

The Democrat's cruel School Move: Preventing Private School Vouchers

Participants: Athena: Me (Jessica Ouellette)
Harry Guerilla: In opposition to me
Southern Democrat: In agreement with me
Dave: In opposition to me

Re: The Democrat's cruel School Move, by Athena

Quote:

Originally Posted by Harry Guerrilla

So then why should we spend more money on government schools? Government schools are inherently flawed because kids are not primarily being educated and they use the factory learning model. Vouchers will work because it can develop vastly superior designs that what we have now.

Education is a right that all people/children have, not merely a privilege. Since it is a right, it must be guaranteed and protected, like other rights by the government (free speech, religion, freedom to assemble). Opponents wishing to argue for the abolition of the Department of Education, or a decrease in government spending on education, speak of a free education market where schools compete for the chance to educate a child, but where in this system is education for a child actually guaranteed? By what standard is the quality of education in a private market system measured, if not by the government?

Opponents would argue that certain academic standards would emerge from these private schools, such as those in the private university system. However, if that is the case, then the educational foundations of basic literacy, arithmetic and problem solving are already—as currently guaranteed by the Department of Education—required for entrance into that more specialized post-secondary system; thus those who do not meet the standard requirements become ultimately excluded. What happens to those students?

The current public system also mandates school attendance up until the age of 16, which is necessary and just, but how could the government enforce this law without public schools? For example, in Massachusetts it is now required that all state residents have some form of health care. How could the state establish such a mandate without providing a public alternative of last resort, such as in the MA state health insurance plan?

If we can agree that education is a right, or rather, a naturalized necessity, then we must have support from the government. In the *Gideon v. Wainwright* case (1963), the government had to provide a public defender for Gideon, as it states under the Sixth Amendment of the Constitution that the government is required to provide counsel in

criminal cases for defendants unable to afford their own attorneys or lawyers. This “established right” is similar to education, in that education needs to be universally provided for children/students, especially for those who cannot afford it, those who do not meet the “academic standards” of these private systems. Education is a right, and necessary for every citizen to uphold his/her end of the social contract; thus, this standard must be set, and the right must be upheld by the government.

Re: The Democrat's cruel School Move, by Harry Guerilla

Quote:

Originally Posted by Athena

Education is a right that all people/children have, not merely a privilege. Since it is a right, it must be guaranteed and protected, like other rights by the government (free speech, religion, freedom to assemble). Opponents wishing to argue for the abolition of the Department of Education, or a decrease in government spending on education, speak of a free education market where schools compete for the chance to educate a child, but where in this system is education for a child actually guaranteed? By what standard is the quality of education in a private market system measured, if not by the government?

Education is not a right. No one has the right to force anyone else to give them an education at someone else's expense.

The government doesn't do much of anything right. Standards are based on individual needs and wants not some arbitrary government measure.

Quote:

Originally Posted by Athena

Opponents would argue that certain academic standards would emerge from these private schools, such as those in the private university system. However, if that is the case, then the educational foundations of basic literacy, arithmetic and problem solving are already—as currently guaranteed by the Department of Education—required for entrance into that more specialized post-secondary system; thus those who do not meet the standard requirements become ultimately excluded. What happens to those students?

If they can't learn it or their parents won't help them learn it either with home school or private school it is not the responsibility of everyone else to fix it.

Survival of the fit is the rule whether or not you want to believe it.

Quote:

Originally Posted by Athena

The current public system also mandates school attendance up until the age of 16, which is necessary and just, but how could the government enforce this law without public

schools? For example, in Massachusetts it is now required that all state residents have some form of health care. How could the state establish such a mandate without providing a public alternative of last resort, such as in the MA state health insurance plan?

They shouldn't mandate anything. If a parent is such a crap hole of suck there is no public mandate that will fix it. Making the kid go to school won't fix it and health care won't fix it either. In most cases the kid will turn out bad either way.

Quote:

Originally Posted by Athena

If we can agree that education is a right, or rather, a naturalized necessity, then we must have support from the government. In the Gideon v. Wainwright case (1963), the government had to provide a public defender for Gideon, as it states under the Sixth Amendment of the Constitution that the government is required to provide counsel in criminal cases for defendants unable to afford their own attorneys or lawyers. This “established right” is similar to education, in that education needs to be universally provided for children/students, especially for those who cannot afford it, those who do not meet the “academic standards” of these private systems. Education is a right, and necessary for every citizen to uphold his/her end of the social contract; thus, this standard must be set, and the right must be upheld by the government.

Education is not a right and no one is required to fulfill any myth of a social contract. I did not sign a social contract and it does not apply to me.

Not every person is able to be educated. That is the real world.

Re: The Democrat's cruel School Move, by Southern Democrat

Quote:

Originally Posted by Harry Guerrilla

Education is not a right. No one has the right to force anyone else to give them an education at someone else's expense. The government doesn't do much of anything right. Standards are based on individual needs and wants not some arbitrary government measure.

In our nation, education is a right and a basic public education is a responsibility of the public sector. Now, you may disagree with it, but that does not change the fact that it's a right in this country.

