



NATIONAL RIGHT TO WORK NEWSLETTER

VOLUME 56, NUMBER 8

www.nrtwc.org

August 2010

Committee Trips Up Government Union Sneak Play *Public-Safety Forced Unionism Still High on Capitol Hill Agenda*

The American people do not support Big Labor's legislative scheme to establish a new federal mandate imposing union "exclusive representation" (monopoly bargaining) over state and local police, firefighters, and other public-safety employees nationwide.

And powerful union-label politicians like U.S. House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) and U.S. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.) know this public-safety scheme (H.R.413/S.3194) is unpopular. That's why they have repeatedly tried to sneak it through Congress.

Most recently, in June, Ms. Pelosi and her top lieutenants cut a deal with AFL-CIO President Richard Trumka and other union bigwigs to attach H.R.413, the House version of the Police/Fire Monopoly-Bargaining Bill, to a massive spending bill that provides funding for U.S. troops.

International Association of Firefighters (IAFF) union boss Harold Schaitberger openly admitted to helping concoct the scheme to tack H.R.413 on to H.R.4899, the Fiscal Year (FY) 2010 Supplemental Appropriations Act, in a June 30 message to officers of his union subsidiaries. Early last month, the National Right to Work Committee obtained a copy of Mr. Schaitberger's communication.

Firefighters Union Chief 'Argued Strongly' For War Supplemental Strategy

Mr. Schaitberger reported that he had "argued strongly" for attaching H.R.413 "to the War Supplemental funding proposal for our troops in Afghanistan."



CREDIT: AP

On July 1, Speaker Nancy Pelosi and her cohorts sneaked public-safety forced-unionism legislation through the House

as part of a giant defense spending bill. But this Pelosi/Big Labor scheme later fizzled under public scrutiny.

The backroom deal between House leaders and the union hierarchy allowed the public-safety forced-unionism measure to come to the floor so quickly that Right to Work members and their allies had virtually no time to mobilize for the vote.

On July 1, the House rubber-stamped H.R.413 as a provision of H.R.4899. With very few exceptions, the national media overlooked the fact that a pro-forced unionism federal takeover of state and local labor-management relations had been approved as part of an unrelated spending bill.

However, despite the media's cluelessness, millions of Right to Work members and supporters around the country were well aware of what was going on, because the Committee was informing and mobilizing them through e-mails, phone calls, and "snail" mail.

For several weeks in July, freedom-loving Americans mobilized by the Committee campaign contacted their senators again and again, urging them to oppose H.R.4899 on all votes unless and

See **Fight** page 2

Legislative Fight Far From Over

Continued from page 1

until the public-safety union monopoly-bargaining amendment was removed.

Several organizations representing the interests of local governments and public-safety departments, such as the National Sheriffs' Association, joined with the Committee in lobbying against the forced-unionism sneak play.

The message clearly got through to a number of senators who normally vote with Big Labor, but are getting antsy and antsy about their next election, regardless of whether they have to face the voters this year, or not until 2012 or 2014.

On the evening of July 22, the Senate voted down the House-passed version of H.R.4899, and then approved a war spending bill without the monopoly-bargaining provision. Finally, on July 27, a chastened House acquiesced to the Senate's action, and sent a stripped-down war supplemental to President Obama's desk.

Vast Majority of Americans Reject Monopoly Bargaining

H.R.413 and its Senate companion, S.3194, would force countless police officers, firefighters and EMT's to accept as their monopoly-bargaining agent a union they never voted for, and want nothing to do with.

Moreover, H.R.413 and S.3194 would, in practice, force tens of thousands of first responders to pay union dues or fees as a condition of keeping their jobs -- despite Big Labor claims to the contrary.

"Americans overwhelmingly oppose monopoly bargaining and forced union dues, period," noted Committee President Mark Mix.

"The public certainly has no interest in backing legislation designed to help Big Labor grab monopoly-bargaining privileges over hundreds of thousands of additional employees."

Decades of polling confirm this point. Mr. Mix cited one recent scientific nationwide survey.

This poll found that 81% of Americans who regularly vote in statewide elections believe that employees in unionized businesses should retain the right to bargain for themselves. Just 17% of regular voters believe employees should not have that right, while 2% are unsure.

