

The taft-hartleys act

[Business](#), [Human Resources](#)



Being a member of the National Labor relations Board, I would not set aside the election. My decision would rely on the Taft Hartley's provisions that accord managements have a right to engage in union campaigns and possibly influence outcomes by using technical force. The supervisor's act of passing by the meeting can, therefore, be regarded as a management's approach to influencing the elections' outcome. Interpretation of the act to mean that supervisors are part of an organization's management also supports this decision. The Taft-Hartley's act, therefore, supports the supervisor's action and the election is legal under the act (Bramball, 2012; DeCrew, 2003).

Alternatively, I would set aside the elections based on the Taft- Hartley provisions and the circumstances of the case. The law stipulates employees' freedom and the right to determine their representative union and prohibits any form of threat of reprisal from the employer. The supervisor, being a recognized representative of the employer, however, expressed interest in the union's meeting by making multiple appearances around the meeting. Such a repetitive act was therefore not coincidental and indicated a motive to influence employees' representation.