DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 138 510 SO 009 961

TITLE Classroom Treatment of the Right to Work: High School History and Government Materials.
INSTITUTION National Right to Work Committee, Fairfax, Va.
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 38p.; Page 34 of the original doucment is copyrighted and therefore not available. It is not included in the pagination

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *American Government (Course); Civics; *Curriculum Evaluation; *Employment Problems; Equal Opportunities (Jobs); History Instruction; Industrial Relations; Instructional Materials; *Labor Legislation; Labor Unions; Laws; Legal Education; Secondary Education; *Textbook Bias; Textbook Evaluation; Textual Criticism; *United States History; Work Attitudes

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the paper is to evaluate classroom materials which are used to teach secondary students in history and government courses about the right to work issue. Classroom and other educational materials designated and evaluated by the National Right to Work Committee as presenting the right to work issue unfairly, inaccurately, or both, are reported. Reviewed are all current history and government textbook adoption lists from the 20 states which have such lists, plus other materials which may be used in other states. Twenty-three texts and five miscellaneous materials are reviewed. The major portion of the document presents evaluations of the text and miscellaneous educational materials. Listed for each entry are title, author, and states which have approved the text, an indication of the status of Right to Work laws in those states, textual reprint of Right to Work coverage, and evaluation of the tone, extent, and slant of the coverage. Basic facts about Right to Work laws are briefly presented, including wording of the law in the Taft-Hartley Act, states which have statutes protecting the right to work, dates these laws were enacted, and a sample Right to Work Law. Comments on objectionable terms often found in the materials are discussed, followed by listings of states with statewide textbook adoptions and an index of titles. (Author/DB)

CLASSROOM TREATMENT OF THE RIGHT TO WORK

High School History and Government Materials

National Right to Work Committee
8316 Arlington Boulevard
Suite 600
Fairfax, Virginia 22038

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Since 1975 researchers for the National Right to Work Committee have reviewed over 135 classroom materials for high school history and government courses to evaluate their treatment of the Right to Work issue.

Of those materials, 45 discussed the issue. Of those that discussed the issue, 23 (or 51%) discussed it unfairly, inaccurately, or both.

In addition, a number of other educational materials were evaluated and are included in this report under "Miscellany".

METHOD

In twenty states, high school textbooks used in public school classrooms must first be approved by that state's department of education. Current history and government textbook adoption lists were obtained from these states. All available texts on those lists were reviewed.

In addition, other history and government materials were reviewed. These included basal texts not on any of those 20 statewide adoption lists (that may nonetheless be used in any of the remaining 30 states) and supplemental materials made available to classrooms throughout the country by textbook publishers, universities, and special interest groups such as unions and businesses.

All materials were reviewed solely for their treatment of the Right to Work and directly related issues.

Evaluations of those texts found objectionable follow. Each evaluation includes, in addition to title, author and publisher, a list of those states on whose textbook adoption lists the text appears (if any) and a point by point evaluation of its bias or inaccuracy.

AMERICAN GOVERNMENT; George G. Bruntz & John Bremer; Ginn & Company.

Approved statewide in two states:

*Arkansas
*Louisiana

*These states have Right to Work laws.

Text

> The Taft-Hartley and Landrum-Griffin acts put some major restrictions on union power. Some states (nineteen in 1964) have gone even farther by passing so-called(1) "right-to-work" laws. Such a law forbids the existence of any requirement that a worker must join a union in order to keep his job...
>
> Supporters of right-to-work laws include workers who do not want to pay union dues, employers who want to weaken existing union power, and business interests seeking to prevent further unionization in order to hold down labor costs in the state(2). Unions, of course, see right-to-work laws as a threat to union growth. And they contend that all workers who benefit from collective-bargaining agreements should help pay the costs of running the union(3). (pp. 479-480)

Evaluation

(1) "So-called" lends an aura of illegitimacy to legitimate laws. (See P. 32)

(2) This sentence implies that Right to Work laws are supported only by people who wish to weaken or destroy unions. The Right to Work is supported by people from all corners of society, including both union and non-union members. (In a survey conducted by the Opinion Research Corporation in March 1976, 49% of the union members surveyed favored the working arrangement in which a "man can hold a job whether or not he belongs to a union" over the arrangement in which "a man can get a job if he doesn't already belong, but has to join after he is hired.")

(3) The overall tone of these last two sentences is one of imbalance. It gives the arguments against the Right to Work and none of the arguments for it.

AMERICAN GOVERNMENT IN ACTION; Miriam Roher Resnick & Lillian Herlich Nerenberg; Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.

Approved statewide in 14 states:

*Alabama	*Nevada
*Arkansas	New Mexico
*Georgia	Oklahoma
Idaho	Oregon
Indiana	*South Carolina
Kentucky	*Tennessee
*Mississippi	*Utah

*These states have Right to Work laws.

Text

> ...about two-fifths of the states, most of them in agricultural areas, have made the union shop illegal by passing so-called(1) "right-to-work" laws. In other states, right-to-work laws have been defeated by those who maintain that the right to unionize is an important aspect of the right to hold a job(2).
>
> A compromise arrangement now permitted in some states is the agency shop(3) -- a plan whereby workers in an industry who do not want to join the union pay a monthly service charge to the union in exchange for its collective bargaining services. Since they do not pay full union dues, they are not considered union members and are not entitled to receive other union benefits such as union-sponsored retirement or hospitalization plans. (p. 421)

Evaluation

(1) "So-called" lends an aura of illegitimacy to legitimate laws. (See P. 32)

(2) This sentence strongly implies that Right to Work laws prohibit unionization. This is false. Right to Work laws guarantee the right to join a union. The basic premise of Right to Work laws is that no person should be compelled, as a condition of employment, to join or not to join a labor union.

(3) In calling the "agency shop" a "compromise arrangement", this phrase expresses only the opinion of "agency shop" proponents. Right to Work supporters consider the "agency shop" another form of compulsion and do not accept it as a compromise.

THE AMERICAN LABOR MOVEMENT; Mark Starr; Oxford Book Company.

Not on any statewide textbook adoption lists.

Text

> Throughout the 1960's, one of labor's(1) prime political goals was to secure repeal of Section 14-b of the Taft-Hartley Act. This section gave the states the right to enact legislation which, in effect, nullified the union-shop provision of Taft-Hartley. The basic impact of such "right-to-work" laws (as they are unjustifiably known)(2) is that no worker may be required to join a union as a condition of being hired or of retaining his job. When such a "right-to-work" provision is enacted, the union member loses his freedom to refuse to work with a non-union member, who may refuse to go along with a majority vote to strike or take other collective action. With this in mind, union critics have called such legislation "right-to-scab" laws...
>
> ...They constituted a serious hindrance to the effective operation of unions and of union growth. With such a law in effect, even if the large majority of workers in a given place of employment voted to be represented by a union, a minority might remain outside the union and still receive all the benefits of the union's activity and expenditures, without paying a cent in dues or assuming any other responsibility..
>
> ...However, labor has remained alert to the menace of hostile legislation and will combat vigorously any efforts to enact laws designed to limit its activities or prevent it from exercising its proper functions(3). (pp. 71-73)

Evaluation

(1) "Labor" is misused here and in the rest of the passage. The author means "labor union officials". (See P. 32)

(2) This parenthetical comment obviously instills bias.

