**Janus Message Guidance: How to Respond to Tough Questions**

*How many members do you expect to lose if the Supreme Court rules against you?*

* Most of our members will choose to stick together through their union.
* Will some people decide not to pay their fair share? Inevitably I think some will. Our members don’t go into public service to get rich, and when they’re faced with a water bill and a mortgage, if their union contributions become optional it will be a tough choice for some.
* But the real story of this case is the rich and the powerful playing politics through the Supreme Court and using their influence to take away freedoms from working people. If they succeed, they will make it harder for public service workers to stand together to improve their lives, their workplaces and their communities. That’s what’s at stake.

*What will the effects be on your political spending?*

* The simple truth is that no one is required to join a union and no one is required to pay any fees that go to politics or political candidates. Nothing in this case will change that.
* Because the law already prohibits unions from contributing directly to candidates and political parties, our political action fund relies on voluntary contributions from members to elect candidates who understand the needs of working families and support their interests.
* They do this because they know that while the corporate CEOs behind this case can cut checks for tens of millions of dollars to spend on politics and rig the system in their favor, when we have the freedom to come together and build power in numbers, we can make progress for all working families.

*How do you respond to the plaintiff’s claims that all collective bargaining in the public sector is inherently political?*

* The people behind this case have made their politics clear and their goal is to use the court to silence working people who serve our communities because they do not believe that working people deserve the same freedoms, opportunities and quality of life as them.
* Our communities expect fire fighters to show up when there is a fire, they expect someone to answer when they dial 9-1-1, and they expect their water to be safe to drink when they turn on the tap, they want great public schools and great healthcare and safe communities.
* These are the things public service members do, and do with pride, and they deserve the ability to speak up on the job if they have ideas to improve services or correct a problem. What’s political about that?

*If you’re saying that this case weakens unions, and if it would be as detrimental as you say it’s going to be, then how concerned are you that unions will remain viable institutions capable of being strong enough to effectively represent members?*

* Unions will always be the most effective vehicle for everyday people to pool their resources to fight for their families. The people behind this case know that, and that’s precisely why they have dreamed up this attack to rig the rules against working people to make it harder for them to come together in strong unions.
* Too many hardworking Americans are finding it hard to get by, let alone get ahead in this economy, and unions have a proven track record of raising wages, increasing benefits and standards for everyone.
* That’s why Americans continue to have an increasingly favorable view of unions, especially our young people. We’re going to continue doing the organizing that we’ve always been doing to build power for working people, while communicating the value of sticking together in the face of these attacks.

*Do you have thoughts on Gorsuch as the deciding vote in this case? Do you think he’s likely to rule against you?*

* We’re not going to speculate on how Justice Gorsuch will rule, but we have nearly 40 years of precedent on our side. If Justices weigh this case based solely on the legal merits, *Abood* will be upheld. It is longstanding sound and effective law that was unanimously decided.

*Will this make unions more responsive to the needs of their members?*

* The corporate interests behind this case are not fooling anyone with their attempts to appear on the side of working people.
* This case is not about lifting up working people and making their unions better. The stated goal of the organizations behind this attack is to “defund and defang” unions and “break” teachers unions.
* That’s because they know that when working people have the freedom to come together in strong unions, they fight for a better life for working people and that threatens the power and greed of the Koch brothers and corporate interests.
* That’s what this case is about, taking away the freedom of – and opportunity for – working people to join together in strong unions to speak up for themselves, their families and their communities.