"Forcing union nonmembers to accept public-safety union officials as their monopoly-bargaining agent is what H.R.413 and S.3194 are all about," explained Mr. Mix.

"Any state law or local ordinance authorizing public-safety union bosses to bargain on behalf of their members only would get tossed in the scrapheap if either measure became law.

"And, as Service Employees International Union second-in-command Anna Burger recently boasted, H.R.413/S.3194 would 'create a national collective,' i.e. monopoly, 'bargaining standard for all public workers.'

"H.R.413/S.3194 simply can't withstand public scrutiny. And Big Labor congressional leaders know it."

Right to Work Committee And Its Members Will Keep Turning up the Heat

"Enactment of H.R.413 or S.3194 would be disastrous, not just for independent-minded public-safety officers and Right to Work advocates, but also for taxpayers and citizens who depend on their local police and fire departments," Mr. Mix continued.

"That's why the National Right to Work Committee and its members can't afford to rest on our laurels for a minute. We will keep turning up the heat in preparation for the next Capitol Hill showdown over this legislation.

"Despite their recent setback, Harold Schaitberger, Richard Trumka, and the rest of the union hierarchy are far from ready to give up on their bid to federalize public-safety union monopoly bargaining.

"A number of the senators who helped defeat the public-safety scheme last month, when they were facing intense pressure from pro-Right to Work constituents, are current or previous cosponsors of this power grab.

"Right to Work supporters shouldn't, and won't, make the mistake of assuming such senators will be with us if, as is likely, Congress takes up H.R.413/S.3194 again this fall.

"Freedom-loving Americans must even be prepared for a possible showdown on this legislation during a 'lame duck' congressional session in November or December, after the elections, but before the new House and Senate are seated.

"Enactment of H.R.413/S.3194 would deal a harsh blow to the Right to Work cause.

"I know Committee members and supporters across the country understand that fact, and will do all they can to stop this legislation." 



Firefighters union czar Harold Schaitberger (left, shown here with union-label U.S. Sen. Chris Dodd) has

actually bragged about holding funds for U.S. troops abroad hostage to legislation expanding his monopoly privileges.

CREDIT: JDEETH.BLOGSPOT.COM

Forced-Unionism Issue Hot in West Virginia

Would-Be U.S. Senators Urged to Stand Up to Big Labor Bosses

West Virginia Gov. Joe Manchin (D) is an unabashed proponent of labor laws foisting union monopoly bargaining on public employees and government agencies.

As recently as this June, in an interview with the Charleston *Daily Mail*, Mr. Manchin endorsed a state law forcing local school boards in West Virginia to grant a single teacher union the power to speak for all teachers in their district, including those who don't want to join.

According to the *Daily Mail's* account, the governor actually said that such a monopoly-bargaining law would constitute a "solution" to "West Virginia's education woes"!

Fortunately for independent-minded public employees and taxpayers, West Virginia legislators have up to now refused to send to the governor's desk legislation handing government union bosses monopoly power to bargain over public employee salaries, benefits, and work rules.

Unfortunately, Mr. Manchin may soon have the opportunity to mandate union monopoly bargaining over West Virginia's local public employees without the cooperation of the state's Senate and House of Delegates.

Next U.S. Senator From West Virginia Could Cast Deciding Vote on Reid Bill

In the Democratic primary late this month to determine the party's nominee for the U.S. Senate seat formerly held by the late Robert Byrd, Joe Manchin is considered the strong favorite. So far polls indicate that, if nominated, he will be the front-runner in the general election as well.

State AFL-CIO union bosses have endorsed Mr. Manchin for senator, making it plain that, if he is elected, they expect him to support "public employee collective [i.e., monopoly] bargaining" in the U.S. Senate.

The U.S. Congress is already dangerously close to passing legislation that would mandate union monopoly bargaining over state and local public-safety employees across the country.

And this scheme, introduced in the Senate as S.3194 by Big Labor Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.),



Like President Obama, Gov. Joe Manchin has an established record of supporting union monopoly bargaining.

