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2013 Attacks on Public Sector Rights

[Map showing states affected by 2013 attacks on public sector rights]
“Paycheck Protection” Proposals to Defund the Labor Movement

• “Paycheck protection” is the close cousin of “right to work”:
  • A virtuous label and a deceptive policy to render unions ineffectual
  • Seeks to pit unions against their members and the other workers they represent
  • Depends upon appeals to short-sighted individual interests over solidarity with others
“Paycheck Protection” Proposals to Defund the Labor Movement

First conceived in the mid-1990s as ballot measures and state and federal legislation

Prominent initial supporters included:
- Americans for Tax Reform (Grover Norquist)
- Educational Alliance (CA Christian activist group)
- Chambers of Commerce
- National Federation of Independent Business
- Wealthy individual conservatives/Republicans
“Paycheck Protection” Proposals to Defund the Labor Movement

• California Proposition 226 in 1998 the first significant state ballot measure fight over “paycheck protection”

• Measure would condition union spending on political contributions and expenditures on specific individual advance written permission

• Applied to dues whether paid via payroll deduction or otherwise

• Labor movement spent over $25 million for come-from-behind 52%-48% victory
“Paycheck Protection” Proposals to Defund the Labor Movement

- Similar Oregon ballot measures defeated after expensive campaigns in 1998 and 2000

- Proposed Nevada measure in 2000 invalidated by union lawsuit before election

- Unsuccessful public sector measure was among 2005 Schwarzenegger ballot propositions, all defeated

- Otherwise, 2000s saw many legislative proposals but none of substance were enacted, and “paycheck protection” waned as anti-union cause
“Paycheck Protection” Proposals to Defund the Labor Movement

• Resurgence of “paycheck protection” in wake of midterm election debacle for Democrats and progressives

• American Legislative Exchange Council and other right-wing groups reactivate the tactic

• With Congress gridlocked, Republicans and conservatives again focus on state legislatures to impose “paycheck protection” on private and public sector workers
“Paycheck Protection” Proposals to Defund the Labor Movement

- “Paycheck protection” proposals apply to private or public sector workplaces, or both
- Almost always one-sided: restrictions imposed on unions, and on payroll deductions that unions use, but not other groups or payroll deductions that they receive
- Variations include:
  - Direct restrictions on union political, legislative and other advocacy and contributions to other groups
  - Indirect restrictions by conditioning that spending on advance individual employee approval
“Paycheck Protection” Proposals to Defund the Labor Movement

- Individuals given authority to approve or block uses of their own dues or fees

- Particular union spending subject to special member votes

- Prohibition of use of payroll-deducted funds for broad range of “political” purposes

- In all cases, ordinary democratic procedures overridden and significant administrative costs imposed on Labor
Meanwhile, ALEC opposes proposals to condition business political and lobbying spending on prior shareholder approval; after all, they:

• “..place an onerous burden on these organizations..”

• “..deter [corporations] from participating in public debate..”

• “..undermine the very purpose of the First Amendment..”
“Paycheck Protection” Proposals to Defund the Labor Movement

• Dozens of “paycheck protection” proposals introduced in states since 2011

• None have yet qualified for the ballot in any state

• Three have been enacted by legislatures, in Alabama, Arizona and Puerto Rico, but lawsuits are succeeding

• Wisconsin has outlawed public employee payroll deduction of dues, period – and a lawsuit failed
“Paycheck Protection” Proposals to Defund the Labor Movement

- Alabama statute enacted at end of 2010
- Applies to public sector in this RTW state
- Bars payroll-deducted dues to any group that engages in “political activity,” including contributions, “political advertising,” polling and other vaguely defined activities
- Federal court enjoined statute on First Amendment grounds
- Has also denied motion to dismiss union claims that state Republican legislators and governors unlawfully retaliated against public sector unions’ opposition to their election
- Appeals court has asked state Supreme Court to determine several state law issues
“Paycheck Protection” Proposals to Defund the Labor Movement

- Arizona statute enacted in 2011
- Applies to both private and public sectors
- Bars wage deductions for “political purposes,” including candidate elections, ballot measures and “political issue advocacy”
- Exempts “public safety” employees, as well as charitable groups and health benefits providers that receive payroll deductions
- Federal court issued injunction in 2011 on First Amendment “viewpoint discrimination” ground; not appealed
- In March 2013, same court issued final judgment invalidating law on same ground, plus federal preemption in private sector
“Paycheck Protection” Proposals to Defund the Labor Movement

- Puerto Rico statute enacted in 2011
- Require unions and corporations to secure secret ballot votes of majority of entire membership, at simultaneous meetings of members, in order to approve very independent political expenditure
- Although not payroll-deduction-based, statute implicates same “advance authorization” concerns as other paycheck protection laws
- Federal appeals court in 2012 enjoined law on First Amendment grounds
“Paycheck Protection” Proposals to Defund the Labor Movement