Re: The Democrat's cruel School Move, by Athena

Quote:

Originally Posted by Harry Guerrilla

Education is not a right. No one has the right to force anyone else to give them an education at someone elses expense. The government doesn't do much of anything right. Standards are based on individual needs and wants not some arbitrary government measure.

The issue at stake here is whether education is (or should be) defined as a right or as a privilege.

Rights are equal guarantees based in ethics and justice, and privileges are advantages based in previous privileges, both regarding position and identity. If we think about these two definitions in terms of power, the latter seems much more in line with power dynamics--unequal power dynamics. My question for you is...what constitutes a privileged education? Who obtains this privilege? I think you will find that the dominant mainstream culture alone benefits from this concept of privilege. What about the underrepresented groups? Have they not "earned" this privilege, and if so, why haven't they?

As mentioned before, privilege comes from privileged predecessors--it's a recurring cycle. A free market of private school systems would further this cycle, as those who are not considered "privileged" become excluded.

If we look at education as a right, then we have an equal ground to work with, where every person has access to receiving an education. The unequal power dynamics become disrupted by this public system; the choice to attend a private school is still an option, it's just not a monopoly.

Re: The Democrat's cruel School Move, by Harry Guerilla

Quote:

Originally Posted by Athena

The issue at stake here is whether education is (or should be) defined as a right or as a privilege.

Quote:

Originally Posted by Athena

Rights are equal guarantees based in ethics and justice, and privileges are advantages based in previous privileges, both regarding position and identity. If we think about these two definitions in terms of power, the latter seems much more in line with power

dynamics--unequal power dynamics. My question for you is...what constitutes a privileged education? Who obtains this privilege? I think you will find that the dominant mainstream culture alone benefits from this concept of privilege. What about the underrepresented groups? Have they not "earned" this privilege, and if so, why haven't they?

I don't believe that anyone has a right to anything at the expense of someone else. If someone else has to pay for your education and they don't want to how is that just? It isn't. What have they done to earn anything? Just being born doesn't entitle you to another persons money.

Who is not represented?

Quote:

Originally Posted by Athena

As mentioned before, privilege comes from privileged predecessors--it's a recurring cycle. A free market of private school systems would further this cycle, as those who are not considered "privileged" become excluded.

Privileges are earned.

They don't have to come from predecessors, however, if the predecessors have earned it and can supply it to their offspring then by all means they should.

Quote:

Originally Posted by Athena

If we look at education as a right, then we have an equal ground to work with, where every person has access to receiving an education. The unequal power dynamics become disrupted by this public system; the choice to attend a private school is still an option, it's just not a monopoly.

It is a right in that as long as you can pay for it or you can educate yourself then that is fine with me.

People are only equal under the law, in everything else no one is equal. Government has a nasty habit of making things unequal and consolidating power though.

No one is the same and no one can be the same.

Re: The Democrat's cruel School Move, by Athena

Originally Posted by Harry Guerrilla

People are only equal under the law, in everything else no one is equal.

Quote:

Originally Posted by Harry Guerrilla

There is a difference between who should be educated and who shouldn't.

Those that want to learn should be educated and those that don't, shouldn't.

Quote:

Originally Posted by Harry Guerrilla

It is hard to come to terms with the objective reality that not everyone is worthy of an education. It is the cold hard truth though. There are far to many subjective irrational opinions based on emotion that should not be entertained. It is pretty utilitarian but there comes a point were you must weigh the benefits of "educating" those who will not benefit it at the expense of those who will

As any Constitutionalist would agree, Americans are guaranteed equality of opportunity (under the law), not necessarily equality of condition. However, children initially lack the tools necessary in this society to pursue their happiness as adults—they acquire these tools through education. If the current education system was replaced with one that did not ensure development of these tools (to a certain standard for all) then that restructuring could effectively limit a person's opportunity beginning in their childhood, when they have little or no autonomy to make responsible decisions.

Those who oppose the Department of Education would argue that it is the responsibility of a child's parent(s) to make responsible decisions for them, but one must consider the countless examples of parents unfit for parenthood or those lacking in wisdom to guide their children to success. Would we really want to adopt a system that limits these children because of their parent's ignorance or financial inability to pay? We no longer live in an age of general practitioners; careers are ultra-specialized in modern society and a person cannot afford to play catch-up on their reading, writing and arithmetic during their teens. Basic K-12 education is necessary for all to have equal opportunity as adults.

Re: The Democrat's cruel School Move, by Harry Guerilla

Quote:

Originally Posted by Athena

As any Constitutionalist would agree, Americans are guaranteed equality of opportunity (under the law), not necessarily equality of condition. However, children initially lack the

tools necessary in this society to pursue their happiness as adults—they acquire these tools through education. If the current education system was replaced with one that did not ensure development of these tools (to a certain standard for all) then that restructuring could effectively limit a person's opportunity beginning in their childhood, when they have little or no autonomy to make responsible decisions.

The current system does not ensure development of anything except the very basics. Parents are ultimately responsible for their child's success and they typically pass off the blame to teachers. A parent could teach that in short order.