As a U.S. senator, Mr. Manchin could help Big Labor corral state and local employees nationwide into unions.

would pave the way for federal legislation mandating union monopoly bargaining over front-line state and local public employees of all kinds.

"So far, Right to Work members and supporters have, through their dedication and generosity, succeeded in blocking Harry Reid's Police/Fire Monopoly-Bargaining Bill," noted National Right to Work Committee Vice President Doug Stafford.

"But if Joe Manchin becomes West Virginia's next U.S. senator, and refuses to budge from his current pro-monopoly bargaining stance, he could cast the deciding vote in favor of the Reid bill.

"I know freedom-loving West Virginians will do everything they can to prevent that from happening."

Federal Survey Program Invites All Candidates to Support Right to Work

Mr. Stafford continued: "This fall, assuming he gets the Democratic nod, Mr. Manchin will face increasing pressure to repudiate public-sector union monopoly bargaining and other forms of forced unionism, thanks to

the Committee's federal candidate Survey 2010."

As longtime Committee members know, the federal candidate survey invites U.S. congressional candidates to pledge to oppose forced unionism consistently and support national Right to Work legislation if elected.

The survey is one of the Committee's most effective tools. In West Virginia, Senate candidates in both major parties are now getting a chance to return their surveys and answer 100% in favor of Right to Work.

But in the fall, more and more Right to Work supporters will be mobilized to lobby the Democratic and Republican standard bearers to pledge to support employees' freedom to get and hold a job without being forced to accept unwanted union "representation" or pay union dues.

"The success of the survey program is key for the Committee's future ability to defeat Big Labor power grabs in Congress and, ultimately, pass a national Right to Work law," said Mr. Stafford.

"For that reason, the Survey 2010 is targeting not just the West Virginia Senate race, but critical Senate and House campaigns across the country." 📧

Why Are Oakland Burglars Breathing Easier?

Public-Safety Union Monopoly Undercuts California Law Enforcement

On Tuesday, July 13, Oakland, Calif., became a friendlier place for burglars, embezzlers, car thieves, bad-check passers, extortionists, and an array of other criminals.

That afternoon, Oakland, a major West Coast port city with roughly 400,000 residents, laid off 80 police officers, or 10% of its force, to help eliminate a budget deficit of over \$30 million. In response, the city police department implemented a new policy in which officers aren't being dispatched to take reports for 44 "lower priority" crimes.

Oaklanders whose homes or vehicles are burglarized must now go online or visit a police station to file reports. However, the police department warns them that, even if they do: "There will be no follow-up investigation, and the primary reason for filing the report is for insurance purposes."

Why is the city recently reported to have the fourth highest violent crime rate in the country slashing the number of cops it employs? Some observers are blaming the recent national recession, which hit California especially hard.

But despite the recession-induced decline in Oakland's tax revenues over the past couple of years, city officials could still have avoided laying off police this summer -- if their hands weren't tied by California labor policies that promote monopolistic unionism in the public sector.

Decades ago, Big Labor California politicians rubber-stamped legislation



CREDIT: AP

Police Chief Anthony Batts to Oaklanders: If your home is burglarized, don't call us.

forcing local police departments to allow the agents of a single union to speak for all the police on their force, including those who haven't joined the union and want nothing to do with it, on matters of pay, benefits, and work rules.

Government Union Bosses Prefer Service Cutbacks To Other Alternatives

The same union monopoly-bargaining system was foisted on California fire departments, school districts, prisons, and other government agencies.

As a consequence of government union bosses' special privileges, California elected officials who face fiscal crises must get Big Labor's permission before they can attempt to get their budgets back in order by changing the way employees are compensated.

For example, in Oakland, like in many other California jurisdictions, government union-promoted work rules make it almost impossible for police supervisors to schedule officers to work when and where they are needed during their regular eight-hour shifts.

Consequently, local taxpayers rack up enormous overtime costs.

Changing Big Labor scheduling restrictions and other work rules could easily have reduced the Oakland police department's compensation expenses by as much as laying off 10% of the force does.

However, police union bosses rejected all proposals that would have resulted in a significant net reduction in taxpayers' compensation costs, making layoffs unavoidable.