(3) The entire passage is a series of attacks on the Right to Work with no attempt at balance. Point by point, rebuttals to these attacks would be:

a. No one "loses his freedom" under Right to Work laws. These laws protect everyone's right to join a union or not, as he sees fit.

b. There is no evidence that Right to Work laws constitute any "hindrance to the effective operation of unions and of union growth".

c. It is not Right to Work laws that grant to the non-union worker "all the benefits of the union's activity and expenditures". It is the unions who demanded and got exclusive representation...the privilege of bargaining for all members of a company's bargaining unit (Wagner Act, 1935). The non-union worker is represented by the union whether he wants to be or not.

d. It is opinion, not fact, that compulsory unionism is a "proper function" of "labor". (Also, see comment on the misuse of "labor" in number (1), above).

AMERICAN LABOR UNIONS, What They Are and How They Work; Florence Peterson; Harper & Row, Publishers.

Not on any statewide textbook adoption lists.

Text

Organized labor voices no serious objections to these legal requirements for union-shop contracts, but it vociferously objects to the Taft-Hartley provision allowing state governments to ban all union-shop contracts within their borders, regardless of the wishes of the employer and a majority of his employees, and irrespective of whether the industry is engaged in interstate or local commerce. In these respects the Taft-Hartley provision is unique: It allows state laws to supersede federal legislation in the area of interstate commerce, and it negates a basic principle accepted in all phases of American life, both public and private - namely majority rule.(1)

Thus far nineteen states have enacted laws banning union-shop contracts, almost without exception these are states where the rural, nonindustrial counties dominate the state legislatures. Typically these so-called(2) "right-to-work" laws read:

> No person may be denied employment and employers may not be denied the right to employ any person because of that person's membership or nonmembership in any labor organization.

Proponents of these laws hold that it is the duty of government to protect the inalienable right of an individual to work - a right which is considered as fundamental as his right to quit work - and that even though a majority of the employees designate a bargaining agent, they have no moral right, and should have no legal right, to act for the minority who wish to bargain as individuals. They maintain that to force workers to join and pay dues to a union in order to obtain and hold a job is repugnant to every instinct of liberty, and is a form of human bondage because it infringes upon the individual's right to work under whatever conditions he chooses.(3)

Unions contend that this application of the concept of the inalienable right to work is in fact false: that an inalienable right is one which cannot be taken away, and that no proponent of the ban on union-shop contracts goes so far as to say that jobs should always be guaranteed to those who seek work, or that no one should be dismissed from a job he wishes to retain(4). Above all unions argue that allowing nonmembers to enjoy the wages and other benefits which union members have fought and paid for is comparable to allowing citizens who voted against a tax measure not to pay these taxes even though they benefit from the services defrayed by the tax levy. Unions argue that the legal protection of the individual's right not to belong to a union which a majority of the employees have voted for, is valid and just only if the laws included a proviso that only union members shall be paid union wages and enjoy the other benefits obtained through collective bargaining(5). (pp. 118-119)

Evaluation

(1) This sentence states opinion as fact. Balance requires presentation of the opposing opinion that the theory of majority rule must be based on the preservation of minority rights and minority opposition. The majority of the people in this country are Protestant. Proponents of the opposing opinion would point out that this textbook's interpretation of "majority rule" suggests that since the majority of the people in this country are Protestant, everyone should become a Protestant.

(2) "So-called" lends an aura of illegitimacy to legitimate laws. (See P. 32)

(3) It is misleading to interpret the belief in the Right to Work as the belief that an individual has a right to work "under whatever conditions he chooses". The Right to Work is based only on the belief that every individual has the right to work for a living <u>without being compelled to join a union</u>.

(4) This passage, along with the preceding one, is the author's one move to present arguments on both sides of the issue. But, since it is based on the misinterpretation discussed above, it is invalid.

(5) This argument is not accompanied by the opposing argument that forced payments are indeed equivalent to taxes, but that taxation is a sovereign power and should be exercised only by the government. Right to Work proponents argue that it would be absurd to suggest that all voluntary organizations should be empowered to compel those whom they benefit to contribute support. In addition, Right to Work proponents do not believe that Right to Work laws can be discredited because the union bargains for all members of the bargaining unit. It is the unions who demanded and got exclusive representation...the privilege of bargaining for all members of a company's bargaining unit (Wagner Act, 1935).

AMERICAN STUDIES, A Conceptual Approach; Irving L. Gordon; AMSCO School Publications, Inc.

Not on any statewide textbook adoption lists.

Text

CONTROVERSY REGARDING THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Opposition by Labor(1)
Labor leaders condemned the Taft-Hartley Act as a "slave labor" law. In particular, they opposed the (a) abolition of the closed shop, since, under the union shop, the union had no power over hiring, (b) right granted to the states to bar even the union shop, (c) use of a temporary injunction, which revived fears of "government by injunction," and (d) anti-Communist oath, which union leaders considered an insult, since it was not required of any other segment of American society.

Approval by Management
Corporation leaders hailed the Taft-Hartley Act for (a) prohibiting unfair practices by unions, just as the Wagner Act had prohibited unfair practices by employers, (b) outlawing the closed shop and thus giving employers the right to hire anyone they wanted, (c) providing a cooling-off period to encourage peaceful collective bargaining, and (d) insisting that unions force their members to honor their labor contracts.

Observations
(a) Despite labor's fears, unions made further gains, growing in membership from 14 million in 1947 to 17 million in 1957 and winning higher wages and many fringe benefits. (b) Some 19 states, most of them in the South, enacted "right-to-work" laws, outlawing the union shop(2). These laws hampered unions in organizing workers...(3) (pp. 354-355)

Evaluation

(1) The misuse of the word "labor" (see comments on P.32), and the way in which this passage is set up ("Opposition by Labor", and "Approval by Management") misleads the reader into seeing the Right to Work issue as a labor vs. management issue.

The Right to Work is supported by people from all corners of society, including both union and non-union members. (In a survey conducted by the Opinion Research Corporation in March, 1976, 49% of the union members surveyed favored the working arrangement in which a "man can hold a job whether or not he belongs to a union", over the arrangement in which a "man can get a job if he doesn't already belong, but has to join after he is hired.")

(2) It is inaccurately implied that the 19 states enacted Right to Work laws as a result of the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act. Actually, 11 states had Right to Work laws before the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act.

