Coates wrote. “In other words, every man, woman, and child in the metropolitan area was poorer by $10 as a result of the sports environment.”

It’s true that going out to the ballgame and rooting for the home team provide many intangible benefits to people, including local camaraderie and a day of fun with one’s family and friends. But subsidizing the private investments of billionaire sports team owners doesn’t guarantee economic growth or improve life for most people.

As Heartland Institute Senior Fellow and board member Joseph Bast notes, “Professional sports are rife with rent-seeking. Billions of dollars of rent are generated and kept by team owners and professional athletes every year, a practice that generates enormous deadweight losses to society. The solution is to remove the privilege – in this case, public subsidies used to build or renovate the stadiums and arenas used by professional sports teams – by expanding popular ownership of sports franchises.”

Instead of greasing the palms of lawmakers seeking a handout, sports teams should be emulating the taxpayer-friendly model used by a National Football League team with an extensive history of success: the Green Bay Packers.

The Packers are owned by the fans themselves. Collectively, 360,584 stockholders hold a total of 5,011,557 shares in the corporation, Green Bay Packers, Incorporated.

The team’s management can never threaten to leave if local taxpayers don’t agree to cough up more of their hard-earned money, because the fanbase is unlikely to allow its beloved sports team to depart for cities willing to subsidize new stadiums using tax dollars.

Many MLB teams have extremely loyal fanbases. Can you imagine how many fans would jump at the chance to literally own a stake in the team? A future world in which fan ownership exists in the MLB would be one in which taxpayers also win. Giving fans a direct stake in the home team would help to solidify the bond between sports teams and fans, and it would cut the government completely out of a market it shouldn’t be involved in.

It’s time to tell big stadium subsidy deals to hit the showers and give fan ownership a swing at the plate.

A revised version of this article was published on April 18 by the Washington Examiner.
Safety in schools has become of paramount concern to students and parents, especially on days like today, the twenty-first anniversary of the horrific Columbine school shooting. It’s not just school shootings causing this concern, however. It is the bullying, sexual harassment, and assaults many students deal with on a daily basis. With the rise of smartphones and social media, the bullying suffered at school can now follow children anywhere, 24 hours a day, seven days a week, 365 days a year. Parents of children with special needs or health issues also must have concerns about whether their child’s school is equipped to keep them safe.

Ta-Nehisi Coates, national correspondent for *The Atlantic*, explained in a recent article the struggles many students now face: “I grew up in West Baltimore … so when you went out into the world, you had to negotiate a different kind of logic, and that logic often had to do with making yourself safe. It wasn’t just enough to do X, Y, and Z in school, you had to always think about making yourself safe.”

When so much energy is spent on figuring out how to keep yourself safe just getting to school, you can imagine the sense of exhaustion setting in on a child even before he or she cracks open a book for the first time in the morning. No wonder then, after negotiating this violent maze day in and day out, that students aren’t performing well in class. Scores on the National Assessment for Educational Progress tests, colloquially known as the “Nation’s Report Card,” continue to be stagnant, even though there has been a significant increase in recent decades in school funding and regulations passed in the name of creating better education outcomes.

School safety isn’t a problem for just a tiny minority of students anymore, either. Nearly 21 percent of all students aged 12 to 18 report being bullied at school. While that statistic represents important progress since 2005, when 28 percent of middle- and high-school students reported being bullied, it’s little consolation to the estimated 6.1 million students who are being bullied today.

Close to one-third (31 percent) of 6th grade students say they have been bullied, as well as 25 percent of 7th graders. Around one in five 8th, 9th, and 10th graders also report being bullied, along with 15 percent of high school juniors and seniors. Findings from the
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention indicate that the overall high-school bullying rate is 20 percent.

Students should not have to wait years at a time or become victims of violent crime before their parents are allowed to transfer them to safer schools. That is why The Heartland Institute is currently working on a proposal for states to create a Child Safety Account (CSA) program that would allow parents to immediately have their child moved to a safe school—be it private, parochial, or a different public school—as soon as they feel the public school their child is currently attending is dangerous to his or her physical or emotional health.

The Florida Legislature recently recognized the issue of bullying and violence against children in schools. To solve this issue, they passed the Hope Scholarship, allowing students who are victims of bullying and other violence to choose another school within their district, outside of district boundaries, or a private school. This bill became law on March 12, 2018, receiving strong approval in both the state’s House and Senate.

Parents worry about the safety of their children at school just as much as their children do, if not more so. Unfortunately, as it currently stands, parents don’t have many options at their disposal to rectify the problem if they feel like their child’s school is an unsafe place for them. Unless they can afford to send their child to a private school or homeschool them, their child’s fate is determined by uncontrollable circumstances and an entrenched bureaucracy.