"When times are bad, government union bosses generally prefer layoffs that reduce services to other alternatives, partly because they know the layoffs will, very likely, only be temporary," commented National Right to Work Committee Vice President Matthew Leen. "Consequently, structural problems never get resolved."

Will U.S. Congress Make Matters Worse?

"That Californians have to deal with this is bad enough," Mr. Leen continued.

"But incredibly, just as Golden State Congressman Brad Sherman [D] wants to foist private-sector forced union dues on all 50 states [see p. 5 for details], other Big Labor politicians are eager to federalize the public-sector union monopolies that are dragging California cities down.

"Their vehicle is S.3194/H.R.413, sponsored by Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid [D-Nev.] and union-label Congressman Dale Kildee [D-Mich.]. Unless it is stopped, this legislation could bring Oakland's woes to other cities across America."

For more information on S.3194/H.R.413, the Police/Fire Monopoly-Bargaining Bill, see pp. 1-2.

NATIONAL RIGHT TO WORK NEWSLETTER

www.nrtwc.org

August 2010

Written and Distributed by:

National Right to Work Committee®

8001 Braddock Road
Springfield, Va. 22160

E-mail: Members@NRTW.org

Mark Mix President

Reed Larson Exec. Cmte. Chairman

Stephen Goodrick Vice President

Matthew Leen Vice President

Doug Stafford Vice President

Stanley Greer Newsletter Editor

Editorial comments only: stg@nrtwc.org

Contact the Membership Department by phoning 1-800-325-RTWC (7892) or (703) 321-9820, or faxing (703) 321-7143, if you wish to:

- Report address changes or corrections
- Receive the NEWSLETTER or request, renew, or cancel Committee membership
- Obtain more information

Because of NRTWC's tax-exempt status under IRC Sec. 501 (C) (4) and its state and federal legislative activities, contributions are not tax deductible as charitable contributions (IRC § 170) or as business deductions (IRC § 162(e)(1)).

© 2010 by the National Right to Work Committee®. Permission to reprint individual articles granted. Credit requested.

'Nowhere to Flee' Sherman Strikes Again

Union-Label Solon Bringing Back Right to Work Destruction Scheme

Big Labor Democratic Congressman Brad Sherman thinks he knows how to stop employees and employers from fleeing forced-unionism states like his native California: Make sure there's nowhere in the country they can go where the Right to Work is protected.

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, between April 1, 2000 and July 1, 2009, a net total of 1.51 million Californians left the Golden State.

And the reason there is a huge net outflow of people, disproportionately young employees and entrepreneurs, from California to other states isn't because Americans have suddenly grown tired of sunny days and moderate temperatures!

From 2000-2009, Net Total Of Five Million Americans Fled Forced-Unionism States

Rather, people are leaving California, over which forced dues-collecting government union bosses now wield more power than ever before, because they can find much better job opportunities and earn higher real incomes elsewhere -- typically in a Right to Work state.

Right to Work laws now on the books in 22 states protect employees, both private- and public-sector, from being fired for refusal to pay dues or so-called "agency" fees to an unwanted union.

Overall, from 2000 to 2009, a net total of 4.97 million Americans moved from forced-unionism states and Washington, D.C., to Right to Work states. That's on top of a net population transfer of nearly five million Americans to Right to Work states during the 1990's.

Mr. Sherman Would 'Level Playing Field' by Imposing Forced Dues Nationwide

Over the years, respected economists have shown time and again that living costs are lower, and real incomes are higher, in Right to Work states than in forced-union-dues states. Scholars who have reported such findings include Dr. James Bennett, of George Mason University's Nobel Prize-winning economics department, and Dr. Barry Poulson, past president of the North American Economics and Finance Association.



CREDIT: WWW.HOUSE.GOV

Once they finish their education, droves of young Californians are fleeing to Right to Work states, where real

incomes are higher. Golden State Rep. Brad Sherman (center) wants to deny them the chance to flee.

Both employees and businesses benefit from being able to flee high-cost, high-tax, forced-unionism states like California.

But to forced-unionism zealots like Mr. Sherman, the existence of a Right to Work alternative creates an "uneven playing field" that must be flattened by a new federal law imposing forced dues and fees nationwide.