(3) There is no evidence that "these laws hampered unions in organizing workers". In fact, the statement immediately before that one cites statistics indicating that labor unions have been anything but hampered.

THE CHALLENGE OF DEMOCRACY; Theodore P. Blaich, Joseph C. Baumgartner; Webster Division, McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Not on any statewide textbook adoption lists.

Text

...Primarily, this (the Right to Work issue) is a question of economics...(1) (p. 283)

Evaluation

(1) This statement is taken from a "Case for Class Discussion" too lengthy to quote here in full, in which a hypothetical argument arises among students about the Right to Work. The statement is one of the teacher's concluding remarks when he calls the discussion to a close. Right to Work supporters do not believe that the issue is "a question of economics". They support the issue as one of individual freedom.

EXPLORING OUR NATION'S HISTORY, Volume II, THE AGE OF GREATNESS; Sidney Schwartz & John R. O'Connor; Globe Book Company.

Approved statewide in three states:

*Arkansas
*Georgia
Oregon

*These states have Right to Work laws.

Text

(Under the Taft-Hartley Act) States could pass "right-to-work" laws. These laws allowed companies with union contracts to hire non-union workers. The new workers were to be represented by the union, but they did not have to join it or pay union dues(1)...

...But unions condemned it (the Taft-Hartley Act) as a "slave-labor law". They charged that it took away important rights of unions and workers. They especially objected to the "right-to-work" laws, which allowed workers who did not pay dues to reap the benefits that unions had won(2). (p. 249)

Evaluation

(1) This sentence implies that Right to Work laws say that the union must represent non-union workers. Exclusive representation...the privilege of bargaining for all members of a company's bargaining unit...was demanded by the unions, and received under the National Labor Relations Act (Wagner Act) in 1935.

(2) This statement presents opinion as fact, by defining Right to Work laws as laws that "allowed workers who did not pay dues to reap the benefits that unions had won". That statement is not fact, but one side of an argument. It is the Wagner Act that "allows" all workers to "reap the benefits". (See (1)).

GOVERNMENT BY THE PEOPLE, National Edition; James MacGregor Burns & J.W. Peltason, Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Approved statewide in one state:

*Tennessee

*This state has a Right to Work law.

Text

...Since 1947, organized labor has kept up its drive to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act, especially Section 14b, which permits states to outlaw union shops. Union leaders contend that these laws undermine their organizing efforts, especially in the South, where most of the states have taken advantage of Section 14b to pass so-called(1) right-to-work laws(2). (p.494)

Evaluation

(1) "So-called" lends an aura of illegitimacy to legitimate laws. (See P. 32)

(2) This sentence suggests that all state Right to Work laws were passed after the Taft-Hartley Act. Eleven states had Right to Work laws before the Taft-Hartley Act was passed.

GOVERNMENT IN OUR REPUBLIC; Stuart Gerry Brown & Charles L. Peltier; The Macmillah Company.

Approved statewide in eight states:

*Alabama	*Mississippi
*Arkansas	Oklahoma
*Georgia	*Tennessee
Idaho	*Utah

*These states have Right to Work laws.

Text

In recent years some states have passed and others have rejected laws aimed directly at the power of unions(1). These laws, known as "right to work" laws (that is, the right to work without belonging to a union), would make the union shop impossible unless the union's members were unanimous in their support of it. The federal law, on the other hand, authorizes the union shop if a majority favors it. Such laws are constantly being tested in the courts to determine whether they conform with the Constitution(2). There is no uniform attitude toward labor among the states, and the states by no means all conform to the standards set by the federal government(3).

Evaluation

(1) It is opinion, not fact, that Right to Work laws are aimed "directly at the power of the unions". Proponents insist that Right to Work laws have no effect on any legitimate function of unions. They are not aimed at "the power of the unions", proponents would argue, but are aimed at the restriction of individual freedom.

(2) The Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of Right to Work laws in 1949. (Lincoln Union vs. Northwestern Company).

(3) This sentence suggests that Right to Work laws are somehow in violation of "standards set by the federal government". They are not. They are sanctioned by federal statute (Section 14(b) of the 1947 Taft-Hartley Act).

HISTORY: USA; Jack Allen & John Betts; American Book Company.

Approved statewide in nine states:

*Alabama	*Mississippi
*Arkansas	New Mexico
*Florida	Oregon
*Georgia	*Tennessee
*Louisiana	

*These states all have Right to Work laws.

Text

> ...Congressional enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act in 1947, and the Landrum-Griffin Act in 1959, opened the way for increased government intervention in union affairs. The purpose of the new laws, presumably, was to promote union democracy and protect individual members from the wrongdoings of union officials. Their effect was to alter the traditional legal view of trade unions as private organizations of workers with the internal affairs of the union rarely a matter of government concern(1). The actions of the federal government were accompanied by the enactment of so-called(2) "right-to-work" laws in a number of states, some eighteen states by 1960(3). The laws took different forms, but, in general, they tended to favor non-union members and to penalize unions(4). (p. 666)

Evaluation

(1) The entire passage to this point reflects an obvious bias against the Taft-Hartley and Landrum-Griffin Acts. (Right to Work laws are sanctioned under the Taft-Hartley Act.)

(2) "So-called" lends an aura of illegitimacy to legitimate laws. (See P. 32)

(3) Eleven states had Right to Work laws on the books before the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act.

(4) This statement is misleading. Right to Work laws penalize no one. They protect the union member and the non-union member alike.

LABOR IN AMERICA, A History; Foster Rhea Dulles; Thomas Y. Crowell Company.

Not on any statewide textbook adoption lists.

Text

> ...(The Taft-Hartley Act) expressly banned the closed shop, required highly complicated voting procedures for establishment of the union shop, and perhaps most significantly, left the door open to even more severe anti-union legislation by the states(1). In Section 14(b) it permitted the states to bypass federal legislation allowing the union shop by themselves banning it. This provision made possible the so-called(2) state "right-to-work" laws which were to hamper further union organization more directly than anything in the Taft-Hartley Act itself(3). (pp. 357-358)
>
> In 1955, 17 states had such laws barring not only the closed shop but the union shop. They were largely in the South or Far West, but conservative business interests(4) mounted an intensive campaign to win over some of the more heavily industrialized states. While labor(5) continued to feel that the only resolution of this issue was repeal of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, it conducted a hard-hitting war against any further state legislation. In only two instances did it fail to defeat proposed new right-to-work laws, and in 1958 decisively threw back anti-union(6) forces in the five important states of California, Ohio, Colorado, Idaho, and Washington. (p. 381)

Evaluation

(1) Calling Right to Work laws "severe anti-union legislation" instills bias. Right to Work proponents argue that Right to Work laws are neither anti-union nor pro-union, and that they protect both the union and non-union worker.

(2) "So-called" lends an aura of illegitimacy to legitimate laws. (See P. 32)

(3) There is no evidence that Right to Work laws "hamper further union organization."

