

Good example of minicase #2: qualifications for union office essay

[Law](#)



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

In this case, I am in agreement with the minority. Every organization establish rules to set guidelines as to how every member should behave. All members are expected to adhere to these rules in order for the group to achieve its goals. The attendance rule was not a recent addition to the standing rules of the union, which meant every member knew about it. If 96.5 percent of the members were disqualified from union office, then perhaps only the remaining 3.5 percent of the members had the genuine desire to lead the union and adhered to its rules in order to qualify for office.

The requirement of being present in at least 50 percent of the total number of meetings in three years does not seem unreasonable if one wants to occupy a position. It is only right for an aspiring union officer to learn the affairs of the union and be able to identify issues that should be addressed and attend to them once s/he is in position. Also, attending meetings regularly is a good way to set examples for the members to follow. If union officers are seen involved, other members may also be inspired to take active participation in the activities of the union.

The attendance rule was a part of what constitutes the union. Therefore, implementing it even if it meant excluding majority of the members from candidacy was not an act of interference to its internal affairs or a hindrance to Landrum-Griffin Act's goal to assure that unions would have democratic elections (UAW). If the members perceived this rule to be unreasonable, it should have been brought up for discussion before the three-year period requirement started and not anytime near the election period. Instead, they would have to wait for the new officers to get elected before they can request for the amendment of the said rule.

Work Cited

“ Landrum-Griffin Act.” UAW. UAW Solidarity House, 2013. Web. 22 Feb. 2014.