This summer, Mr. Sherman is circulating among his colleagues a letter urging them to join him in sponsoring legislation that would wipe out all 22 current state Right to Work laws by repealing Section 14(b) of the federal Taft-Hartley Act, which explicitly authorizes states to enact such laws.

If this scheme were to become law, private-sector employees in Right to Work states would no longer be protected from being forced to pay union dues or fees as a job condition, though states would retain the ability to protect state and local government employees' Right to Work.

National Right to Work Committee President Mark Mix recalled that Mr. Sherman had previously introduced his 14(b) Repeal Bill in 2008, before

forced-unionism apologist Barack Obama became President.

"Of course, the time was not yet ripe for a full-scale attack on 14(b) in 2008. Even today, union strategists appear to be nervous about trying to ram such legislation through Congress," Mr. Mix noted.

Brad Sherman 'Says What Big Labor Is Thinking'

"Nevertheless, Mr. Sherman's union-boss patrons clearly don't mind that he is beating the drum for 14(b) repeal now, because Right to Work destruction is their goal. Brad Sherman says what Big Labor is thinking," Mr. Mix continued.

"Right to Work supporters should take heed: Unless they can break Big Labor's stranglehold on Congress this year, they must expect to have to fight in 2011 and 2012 not just against familiar power grabs like the 'card-check' forced-unionism bill, but also for the very preservation of state Right to Work laws.

"Big Labor puppet that he is, Congressman Sherman has done Right to Work supporters a favor by reminding them what is at stake." 📌

Union Dons Take Care of Themselves, Not Workers

Unlike Unionized Workers' Pension Funds, Union Bosses' Are Secure

There's no denying the fact that federal labor law grants union officials extraordinary power over unionized employees. More candid apologists for union monopoly bargaining and forced union dues and fees have long acknowledged that fact.

Authorizing union bosses to get workers who don't wish to join a union fired for refusing to fork over union dues or fees is coercion, blunt Big Labor apologists concede, but it is for the workers' "own good."

In Practice, Forced Unionism Is Impossible to Defend

Big Labor academic Allan Pulsipher once explicitly defended compulsory unionism as a "legitimate form of coercion in a free market economy!"

Reasonable people may disagree about whether it is theoretically possible that a worker could benefit from being forced to allow an unwanted union to have "exclusive" power to negotiate with the business over his or her pay, benefits, and working conditions.

Some well-intentioned people might even be able to defend, in theory, forcing workers to pay dues or fees for Big Labor "services" they didn't ask for, and don't want.

However, practical experience shows that union bosses rarely wield their coercive privileges to achieve objectives furnishing long-term benefits to unionized workers. Instead, union dons take care of themselves.

Union Chiefs 'Know How to Fund a Pension Plan Properly, If They Choose to'

One remarkable example of how forced unionism benefits union bosses, not workers, pertains to pension funds.

As economists Diana Furchtgott-Roth and Andrew Brown pointed out in a well-documented study for the Hudson Institute late last year, the pensions that monopolistic unions negotiate for workers are disproportionately underfunded, compared with other pensions.

In 2006, for example, the last year completely unaffected by the recent recession, only 17% of union-negotiated pension plans were fully



CREDIT: C-SPAN

Mark Mix: Enactment of a national Right to Work law "would greatly strengthen union officials' incentive to

do what's best for the employees they purport to represent, rather than feather their own nests."

funded according to the criteria established by the federal Pension Protection Act (PPA).

Under the PPA, pension funds that have less than 80% of the assets needed to pay out scheduled benefits are considered "endangered." In 2006, 41% of union-negotiated funds were endangered. In fact, union-negotiated funds were three times as likely to be endangered as nonunion funds.

And union-negotiated plans were 13 times more likely (13% vs. 1%) to fall under the PPA's "critical" status, reserved for pensions that are less than 65% funded.

As Ms. Furchtgott-Roth pointed out in a follow-up op-ed for the *New York Daily News*, union chiefs "know how to fund a pension plan properly, if they choose to."