It shouldn’t be that way, and that is why CSA programs are so desperately needed. Heartland’s program would offer parents and their children a near-instantaneous solution to school violence by allowing parents to quickly and easily move their child to the school they determine to be the best and safest fit for them—whether that school be another public school, charter school, or private school. Even more importantly, it makes the parents themselves, not some disinterested bureaucrat, the final arbiter of whether or not the child’s school environment is an unsafe one for them.

Right now, thousands of students across America are frustrated, hurting, and dreading having to wake up in the morning and to spend a day in a place where they are poorly treated and possibly physically harmed. Their parents are hurting for them, feeling exasperated and helpless, worried about what the news from school is going to be each day, because they feel there is nothing they can do to help their child. That is why Child Safety Accounts are so desperately needed. There is no time to act like the present.

A revised version of this article was published on April 20 by The American Spectator.
Communities across the United States face a growing dental care crisis. According to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, nearly 63 million Americans live in areas designated as Dental Health Professional Shortage Areas. However, lawmakers in Arizona recently approved a measure that promises to expand access to affordable dental care for struggling communities.

On May 16, Gov. Doug Ducey signed legislation that allows mid-level dental professionals known as “dental therapists” to deliver a wide range of preventive and restorative treatments for patients in Arizona. The bill authorizes dental therapists to independently perform teeth cleanings and other important procedures, drill for cavities, and apply crowns.

Dental therapists are already trained and credentialed to provide all these services, but nearly every state prohibits them from serving patients unless a dentist is physically present. This legally mandated arrangement severely limits their capacity to treat families in communities that lack reliable access to dentists.

Restricting access to dental therapists is especially harmful for low-income Americans. Nearly half of all poor families didn’t visit a dentist in 2017 because dental care is too expensive, isn’t available nearby, or isn’t covered by their insurance. More than 62 percent of dentists refuse to treat patients on Medicaid, which is the primary insurer for poor Americans, especially poor children.
Without reliable access to dentists, patients often visit the emergency room as their dentist of last resort. Data from the American Dental Association show Americans make more than two million visits to the emergency room every year for preventable dental issues like tooth decay, which costs taxpayers nearly $700 million annually.

Allowing more dental therapists to practice without the supervision of a dentist would dramatically expand the availability of preventive dental care. After Minnesota became the first state to license dental therapists, the state’s Office of Rural and Primary Care determined one-third of all Minnesotans experienced a reduction in wait times for dental appointments. In addition, the availability of dental therapists permitted patients in Minnesota’s rural areas to travel short distances to attain dental care.

Expanding access to dental therapists would improve oral health. According to a report in the *Journal of Public Health Dentistry*, children and adults served by dental therapists receive more preventive care and need fewer invasive teeth extractions than patients who lacked reliable access to these qualified providers.

Yet despite this enormously positive track record, some special-interest groups oppose allowing dental therapists to treat patients in need. Earlier in 2018, the South Florida District Dental Association defeated a dental therapy bill in the Sunshine State by claiming dental therapists would expose patients to substandard care. Nothing could be further from the truth.

More than 1,100 studies conducted across 26 countries demonstrate these mid-level practitioners provide patients with safe and effective care. Even the former chairman of the American Dental Association’s Council on Scientific Affairs concluded dental therapists “are capable of providing high-quality services, including irreversible procedures such as restorative care and dental extractions.”

Rather than oppose dental therapists, dentists should welcome these mid-level providers. When dentists partner with dental therapists to deliver preventive care, dentists are free to dedicate more of their time to more-complicated procedures, allowing them to earn more money. One Minnesota dentist who partnered with a dental therapist saw his profits increase by $24,000 and his patient caseloads improve by 38 percent.

Dental therapists in the United States and abroad have proven they can play a crucial role in delivering quality dental care, and Arizona has now shown how the rest of the country can utilize these mid-level practitioners to improve oral health.

*A revised version of this article was published on May 24 by The Hill.*
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**By Charlie Katebi**  
State Government Relations Manager  
The Heartland Institute
By Arianna Wilkerson  
Government Relations Coordinator

The Heartland Heat Map lays out the government relations team’s education and legislative activities in the 50 states during the first half of 2018. In 48 states, we wrote and sent Research & Commentaries, Heartland’s signature analytical pieces on specific policies facing individual states on issues ranging from income tax reform in South Carolina to education choice scholarships in Nevada. Additionally, we had face-to-face meetings with elected officials in 18 states to discuss their legislative priorities, and our experts testified in 17 different states. In five states, we hosted events for legislators in or near their state capitol to brief them on issues and to encourage them to join our Legislative Forum.