(4) This implies that "conservative business interests" are the driving force behind the Right to Work movement. The Right to Work is supported by people from all corners of society including union and non-union workers alike. (In a survey conducted by the Opinion Research Corporation in March, 1976, 49% of the union members surveyed favored the working arrangement in which a "man can hold a job whether or not he belongs to a union", over the arrangement in which "a man can get a job if he doesn't already belong, but has to join after he is hired.")

(5) "Labor" is misused here. What is meant is "labor unions". (See P. 32)

(6) See Number (1).

THE LABOR MOVEMENT, An American Reader Book; Charles L. Cutler & George P. Morrill; Xerox Corporation.

Not on any statewide textbook adoption lists.

Text

One part of the Taft-Hartley Act that angered labor leaders was the rule that allowed states to pass their own "right-to-work laws." Under these laws a person could not be forced to join a union in order to hold a job.

Some unions had contracts requiring that every worker in a plant be a union member. Under the new law independent workers could be hired. Union leaders were afraid that factory owners would use independent workers to push down wages or add to daily work hours.

In factory states - such as California and Illinois - working people(1) were strong enough to block right-to-work laws from passing. But in poorer states - mostly the South - the laws were put on the books. As a result, the unions said, workers there could not make a good living.

The AFL-CIO pointed out that in Mississippi factory workers earned an average of only $50 a week in 1955. The average personal income of every man, woman, and child - in that right-to-work state was only $946 a year, the lowest in the nation.

"In right-to-work South Carolina, the average weekly earnings of factory workers were $53 in 1955. They were $54 in Georgia, another right-to-work state. Per capita income in South Carolina was $1,108 for the year. And in Georgia it was $1,133."

In the 1950's right-to-work laws were beaten back in 31 states. Unions never stopped talking and working against them.

Backers of each right-to-work act, on the other hand, were just as sure that they were helping the working person. They said they were giving the worker a chance to better himself without paying union dues or putting himself under leadership of faraway officers(2). (p. 43)

Evaluation

(1) It was the labor union which prevented Right to Work laws from passing, not the "working people".

(2) This presentation is extremely one-sided. A lengthy attack is made on the Right to Work with carefully chosen statistics. The only rebuttal is a brief, broad statement about the "backers" of Right to Work laws.

THE LABOR MOVEMENT IN THE UNITED STATES; Jack Barbash; Public Affairs Committee, Inc.

Not on any statewide textbook adoption lists.

Text

> The other question which is frequently raised with respect to the impact of unions on the society is the monopoly power of unions...
>
> The specific proposals made to deal with "union monopoly" - right-to-work laws, and outlawing of "industry-wide bargaining" - would prohibit sound practices...
>
> Both union security and multi-employer bargaining are frequently associated with mature bargaining relationships. The employer, the workers, and the consumers all benefit from the stability that has resulted from the relationship(1)...
>
> The union shop prevails only when: (a) the employer agrees to it in collective bargaining; (b) when the majority of employees want it.
>
> Under those circumstances the requirement that every employee join the union as a condition of holding his job and thereby contribute to the upkeep of the union that represents him is not unreasonable(2). (pp. 24-26)

Evaluation

(1) That Right to Work laws "prohibit sound practices", that "union security" is associated with "mature bargaining relationships", and that "the employer, the workers, and the consumers all benefit" are statements of opinion, yet they are presented as fact. There is no attempt whatever at substantiation.

(2) As above, this is not a statement of fact, but one side of an argument. The other side is that under no circumstances is "the requirement that every employee join the union" reasonable. It is never an employer's right to compel anyone to join a union, just as it is never the employer's right to prohibit union membership. In many instances, in fact, the employer has not agreed to a union shop voluntarily, but has been coerced by strikes, threats of strikes, and even violence against his person or property.

Right to Work proponents would argue also, that the theory of majority rule must be based on the preservation of minority rights including the right to oppose the majority.

THE LABOR MOVEMENT IN THE UNITED STATES; John J. Flagler; Lerner Publications Company.

Not on any statewide textbook adoption lists.

Text

> Another provision of the Taft-Hartley Act which labor(1) firmly opposed was section 14(b) which provided that the states were free to go beyond the federal ban on the closed shop and to legislate stricter prohibitions against union security arrangements(2). In the next few years, 20 states, most of them in the agricultural regions of the Midwest and in the newly industrialized Southeast, passed so-called(3) "right-to-work" laws(4). (pp. 95-96)

Evaluation

(1) "Labor" is misused here. It was labor union officials who opposed Section 14(b). (See P.32)

(2) "Union security arrangements" should not be used without qualification. Proponents of Right to Work consider that phrase a euphemism for compulsory unionism.

(3) "So-called" lends an aura of illegitimacy to legitimate laws. (See P.32)

(4) This sentence is inaccurate. Eleven of those states had Right to Work laws before passage of the Taft-Hartley Act.

MAGRUDER'S AMERICAN GOVERNMENT; Revised by William A. McClenaghan; Allyn & Bacon, Inc.

Approved statewide in 14 states:

*Alabama	*Mississippi
*Arkansas	New Mexico
*Georgia	Oklahoma
Idaho	Oregon
Indiana	*Tennessee
Kentucky	*Texas
*Louisiana	*Utah

*These states have Right to Work laws.

Text

> A union shop is one in which employees must join the union within a short time after being hired. Several of the States now have so-called(1) "right-to-work" laws, which ban both the closed and the union shops; they provide only for the open shop -- a worker may join a union or not, as he or she sees fit. (p. 374)

Evaluation

(1) "So-called" lends an aura of illegitimacy to legitimate laws. (See P.32)

NOTE: The use of "so-called" is the only bias in this text's presentation. Right to Work laws are not discussed by name in the text (the mention using "so-called" is in the footnote) but the discussion of the Taft-Hartley provision is fair and accurate.

ONE NATION, An American Government Text with Readings; Robert L. Keighton; D.C. Heath and Company.

Approved statewide in one state:

Idaho

Text

The latter provision (Section 14(b)) led to the passage in nineteen states of so-called(1) "right to work" laws(2). (p.377)

Evaluation

(1) "So-called" lends an aura of illegitimacy to legitimate laws. (See P.32)

(2) Eleven of those 19 states had Right to Work laws before the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act.

NOTE: The passage above is followed by a brief, accurate discussion of the Right to Work issue.

OUR DEMOCRACY AT WORK; Harris G. Warren, Harry D. Leinenweber, & Ruth O. M. Andersen; Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Not on any statewide textbook adoption lists.

Text

...In recent years a strong anti-labor union movement(1) has caused about one-third of the states to adopt so-called(2) "right-to-work" laws. According to these laws, a worker does not have to belong to a union in order to work on a job...(pp. 246-247)

Evaluation

(1) Right to Work laws are neither pro-union or anti-union. They protect the right of every worker to join a union, or not to join a union, as he sees fit.