She and Mr. Brown sampled 30 union professional staff pensions "among unions that sponsor the largest 46 rank-and-file" multiemployer plans and found that union bosses' own plans "were 93% funded," whereas the worker plans had only 70% "of the funds needed to satisfy their obligations."

'A Worker Is the Best Judge of Whether He or She Benefits From Unionism'

National Right to Work Committee President Mark Mix commented:

"The recent Hudson Institute study contrasting the pension security of unionized employees with those of union-free employees and of union bosses illustrates the fact that employees are typically harmed, not helped, by compulsory unionism.

"Undoubtedly, some employees believe they benefit from being in a union. But the system only works for employees as a group and for the country when we trust employees to join and pay dues to the union voluntarily.

"A worker is the best judge of whether he or she benefits from unionism."

Mr. Mix concluded that the Hudson Institute pension study reaffirms the need for passage of the National Right to Work Act, introduced in the current Congress by Iowa GOP Rep. Steve King as H.R.4107.

H.R.4107 would repeal all federal labor-law provisions that authorize the firing of employees for refusal to pay union dues or fees.

Enactment of this bill, Mr. Mix noted, "would greatly strengthen union officials' incentive to do what's best for the employees they purport to represent, rather than feather their own nests."

He encouraged Committee members across the country to contact their congressmen and urge them to cosponsor H.R.4107, the National Right to Work Act, if they have not already done so. 📧

Beating Big Labor Takes Time

Continued from page 8

Dr. Vedder concluded: While alternative models "might offer somewhat different conclusions, . . . based on existing evidence, a strong case can be made" that Right to Work laws "have a positive impact on U.S. living standards."

But despite all the evidence of Right to Work laws' economic benefits, and despite the fact that nearly 80% of Americans who regularly vote support the Right to Work as a matter of principle, passing a state Right to Work law is never easy.

Unions that file federal disclosure forms rake in a total of roughly \$20 billion a year in (mostly forced) dues and fees, government grants, rents, interest, and other revenues. And union bosses deploy a huge share of that money for politics and lobbying.

Freedom-Loving Citizens Must Be Mobilized to Pass More Right to Work Laws

If freedom-loving citizens are to counter successfully the might of the union political machine and prevail upon their elected officials to adopt a state Right to Work law, they must first be mobilized.

For years, grass-roots efforts to pass Right to Work legislation in the Midwest have been assisted by state groups like the Lansing-based Michigan Right to Work Committee and the Indianapolis-based Indiana Right to Work Committee.

In state after state this summer, these groups are mobilizing pro-Right to Work citizens to contact their legislative and executive candidates with thousands of postcards, letters, and phone calls urging them to oppose forced unionism.

Already, many politicians who were riding the fence have decided to take a stand in favor of Right to Work.

"Michigan, Ohio, Illinois and Indiana have long had reputations as Big Labor strongholds," commented Mr. Mix. "Union bosses remain very powerful in much of the Midwest, largely because of their government-backed domination of public-sector employment.

"However, when a state's private-sector job gains are paltry or negative during periods of nationwide economic growth, and its job losses are out-sized during recessions, then its citizens eventually get fed up.



CREDIT: OHIOALUMNI.ORG

Dr. Richard Vedder: Right to Work laws "have a positive impact on U.S. living standards."

"Once a critical mass of ordinary people become determined to change the way their state operates, union special interests can't stop them.

"That's why, in 2010, the pressure on Great Lakes state politicians to support Right to Work is mounting, even in Michigan, of all places!"

Right to Work Laws A Matter of Principle

Mr. Mix added that a desire to make their states more economically successful is not the sole motivation for supporters of state Right to Work legislative efforts:

"The Right to Work is a matter of principle as well as economics. Right to Work laws' fundamental purpose is to protect the employee's personal freedom of choice.

"Commitment to principle helps explain why so many National Committee members who live in a state that already has a Right to Work law are eager to offer their assistance to efforts to pass such laws in the remaining 28 forced-unionism states.

"No American should be forced to join or bankroll a union as a condition of employment. That's why the Committee also continues to work for passage of national Right to Work legislation repealing all federal labor-law provisions that authorize forced union dues and fees.