What the map doesn’t show is a record count of how many times we engaged in a particular activity within a state, somewhat underselling Heartland’s role in bringing about policy change. For example, we testified in Wisconsin four times in favor of bills that would expand direct primary care, reform civil asset forfeiture, and implement welfare reforms. We sent eight Research & Commentaries to Pennsylvania lawmakers on topics such as loosening telemedicine regulations and establishing education savings accounts, to name just a few.

All this work added up to numerous legislative victories this year, such as the expansion of direct primary care in Florida, Missouri, and Nebraska; the passage of a comprehensive welfare reform package in Wisconsin; and the defeat of carbon taxes in at least 10 states. From Hawaii to Maine, Heartland logged more than 400,000 contacts with state elected officials on education, budget and tax, energy and environment, and health care issues.

In June, 2018, Victory Enterprises, Inc. surveyed by telephone 500 randomly selected state elected officials representing all 50 states. Victory Enterprises found nearly 72 percent of all legislators recognize Heartland and 37 percent find us to be “very” or “some-what” valuable to them. Even more amazing is that 78 percent of legislators said they have read at least one of our newspapers, with 45 percent of them indicating a Heartland newspaper changed their opinion on a public policy issue.

Heartland’s dedicated full-time staff and network of policy advisors continue to work overtime to make sure we take advantage of the current political makeup at the federal and state levels. The Government Relations Department is one of the aspects of The Heartland Institute that makes our organization unique among free-market think tanks. We treat state legislators like customers and with the utmost importance. Obviously, we hope all 50 states embrace individual liberty, but regardless of the political composition of a state’s legislature, Heartland is committed to educating and advising lawmakers in every political party. If you’re interested in free-market solutions, we’re here to help!
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We all want healthier, longer, and more productive lives for ourselves and our families. The primary goal of the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) should be to help us achieve that goal by delivering better drugs, sooner, at lower prices. Unfortunately, the agency’s incentives to pursue safety at the expense of all other goals make this impossible.

A new project at The Heartland Institute, called Free To Choose Medicine (FTCM), would solve the problem by breaking the FDA’s monopoly on new drugs. It would save lives and end needless suffering by creating a “Free to Choose Track” around the FDA for patients and their doctors.

**No Time to Waste**

Recent political developments have created an unprecedented window of opportunity for FTCM to become a reality. In his first State of the Union address in January 2018, President Donald Trump mentioned “Right to Try,” a similar but less comprehensive proposal to allow terminally ill patients to work with their doctors and pharmaceutical companies to access potentially lifesaving drugs. It was one of a very few new policy proposals mentioned in the speech, and it came after Heartland President Tim Huelskamp had a high-level meeting at the White House.

The U.S. House of Representatives passed Right to Try in March, showing the idea of changing the 40-year FDA status quo has now been “normalized.” FDA Commissioner Scott Gottlieb, M.D., has also voiced support for reforms that would give patients more choices. The opportunity to advance FTCM has never been better than it is right now.

The Heartland Institute has held two private briefings on FTCM—one in our Arlington Heights headquarters and another on Capitol Hill—with think tank allies, congressional staff, and representatives of the pharmaceutical industry, to inform these important stakeholders about the idea and rally support. We also held a public breakout session featuring FTCM pioneer Bartley Madden and representatives from two allied groups at the Conservative Political Action Conference in suburban Washington, DC, in February. Additionally, Heartland has hired a new full-time staffer with experience in project management to direct our efforts to promote FTCM this year and beyond.

**TOGETHER, WE CAN SAVE LIVES!**

It is difficult to imagine a more exciting and promising opportunity to improve, and potentially save, the lives of Americans than Heartland’s Free to Choose Medicine project.

Are you interested in learning more? Can you help in this landmark effort? Please call Kurt Hellmann at 312/377-4000 or send an email to khellmann@heartland.org.
In every episode of “Two Minutes with Tim,” Heartland Institute President Tim Huelskamp, Ph.D., weighs in on a hot news story of the week or an issue that is important to advancing our shared mission of advancing smaller government and individual liberty.

Subscribe to Heartland Publications

The Heartland Institute offers free email subscriptions to all of its newsletters and monthly public policy newspapers. If you’d like to subscribe to the print versions of any of Heartland’s monthly public policy newspapers, email Tonya Houston at THouston@heartland.org, call 312/377-4000, or subscribe online at Store.Heartland.org for just $36 for each publication.

PolicyBot™ is Heartland’s online database and search engine offering reviews and the full text of more than 32,000 articles and reports from 350 think tanks and advocacy groups. Visit policybot.org.
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