Name

Professor

Course

Date

The Taft-Hartley Act

The Taft-Hartley Act (1947) which was backed by Representative Fred A. Hartley and Senator Robert A. Taft was intended to revise most of the Wagner Act and suspend sections of the Federal Anti-Injunction Act (1932). The amendment came after much opposition from labor heads and rejection from President Harry Truman. The act outlined six other unjust labor procedures, revealing the Congress' opinion that there parts of union conduct that required rectification. The Taft-Hartley Act was changed to safeguard workers' freedoms from such inequitable routines by unions. There are various arguments for/against the Taft-Hartley Act and reasons explaining the stances.

Arguments in Support of the Taft-Hartley Act

Supporters of right-to-work policies tend to cite the law of private ownership of property and the freedom of association. Their arguments state that laborers should have the right to join or exit unions[1]. The proponents claim that it is unlawful for unions to have the capacity to coincide with proprietors to incorporate sections in their union security agreements that oblige every worker to become part of the union or pay union fees as a prerequisite for employment (Macaray). Additionally, they argue that in some situations union subscriptions are utilized to sponsor political endeavors that are disputed by union members.

[1] See Macaray's explanation of the same.

Sadly, there is an increasing difficulty in evaluating right-to-work regulations through the comparison of states. This challenge is explained by other dissimilarities between states that are intensely linked to right-to-work rules. As an example, states applying right-to-work policies have pro-enterprise laws that complicate the process of establishing the result of any single regulation.

Arguments against the Taft-Hartley Act

Opponents of the Taft-Hartley Act contend that right-to-work laws facilitate a market failure where non-member employees profit from labor arbitration without paying union levies (Wagner). Because of this, they indicate the ‘’non-right-to-work’’ states as ‘’labor arbitration’’ states and right-to-work states as ‘’right to labor for less’’ states.[2]

Moreover, opponents maintain that because these laws undermine the unions, there is a reduction in incomes and worker safety is jeopardized.[3] They point to data from the Department of Labor that displays, as an illustration that the rate of work-related casualties per 100,000 laborers was at its peak in 2003 in right-to-work states (National Labor Relations Board).

Personal view

Right-to-work policies can be contended either for or against, hinged on whether the emphasis is on the right of the employer or the right of the employee. This law can be viewed as confining the freedom of an employer to sign a voluntary contract with its labor union or liberating employees from being forced into a union. To illustrate, the Libertarian Party’s partner in Georgia involves an approval of right-to-work principles in its party manifesto. The party has incorporated discussions in its policy that have plainly required for the reversal of right-to-work laws.

---

[2] Wagner provides elucidation on the free-rider problem.
[3] The National Labor Relations Board plainly outlines the issue with worker safety.

All in all, labor law impacts every person, and a significant percentage of the public can understand it. Even though issues concerning the workforce can be difficult, work is the foundation of society. The world would stop operating without labor, and many depend on it for existence. If work is analyzed correctly, crucial issues about social control and power materialize. Laws touching on work influences everyone and because of this, great modifications bring massive arguments that result in tremendously conflicting and challenging passing. In spite of the reputation, any prominent alterations in labor regulation have always attracted immense debates and will persist provided that the system allows modifications in the law.

Works Cited

Macaray, David. "Labor Unions and Taft-Hartley." *CounterPunch*, 2 Jan. 2008, www.counterpunch.org/2008/01/02/labor-unions-and-taft-hartley/. Accessed 30 Mar. 2017.

National Labor Relations Board. "1947 Taft-Hartley Substantive Provisions." *NLRB*, 10 June 2015, www.nlrb.gov/who-we-are/our-history/1947-taft-hartley-substantive-provisions. Accessed 30 Mar. 2017.

Wagner, Steven. "How Did the Taft-Hartley Act Come About?" *History News Network*, 14 Oct. 2002, historynewsnetwork.org/article/1036. Accessed 30 Mar. 2017.