(2) "So-called" lends an aura of illegitimacy to legitimate laws. (See P.32)

PERSPECTIVES IN UNITED STATES HISTORY; Peter J. Hovenier, et al; Field Educational Publications, Inc.

Approved statewide in 11 states:

*Alabama	Oklahoma
*Arkansas	Oregon
*Georgia	*Tennessee
Idaho	*Texas
*Louisiana	*Utah
*North Carolina	

*These states have Right to Work laws.

Text

(The Taft-Hartley Act) was a punitive measure against labor(1)...the Taft-Hartley Act was designed ostensibly to stop "unfair" labor practices. The act...urged "right to work" laws by the states which could destroy the union shop(2). (p. 302)

Evaluation

(1) The Taft-Hartley Act deals with labor unions, not "labor". (See P.32)

(2) It is misleading to suggest that the Taft-Hartley Act "urged" Right to Work laws. It allowed them, but did not "urge" them.

PROBLEMS OF DEMOCRACY, Political, Social, Economic; William E. Dunwiddie; Ginn and Company.

Approved statewide in eight states:

*Arkansas	*Mississippi
*Georgia	*Nevada
Indiana	New Mexico
*Louisiana	Oklahoma

*These states have Right to Work laws.

Text

...Union workers strongly resent the "free rider", the fellow who is willing to get the benefits gained by the union but who is unwilling even to pay union dues. One union leader has summarized the feelings of union workers in this way: "We have always felt that it is manifestly unfair that individual employees should be permitted to obtain all of the benefits which result from the collective bargaining process and be subject to none of the obligations of that process." Another has put the argument more colorfully: The philosophy of the "free rider" is the philosophy of the "chiseler, the tax dodger...the man who rides the train without paying his fare. He enjoys what others have created without paying his share of the freight"(1).

...The hotly disputed section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act permits states to pass so-called(2) "right-to-work" laws. Nineteen states have laws that prohibit agreements between unions and companies to make union membership a condition of continued employment. (p. 267-268)

Evaluation

(1) This passage presents the "free rider" argument as fact. The other side of the argument is that the non-union worker is represented by the union whether he wants to be or not. He is a "captive passenger" rather than a "free rider". (It is the unions who demand "exclusive representation", the privilege of being the sole representative of the bargaining unit. That privilege is granted under the Wagner Act of 1935). Motives for refraining from union membership abound. Many workers do so because their dues pay not just for collective bargaining, but for political campaigns, social and economic propaganda, insurance, and etc., some or all of which they may not wish to support.

It is also not true that all "union workers strongly resent" workers who do not choose to join the union. In a survey conducted by the Opinion Research Corporation in March, 1976, 49% of the union members surveyed favored the working arrangement in which "a man can hold a job whether or not he belongs to a union", over the arrangement in which "a man can get a job if he doesn't already belong, but has to join after he is hired."

(2) "So-called" lends an aura of illegitimacy to legitimate laws. (See P. 32)

TODAY'S PROBLEMS, Social, Political, and Economic Issues Facing America; Revised by C. H. W. Pullen & James F. Reed; Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Not on any statewide adoption lists.

Text

...The Act also made it possible for states to pass "right-to-work" laws, which are actually laws to make the open shop compulsory. More than a dozen states now have such laws(1). Union leaders were vigorous in their condemnation of the Taft-Hartley legislation after Congress had passed it over President Truman's veto. They charge that Taft-Hartley and "right-to-work" legislation are "union-busting" laws...(2) (p. 521)

Evaluation

(1) Eleven states already had Right to Work laws when the Taft-Hartley Act was passed, and 20 states (considerably more than a dozen) have them now.

(2) This presentation is one-sided. It states union opposition to the Taft-Hartley Act and Right to Work laws without stating support of them.

TOIL AND TROUBLE, A History of American Labor; Thomas R. Brooks; Delta Books.

Not on any statewide adoption lists.

Text

Unlike most Federal legislation, Taft-Hartley in the so-called(1) States Rights clause gave the states the right to pass legislation that could override provisions of the national labor law. As a result, some 21 states passed so-called(2) right-to-work laws following the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act(3). The common feature of this legislation is the strong anti-union bias(4). The union-shop and maintenance-of-membership clauses in union contracts, as well as the closed shop (forbidden by Taft-Hartley) are outlawed. While the Taft-Hartley Act permits union discipline of and discharge of any employee who fails to pay his dues, even this minimum discipline is illegal under right-to-work legislation(5).

Evaluation

(1) The use of "so-called" lends an aura of illegitimacy. (See P. 32)

(2) See no. (1).

(3) Eleven states had Right to Work laws before passage of the Taft-Hartley Act.

(4) The statement that "the common feature of this legislation is the strong anti-union bias" is opinion, not fact. Proponents of Right to Work laws consider them neither pro-union nor anti-union. They protect the right of each worker to join a union, or not, as he sees fit.

(5) That "union discipline of and discharge of any employee who fails to pay his dues" is a "minimum discipline" is a very debatable statement of opinion.

UNDERSTANDING OUR GOVERNMENT, With Cases and Problems; George Bruntz & Ronald B. Edgerton; Ginn and Company.

Approved statewide in three states:

*Arkansas *Tennessee
*Georgia

*These states have Right to Work laws.

Text

...In addition, various states have taken steps to weaken the power of organized labor by adopting so-called(1) right-to-work laws(2). These do away with the closed shop and permit workers to join or not join a labor union...(p. 462)

Evaluation

(1) "So-called" lends an aura of illegitimacy to legitimate laws. (See P. 32)

(2) The statement that the states have "taken steps to weaken the power of organized labor" in passing Right to Work laws is opinion, not fact. Right to Work proponents believe that Right to Work laws make no infringement on any legitimate functions of labor unions. They protect the rights of union and non-union members alike.

UNIONS AND WHAT THEY DO; Sidney Lens; Putman, Inc.

Not approved on any statewide adoption lists.

Text

There are three forms of union security(1). Under the union shop - the most prevalent one by far - the employer may hire anyone he pleases, but after thirty or more days that employee must join the union as a condition of employment. All workers must become union members. A second form - maintenance of membership - provides that an employee does not have to join the union if he does not want to, but once he does, he must remain a member for at least a year. In some of the twenty states which have right to work laws, unions have devised a third type of union security, the agency shop(2). That means that a worker does not have to join the union or participate in its activities, but he must pay the equivalent of union dues for the organization's upkeep.

Some people argue that all this amounts to compulsory unionism - forcing a worker to belong to a union against his will. Twenty of the less industrial states(3) have made it illegal to negotiate agreements with union security clauses.