• Wisconsin “Act 10” was enacted in 2011, and sparked huge demonstrations and now, ultimately unsuccessful litigation

• One provision bans payroll deduction of union dues and agency fees by employees, but exempts certain “public safety” employees

• In January 2013 federal appeals court upheld this provision against First Amendment and Equal protection Clause claims, concluding that it is viewpoint-neutral and the public-safety exemption is rationally supported by “labor peace” concerns
“Paycheck Protection” Proposals to Defund the Labor Movement

• New “paycheck protection” bills loom in 2013
• Most immediately, two Missouri bills:
  • HB 64, passed by the House, would apply in the private and public sectors and condition union political spending of payroll-deducted funds on annual written advance authorization, while exempting first responders and trade associations
  • SB 29 would condition public sector union spending on political contributions and expenditures on prior annual written employee authorization using a specific form
A Message Frame that Works

Clear, simple value-based messaging

Counter opposition attempts to marginalize unions and divide non-union voters from union workers

Make a unique and effective case in each state

Define and undermine the credibility of political opposition by exposing their true motives and corporate-backed funders – define the “bad guys” in your state.
This is about politics
Not economics

Talking to Members and the Public About the Attacks

Define the Situation from the perspective of the public

Attacks Middle Class

Impact on public

Source of the Problem

Motivations for Attack

OUR MESSAGE
Our opposition attempts to marginalize unions and divide non-union voters from union workers.

Connecting with and winning the support of voters is key. We need to expose who’s behind these laws and what’s their motivation.

We must not play on our opponent’s ground or get into the weeds of the policy attacks on worker rights.
Protecting Collective Bargaining
Key Takeaways From Successful Fights:

• *Where voters are concerned, “It’s all about me.”* Focus on their safety, well-being, economic interests.

• *Make everyday heroes (nurses, teachers, firefighters) the allies of voters.* Make them the face, avoid the “us versus them” dynamic.

• *Refuse to be defensive & don’t take the bait.* Avoid spending time refuting union-bashing. Stick to bigger principles.

• *Values-laden language wins.* Voters understand the world and frame political choices through their values.

• Don’t get bogged down in policy details, facts & figures.

• *Tell powerful stories.* Voters connect with real people whose stories they can relate to.
This is about politics
Not economics

Our legislative leaders should be coming together to balance the budget, improve our schools, and create jobs.

Instead, some politicians are pushing unnecessary and irresponsible legislation that attacks collective bargaining rights – including paycheck deception bills.

Attacks Middle Class
Paycheck deception and similar bills take away the professional voice of firefighters, nurses and police and make it harder for them to bargain for equipment and safe staffing levels.

Protect workers who are critical to our community and safety (Nurses, Teachers, Fire)

Motivations for Attack
Politicians give their wealthy donors and CEOs tax breaks while those same CEOs outsource jobs, and cut wages and benefits for middle class workers.

Politicians want to give CEOs more power over middle class workers by stripping them of their right to collectively bargain.

Talking to Members and the Public About the Attacks

Define the Situation from the perspective of the public

Source of the Problem (same)

Impact on public
Good Messengers

These attacks on public service workers are unfair – unsafe and unnecessary
We Are Missouri Coalition Launches Online Story Collection Showcasing Workers Responses to Jefferson City Attacks

**WorkingVoices.Tumblr.com**
Use Social Media

The truth is, right-to-work-for-less laws DON'T help state economies. States with these laws DO have lower wages and fewer people with health insurance.

Michigan can't afford that.

Please LIKE and SHARE.
Occupy Chicago @OccupyChicago
RT @WeAreMichigan: We're hearing word that voting will be taking place shortly in the House. Let's keep the pressure up! #savemi
Followed by Andy Richards
Expand

John @JohnSerwach
Call gov. Snyder at 888-979-7646 and ask him to veto Right to work legislation... And RT! Thanks!! #savemi #RTW4Less
Followed by Todd Cook
Expand

Emily Heffling @emilyheffling
"@ocsea: Dems offer amendment to take out fiscal note so bill can be repealed. No vote just gavelled down. Shame on them. #savemi #miunion."
Expand

Kitty @KRansome83
Word has it that voting will be taking place shortly in the #MI House. Let's keep the pressure up! #savemi
Followed by R.Saddler and 15 others
Expand

Zaid Jilani @ZaidJilani
Why can't we have a "Right To invest" law that allows investors to opt funds out of corporate political spending? #RTW #SaveMI
Retweeted by Doug Foote
Expand
Questions and Discussion

For more information:

Peggy Shorey, Director, State Government Relations
pshorey@aflcio.org

Christine Silvia-DeGennaro, State Legislative Issues Coordinator
csilvia@aflcio.org