There has to be consequences for ****ty parenting. The government continuously keeps taking control and responsibility while parents keep shedding it.

Quote:

Originally Posted by Athena

Those who oppose the Department of Education would argue that it is the responsibility of a child's parent(s) to make responsible decisions for them, but one must consider the countless examples of parents unfit for parenthood or those lacking in wisdom to guide their children to success. Would we really want to adopt a system that limits these children because of their parent's ignorance or financial inability to pay? We no longer live in an age of general practitioners; careers are ultra-specialized in modern society and a person cannot afford to play catch-up on their reading, writing and arithmetic during their teens. Basic K-12 education is necessary for all to have equal opportunity as adults.

They are already inherently limited. If the child does not get reinforcement at home they will most likely not succeed anyway.

K-12 is wholly unnecessary because these parents can teach at least the first 4-5 grades of schooling with out having to enroll their child.

The responsibility must be first with the parent. They by choice had the child and now it is theirs to raise if they fail they must pay for it.

There are to many people pushing their responsibilities on government, it hurts everyone.

Re: The Democrat's cruel School Move, by Dav

What confuses me is why it's liberals in particular who are against vouchers. Shouldn't they be mad at the inequality in rich kids getting a better education than poor kids? Come on, it even involves handing out checks from the government! The only argument I've ever heard against it is that it will somehow steal attention away from the public school

system where the non-voucher kids will still have to go, which of course is a load of crap seeing as liberals want to spend way more money on other programs than a voucher system and public schooling combined would cost. Is free market capitalism just so scary, liberals will abandon everything that makes them liberal to avoid it?

Re: The Democrat's cruel School Move, by Athena

Quote:

Originally Posted by Dav

What confuses me is why it's liberals in particular who are against vouchers. Shouldn't they be mad at the inequality in rich kids getting a better education than poor kids? Come on, it even involves handing out checks from the government! The only argument I've ever heard against it is that it will somehow steal attention away from the public school system where the non-voucher kids will still have to go, which of course is a load of crap seeing as liberals want to spend way more money on other programs than a voucher system and public schooling combined would cost. Is free market capitalism just so scary, liberals will abandon everything that makes them liberal to avoid it?

All children should have the same equal opportunity for education in life, and this problem (unequal education) exists, but not in the sense that you mean. There is a perception that public schools are inferior to private schools, but generally speaking, that view is incorrect. In Massachusetts, for example, the public schools in Lexington and Concord consistently perform very well—at the same level as, or better than, private schools. Public schools in wealthy suburbs are a model for successful public education, and this suggests that the issue is not about there being a single provider for K-12 education, but rather that there is an equal amount of funding for each student within that system. Regional schools (such as Tantasqua and Shepard Hill, in Massachusetts) are also other examples of successful public models because they can pool resources from several different communities and provide diverse opportunities for their students.

The issue at stake here is not whether or not public schools can efficiently provide a quality education, because there are many cases in which they do, but the issue is the efficient and equal distribution of funding per student. It is not the just “rich kids”, as you say, who get the better education, but it is the children who live in proximity to rich communities that benefit from their situation. The current system needs to be remedied to ensure that schools in the inner cities or the poorer rural towns get the same funding per student as those in the suburbs.

Re: The Democrat's cruel School Move, by Dav

Funding means bull poo if a school is so crappy it doesn't know what to do with it. DC school systems spend gigantic amounts on their failing public schools, and guess what? They still suck. Barack Obama knows this. Hillary Clinton knows this. Yet both of them are against school vouchers- while they send their own kids to private schools, because they can afford it.

Re: The Democrat's cruel School Move, by Athena

Quote:

Originally Posted by Layla Z

How do you teach a child literature with no books, how do you teach a child to use a computer with not computers, how do you teach geography with no maps? I could go on. Your ideas of what education could be are very naive. Good education requires resources which require money. Students need history texts that don't still show that Soviet Union on the maps.

This exchange between Layla Z and Harry Guerrilla outlines a key potential problem with a private market for education: people have differing opinions about what constitutes a quality education. Harry Guerrilla asserts that:

"You can teach a small group of kids with a chalkboard alone if the students want to learn and if the teacher wants to teach. This has been done before."

...but in modern society, this is completely insufficient. Computers, technology and up-to-date textbooks are a necessity for a quality education, but schools with a different philosophy, more in line with Harry Guerrilla's less expensive private school, where the lower class and "less motivated" students would go, would not offer a quality education. Poor or thrifty parents would most likely send their children to these schools because of financial circumstances (or just plain selfishness—we can't assume that all parents have their children's best interests in mind anymore!) and they would be doing a great injustice to their children by subjecting them to such an inadequate education.

The single provider—the public schooling system—is the only way that a certain standard of education can be guaranteed for all children. Opponents have argued that this limits the freedom of parents to educate their children the way they see fit, but why is a societal standard for education necessarily a bad or unjust idea? Parents bear children into a society, raise them in a society and then those children become part of the society and affect society...why do they suggest that society should be left out of the discussion? The single provider education system allows for society to set equal standards and guarantee them for all members, and there specifically, a private market system falls short.