But labor leaders give a number of reasons for insisting on the union shop (the other two forms are relatively rare)(4). The most persuasive one is that a man who gets benefits from a union contract but refuses to join is a free rider. He gets something for nothing. American labor laws are different from those in other countries. In the United States a union must negotiate for all workers in the bargaining unit...

In a sense the union shop is similar to conditions imposed on the residents of the country. Every resident must pay taxes. Even if he is not a citizen, he must pay. And if he is a citizen, it does not matter whether he votes Democratic or Republican, whether he likes or dislikes government policies, he still must file an income tax return. That's one of the conditions for living here. Your city government must build schools for you, must repair roads, purify water, install sewers. Your state government and your federal government provide other services - and whether you're rich or poor, whether you benefit much or only a little from such services, you are required by law to share in their costs.

The same is true of a union: It provides certain services. Those who gain from those services, the unions say, ought to be willing to share the cost for them.

Unions also argue that the union shop is needed so that labor can be more nearly equal in bargaining with the employer. The company has a single voice. One man - the owner or the plant manager - runs it and makes decisions. The factory, however, employs hundreds or thousands of men and women. If some belong to the union and others do not, the employees cannot speak to their employer out of a position of equal strength. Their ranks are divided, and they are thereby weakened. In states where union security is prohibited, wages are usually considerably lower than in the rest of the country.

Finally, unions point to the fact that workers are not as hostile to joining a labor organization as the public is led to believe. Under the provisions of the 1947 Taft-Hartley Act, secret ballot elections were required before unions could negotiate union shop agreements. The results were so overwhelming in favor of union security that the act was amended to drop this section. An average of 87 percent of those who voted said they wanted a union shop.

Quite a few employers now consider a union shop beneficial because it eliminates disharmony. In nonunion shops the union is constantly trying to win the allegiance of nonmembers by processing their grievances. Some of those grievances are deliberately contrived just to recruit new forces. Many employers, therefore, have come to the conclusion that there is more peace and harmony when a union shop prevails(5). (pp. 72-75)

Section 14-b of the Taft-Hartley Act conferred on the states the right to outlaw union security(6) provisions in labor-management contracts. Twenty states thereupon passed right to work laws(7), which, contrary to the name, do not guarantee anyone the right to a job(8). What they do is prohibit the union shop. Their effect is to blunt union organizing campaigns, as well as collective bargaining(9). In an effort to change this state of affairs, therefore, the AFL-CIO has conducted a long drive to repeal Section 14-b, so far unsuccessfully. (p. 130)

Evaluation

(1) The term "union security" should not be used without qualification. Proponents of Right to Work consider that phrase a euphemism for compulsory unionism.

(2) This is incorrect. State Right to Work laws prohibit the compulsory "agency shop".

(3) This is incorrect, also. Some of the Right to Work states, Texas and North Carolina, for example, are among the most highly industrialized in the nation.

(4) It is incorrect that "the other two forms are relatively rare". The compulsory "agency shop" is common, not rare.

(5) This extensive argument for compulsory unionism, which goes on for several pages, is prefaced by a one-sentence statement of the opposing argument. Proponents of Right to Work would make the following rebuttals of the major points of the argument for compulsory unionism:

a) The argument that begins with the statement that the "union shop is similar to conditions imposed on the residents of this country" is another expression of the "free rider" argument. The rebuttal is that forced payments are indeed equivalent to taxes, but that taxation is a sovereign power and should be exercised only by the government. No labor union or other private group should claim such powers. In the words of Samuel Gompers, the founder of the American Labor Movement, "All through our society, voluntary organizations carry on activities which benefit a great many who do not contribute any financial or other support". It would be absurd to suggest that these groups should be empowered to compel those whom they benefit to contribute support.

b) The argument that the union shop is needed "so that labor can be more nearly equal in bargaining with the employer" overlooks the point that if the union can maintain its membership only by compulsion, then it is obviously not bargaining for advantages which are wanted by all workers.

c) That workers are not "as hostile to joining a labor organization as the public is led to believe", even if true, is beside the point. In the first place, if that were true, compulsion would not be necessary, and in the second place, those who don't want to join, even if a minority, should nonetheless be allowed their freedom of choice.

d) Even if "quite a few" employers "consider a union shop beneficial because it eliminates disharmony", that should not be an argument for compulsion. Indeed, "the elimination of disharmony" through compulsion, is hardly a goal that should be supported anywhere in a democratic society.

(6) See (1).

(7) Eleven states had Right to Work laws before the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act.

(8) The suggestion that Right to Work laws function "contrary to the name" obviously instills bias.

(9) There is no evidence to support the statement that "their effect was to blunt union organizing campaigns". And Right to Work laws have no effect whatever on collective bargaining.

MISCELLANY

Evaluated in this section are miscellaneous educational materials uncovered by researchers that are not in the category of history and government classroom materials. Some are teacher's materials, and others are classroom materials on the subject of career planning. All have biased or inaccurate treatment of the Right to Work issue.

LABOR IN LEARNING: Public School Treatment of the World of Work; Will Scoggins; Institute of Industrial Relations, University of California.

NOTE: This is not a textbook. It is an evaluation, for teachers, of the treatment of labor in textbooks.

Text

> ...I was most interested in whether or not the textbooks would point out that this section of the law (Section 14 (b) of the Taft-Hartley Act), with most unusual latitude, allows state governments to preempt federal legislation in labor-management relations by enacting so-called(1) "right-to-work" laws, making illegal the otherwise lawful union shop. Nineteen states now have such legislation outlawing the union shop and other union security(2) contract clauses.
>
> Brown and Peltier, in Government in Our Republic (p. 559), in a short treatment do perhaps the best job:
>
> > In recent years some states have passed and others have rejected laws aimed directly at the power of unions. These laws, known as 'right to work' laws (that is, the right to work without belonging to a union), would make the union shop impossible unless the union's members were unanimous in their support of it. The federal law, on the other hand, authorizes the union shop if a majority favors it. Such laws are constantly being tested in the courts to determine whether they conform with the Constitution. There is no uniform attitude toward labor among the states, and the states by no means all conform to the standards set by the federal government(3).
>
> Comments: Should not textbooks attempt to explain what such laws mean to the partisans of labor and management(4), and why labor unions are so universally opposed to these so-called(5) right-to-work laws(6)? (p. 26)

Evaluation

(1) "So-called" lends an aura of illegitimacy to legitimate laws. (See P.32)

(2) "Union security" should not be used without qualification. Proponents of Right to Work consider that phrase a euphemism for compulsory unionism.

(3) This textbook is biased and, hopefully, does not do the "best job". (See P.10 for evaluation).

(4) This suggests that the Right to Work issue is a labor versus management dispute. The Right to Work is supported by people from all corners of society, labor and management alike.

(5) See (1).