"Effectively, that would make all 50 states Right to Work states." 📞



CREDIT: KYVA GIBBONS / SPECIAL TO THE DETROIT NEWS

Seemingly endless private-sector job losses have driven many natives of forced-unionism states in the Midwest to

move out. But others are vying for a better future by backing state Right to Work legislation.

Job Losses Increase Pressure For Reform

Grass-Roots Right to Work Efforts Expanding in Midwestern States

All across America, Right to Work states have long benefited from economic growth far superior to that of states in which millions of employees are forced to join or pay dues or fees to a labor union just to keep their jobs.

But over the past decade, the contrast between Right to Work states and forced-union-dues states has been especially stark in the Midwest.

Four Midwestern forced-unionism states -- Michigan, Ohio, Illinois and Indiana -- suffered absolute private-sector job declines over the past decade that were worse than those of any of the other 46 states. Midwestern forced-unionism states (the four just mentioned, plus Missouri, Wisconsin and Minnesota) lost a net total of 1.88 million private-sector jobs.

Combined, these seven forced-unionism states had 8.1% fewer private-sector jobs in 2009 than they did back in 1999.

Meanwhile, the five Midwestern Right to Work states (North Dakota, Nebraska, South Dakota, Iowa and Kansas) experienced an overall private-sector job increase of 2.3%.

Moreover, from 1999 to 2009, real personal income in Midwestern Right to Work states grew by 17.3% -- an increase two-and-a-half times as great as the combined real personal income growth in Midwestern forced-unionism states.

State Right to Work laws prohibit the firing of employees simply for exercising their right to refuse to join or bankroll an unwanted union.

At this time, 22 states have Right to Work laws on the books. However, because of intensifying grass-roots efforts in many of the remaining 28 forced-unionism states, the number of Right to Work states could be on the rise over the course of the next few years.

Recession's End Won't Suffice to Revive Big Labor-Controlled States

"More and more citizens of Big Labor-controlled states like Michigan, Ohio, Illinois and Indiana recognize that their states require fundamental reform in order to get their economies



Pro-forced unionism politicians like Gov. Jennifer Granholm (D-Mich., shown here with former Vice President Gore and

President Obama) have lost credibility due to the extraordinarily poor economic performance of forced-unionism states.

back on track," observed National Right to Work Committee President Mark Mix.

"The fact is, compulsory unionism impedes private-sector job creation and income growth in every part of the business cycle. It's clear that the national recession's end won't suffice to turn Michigan, Ohio, Illinois and Indiana around.

"On the other hand, there is strong evidence that economically troubled states could greatly accelerate their job and income growth by passing Right to Work legislation."

One recent example of such evidence is a scholarly article by eminent economist Richard Vedder. A professor on the faculty of Ohio University in Athens, Ohio, and a specialist in labor, taxation and education issues, Dr. Vedder is the author of more than 100 academic papers as well as several books.

One of his books, coauthored with fellow Ohio University economist Lowell Galloway, is the acclaimed *Out of Work*. It received the Sir Anthony Fisher International Memorial Award and was also a Mencken Award Finalist.

In his article entitled "Right to Work Laws: Liberty, Prosperity, and Quality of Life," appearing in the Winter 2010

edition of *Cato Journal*, Dr. Vedder reported the results of a regression analysis he did to test the economic impact of Right to Work laws.

Right to Work Law 'Would Have Increased Per Capita Income by an Extra \$2760'

Specifically, Dr. Vedder sought "to relate the rate of growth in real per capita personal income from 1977 to 2007 for the 48 contiguous U.S. states to the existence" of Right to Work laws.

The analysis controlled for each state's tax burden, the share of its adults with college degrees, land area, and several other variables.

Dr. Vedder found "a very strong and highly statistically significant . . . positive relationship between" Right to Work laws and economic growth. He elaborated: Suppose two states both "had per capita income of \$24,000 in 1977."

Real per capita income in the state without Right to Work protections "would have risen to \$36,000 in 2007, compared to \$38,760" in the Right to Work state. Right to Work protections "would have increased per capita income by an extra \$2760 -- or over \$11,000 annually for a family of four."

See **Beating Big Labor** page 7