(6) First, textbooks should attempt to explain why there are proponents of Right to Work laws as well as why there are opponents. Also, if one uses the term "labor unions" to mean the members of labor unions, (as opposed to labor union officials) it is inaccurate to say that they are "universally opposed" to Right to Work laws. (In a survey conducted by the Opinion Research Corporation in March, 1976, 49% of the union members surveyed favored the working arrangement in which "a man can hold a job whether or not he belongs to a union", over the arrangement in which "a man can get a job if he doesn't already belong, but has to join after he is hired.")

LABOR UNIONS, Progress and Promise; Harold Kessler; Marvin A. Robinson, and Mark Stone; School District of Philadelphia.

NOTE: This is a curriculum guide prepared by the Office of Curriculum and Instruction of the Philadelphia School District. The text quoted here is a dramatization offered as part of a lesson plan.

Text

THE FREE RIDER

Bert: Hey, Fran, since you're the shop steward, you ought to be aware of this problem and try to get us the answer.

Fran: Sure, Bert, since you're a member of the shop committee it's part of your responsibility to bring up any problems that come to your attention. What's up now?

Bert: The free rider problem - those few kooks, lame-brains, or spongers who won't join the union.

Fran: I know about them - about 5% of the working force - so what's the problem - are they causing trouble?

Bert: Well, it's this way. Some of the union members, whom I thought were solid, are squawking because the free riders pay no dues but get all the benefits of the contract that our dues helped to get. They don't think it is fair...

Fran: Bert, tell them, first, that it is standard union practice, everywhere, based on experience, that the contract covers every worker in the bargaining unit, equally. That means the union represents all workers in the departments or jobs that were involved in the collective bargaining election we won several years ago. Second, we are not working for a private employer, our boss is a government agency, and the law is clear on this point: no worker can be required or forbidden to join any organization as a condition of employment (except for practices in effect before the place of employment became a government agency). Third, if the non-union people were not protected equally by the contract, that group would become favorites of the employer in many ways, and that would harm the rest. Fourth, there are a number of ways that the union members can use in trying to solve this problem - different methods may work on different people. But one thing is sure - if any member says he won't pay dues because the free riders don't, he is playing the game of the union's enemies. If such an idea were put into practice on a wide scale, there would be no union, no contract, no benefits, no protection - who would gain from that?

Bert: I get it - those who are so vocal about the free riders should direct their energy in that direction, not at us, the leadership. We have tried, and we will try, to recruit everyone we represent, but we won't do it all ourselves, and we have more important duties than that. The point is, don't let the free rider thing be used to weaken the union.

Fran: Our state law forbids the union shop or agency shop in public employment such as ours.

Bert: Can't the law be changed?

Fran: Sure, either way, and that means danger. Those who are in the best position to know say that the present law on labor's rights is not perfect, but, considering the present state legislature, any effort to change the law will make it worse. If we had a more pro-labor legislature, the law might be improved, but that seems out of the question just now(1). (p. 43)

Evaluation

(1) This dramatization does not mention the Right to Work issue by name, but discusses the issue as "the free rider problem". Its entire tone is biased and obviously inflammatory. There is no attempt to balance the presentation, and in fact, there is an active attempt, with phrases like "those few kooks, lame-brains, or spongers who won't join the union", to discredit anyone who refrains from union membership.

THE STORY OF LABOR IN AMERICAN HISTORY, A Resource Unit for Senior High School American History; John C. Matlon; Minnesota AFL-CIO and the Minnesota Federation of Teachers.

Text

(Under Outline of Content heading)

2. Nevertheless, anti-labor(1) "right-to-work" laws were enacted in 1946 by Arizona, South Dakota, and Nebraska. (p. 20)

(Under Teaching Procedures heading)

55. Copy, verifax, or make a transparency of the map depicting states which have enacted right to work legislation which appears in the appendix...The following are some of the questions which might be asked.

a. Why is the title "right to work" a misnomer?(2)
b. Why are these laws enacted?
c. Economically speaking, what type of states tend to have right to work laws?
d. Politically speaking?
e. Is this information up to date?(3)
f. What is the trend in the enactment of this law by other states? Why? (p. 38)

Evaluation

(1) Right to Work laws are not anti-labor. They protect the rights of the labor force by protecting the right of each worker to join a union or not, as he sees fit.

(2) This question is loaded. It presumes that the title Right to Work is a "misnomer".

(3) The information referred to, a map depicting states with Right to Work legislation, is not up to date. The fault for this lies with the publishers of The Story of Labor in American History, but by having the teacher call the attention of the students to the fact that the materials are out of date, the question discredits the Right to Work issue. (The map referred to was printed in 1956.)

YOU AS AN EMPLOYEE IN THE WORLD OF WORK, University of Hawaii.

Text

Most workers who join a union do so voluntarily, although in some cases membership is a requirement for work. Unions claim that because every worker benefits from the contract, each one should pay his share of the expenses of the union activity which produces the contract(1)... (p. 76-77)

Union security(2) may be defined as any provision in a contract designed to protect the organization from the undermining or erosion of its numerical strength.

Union security is important to collective bargaining because a union gains its strength through member support. All workers in the bargaining unit benefit from collective bargaining, and the union is required by law to represent them all, whether or not they are members. Thus, workers who are not members and do not pay dues weaken the union(3).

Evaluation

NOTE: This resource unit for students studying labor was produced by the Center for Labor-Management Education, University of Hawaii, in cooperation with many of the state's labor unions and organizations. It is endorsed by the State Industry-Education-Labor Coordinating Council. Although the Right to Work is not mentioned directly, compulsory unionism is discussed.

(1) This union claim is not balanced by the fact that it was the unions that demanded and got exclusive representation...the privilege of bargaining for all members of a company's bargaining unit (Wagner Act, 1935). The non-union worker is represented by the union whether he wants to be or not.

(2) "Union security" should not be used without qualification. Proponents of the Right to Work consider the phrase a euphemism for compulsory unionism.

(3) See numbers (1) and (2).

YOUR WORK & YOUR CAREER; Bertram L. Linder & Edwin Selzer; William H. Sadlier, Inc.

Text

Many employers favor the open shop(1). If few of their employees are union members, the union is likely to be weak. The union cannot claim to speak for all the workers in a plant. How could a strike called by such a union hope to be effective? More than likely, the nonunion workers would cross union picket lines. The employer is generally under no great pressure to negotiate with the strikers in such matters as job security, wages, and fringe benefits(2).

In a union shop, newly hired workers must become union members after they have been on the job for a certain specified period of time. Why do union workers strongly favor a union shop(3)? Most workers with a knowledge of the history of labor unions realize that only collective strength has enabled unions to attain higher wages, shorter hours, and improvements in working conditions. In fact, every worker today receives higher wages and all the other benefits because union members in the past struggled so hard to attain them. Union workers feel that it is only right and just for all new workers to join the union since they are enjoying all the benefits for which the union fought. To them, joining a union is not only a way of preserving the collective strength needed to win new gains for the workers; it is also a way of paying a debt to those union members who struggled in the past(4).

Seventeen states, most of them with little industry, have enacted right-to-work laws which outlaw the union shop. These states are Arizona, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Iowa, Kansas, Mississippi, Nebraska, Nevada, North Carolina, North Dakota, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia, and Wyoming(5).

Labor unions, of course, strongly oppose right-to-work laws. They argue that in most states having these laws, wages are low. Factory workers in these states earn much less than factory workers in other states. Union leaders maintain that right-to-work laws interfere with the union in organizing workers. These leaders insist that the union shop bolsters union strength and is in the best interest of all workers(6). (pp. 65-66)

Evaluation

(1) This sentence misleads the reader into believing that only employers favor the open shop. The open shop, or the Right to Work, is supported by people from all corners of society, union and non-union members alike. (In a survey conducted by the Opinion Research Corporation in March, 1976, 49% of the union members surveyed favored the working arrangement in which "a man can hold a job whether or not he belongs to a union", over the arrangement in which "a man can get a job if he doesn't already belong, but has to join after he is hired".)

(2) The conclusions made in this paragraph reflect an obvious bias. The argument being made throughout the paragraph is based on the presumption that a union, even though supported by "few employees", is nevertheless, desirable.

It is true that if few employees are union members, then the union is likely to be weak. However, if few employees are union members, then most employees don't want to be union members. Of course, such a union "can not claim to speak for all the workers in a plant". Why should it? If this theoretical union can maintain membership only by compulsion, then obviously its aims are at odds with those of its potential membership.

(3) Union workers do not "strongly favor a union shop". (See Number (1) above).

(4) This is not fact, but opinion. It is another expression of the free rider argument. The other side of the argument is that the non-union worker is represented by the union whether he wants to be or not. (It is the unions who demanded and got "exclusive representation", the privilege of being the sole representative of the bargaining unit. That privilege is granted under the Wagner Act of 1935).

(5) This statement is incorrect. Twenty states have Right to Work laws. Alabama, Louisiana, and Texas are missing from the list.

(6) This paragraph gives all the arguments made by union officials against the Right to Work and none of the arguments for it.

THE FACTS ABOUT RIGHT TO WORK LAWS

Right to Work laws are now in effect in 20 states. The laws are federally sanctioned by Section 14(b) of the Labor-Management Relations Act (the Taft-Hartley Act), a federal statute amending the Wagner Act of 1935. (The Taft-Hartley Act became law on June 23, 1947). Eleven states, however, had Right to Work laws before passage of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Section 14(b):

> Nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the execution or application of agreements requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment in any State or Territory in which such execution or application is prohibited by State or Territorial law.

States With Right to Work Laws:

BY CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION

State	Date
Arizona	November 5, 1946
Arkansas	November 7, 1944
Florida	November 7, 1944
Kansas	November 4, 1958
Mississippi ***	June 7, 1960
Nebraska	December 11, 1946
South Dakota	July 1, 1947

BY STATUTE

State	Date
Alabama	August 28, 1953
Georgia	March 27, 1947
Iowa	April 28, 1947
Louisiana	July 9, 1976
Nevada	December 4, 1952
North Carolina	March 18, 1947
North Dakota	June 29, 1948
South Carolina	March 19, 1954
Tennessee	February 21, 1947
Texas	April 8, 1947
Utah	May 10, 1955
Virginia	January 12, 1947
Wyoming	February 8, 1963

***In Mississippi, the Right to Work is also sanctioned by statute.

Sample Right to Work Law (Iowa):

"Section 736A.1. Right to join union. -- It is declared to be the policy of the State of Iowa that no person within its boundaries shall be deprived of the right to work at his chosen occupation for any employer because of membership in, affiliation with, withdrawal or expulsion from, or refusal to join, any labor union, organization, or association, and any contract which contravenes this policy is illegal and void."

"Section 736A.2. Refusal to employ prohibited. -- It shall be unlawful for any person, firm, association or corporation to refuse or deny employment to any person because of membership in, or affiliation with, or resignation or withdrawal from, a labor union, organization or association, or because of refusal to join or affiliate with a labor union, organization or association."

"Section 736A.3. Contracts to exclude unlawful. -- It shall be unlawful for any person, firm, association, corporation or labor organization to enter into any understanding, contract, or agreement, whether written or oral, to exclude from employment members of a labor union, organization or association, or persons who do not belong to, or who refuse to join, a labor union, organization or association, or because of resignation or withdrawal therefrom."

"Section 736A.4. Union dues as prerequisite to employment-prohibited: -- It shall be unlawful for any person, firm, association, labor organization or corporation, or political subdivision, either directly or indirectly, or in any manner or by any means as a prerequisite to or a condition of employment to require any person to pay dues, charges, fees, contributions, fines or assesments to any labor union, labor association, or labor organization."

COMMENTS: THE USE OF "SO-CALLED" AND "LABOR"

Many textbooks, as indicated in their evaluations, use the term "so-called" in referring to Right to Work laws. To understand fully why that phrase is objectionable, see the following editorial, reprinted from the Houston, Texas CHRONICLE, and the comments that precede it.

The second editorial, "Who is Labor?" from the Norfolk, Virginia TIMES ADVOCATE, deals with misuse of the term "labor". This misuse also applies to textbooks, where "labor" is often misused to mean "labor unions" or "labor union officials".

So-Called Comment on 'So-Called'

The editorial reprinted below is particularly appropriate in view of the occasional use of the phrase "so-called Right to Work laws" in stories about the issues of compulsory vs. voluntary unionism.

For your information the World Book Encyclopedia defines a Right to Work law as one which "provides that a person need not belong to a union to get or keep a job." Encylopaedia Britannica defines them as "...state laws forbidding various union security measures...under which workers are required to join a union within a specified time after they begin employment..." And Encyclopedia Americana says, "The laws state that no one shall be denied the right to work because of membership or non-membership in a labor union. That is, union membership or nonmembership cannot be a condition of obtaining or continuing in employment."

The use of the phrase "so-called" in connection with Right to Work very likely stems from the charge by union officials that a Right to Work law is a misnomer. But if, as the unions argue, the three-word term is inaccurate; what about the word "labor" to describe the minority special interests promoted by officials of organized labor?

Editorial from the Houston, Texas, Chronicle removed by ERIC to conform with copyright laws.

STATES WITH STATEWIDE TEXTBOOK ADOPTIONS

The following states adopt textbooks at the state level. Textbook adoption is most commonly the function of textbook committees within the state's department of education.

Alabama
Arkansas
Florida
Georgia
Hawaii
Idaho
Indiana
Kentucky
Louisiana
Mississippi
Nevada
New Mexico
North Carolina
Oklahoma
Oregon
South Carolina
Tennessee
Texas
Utah
Virginia

(California adopts elementary texts, but not high school texts, at the state level).