

Sweatshop and Employee Rights Protection

Yiting Wang^{1,a,*}

¹*Department of Communication and Journalism, Shandong University, Jinan, 250100, China*
a. 13882277673@163.com

**corresponding author*

Abstract: As the academic debate about sweatshops has become more complex, public attention to sweatshops has become more and more widespread, but the interests of sweatshop workers have not been completely improved. This paper will use the method of literature review to discuss how to effectively promote the improvement of workers' working conditions and raise their wages from the perspective of the development history of sweatshops and the government. The government should implement labor protection laws to protect the legal rights of workers in domestic and foreign factories. And in the continuous development of the national economy, for these workers to improve the working environment in the factory or find alternative jobs for them, and raise the minimum wage. With the deepening of research on sweatshops and the strengthening of the government's role in protecting workers' rights and interests, the interests of sweatshop workers in developing countries can continue to be improved.

Keywords: Sweatshop, labor right, government

1. Introduction

The purpose of this article is to discuss the development relationship between sweatshops and workers from the perspective of the government, and thus to discuss how the government can improve the working environment of workers and raise their minimum wage from the perspective of labor protection. According to one typical definition, a sweatshop is "any workplace where workers are generally required to meet two or more of the following conditions: to earn less than the country's overall poverty rate for working 48 hours a week; Systematic forced overtime; Systemic health and safety risks caused by negligence or willful neglect of employee welfare; Coercive; Systemic cheating that puts workers at risk; And underpaying." Since the advent of the sweatshop system in the 19th century, most pro-worker advocates have pointed the finger at those who profit from the exploitation of workers, and a big feature of the anti-sweatshop movement in the context of globalization is that it focuses almost exclusively on putting pressure on contractors at the head of the chain, while ignoring the role of government. Due to the different economic development of countries around the world, the strategies and results of governments in developed countries and developing countries are very different, such as the United States and Vietnam. At the same time, people with diametrically opposed views are putting pressure on the government to act.

Experts who oppose a ban on the sale of products made under sweatshop conditions argue that an outright government ban on the sale of sweatshop products would result in the loss of jobs for these workers, who may continue to work in sweatshops for lack of acceptable alternatives. Economists

like Nicholas Kristof, Paul Krugman, and Jeffrey Sachs have argued that sweatshop labor is preferable to the alternatives, these options include not having a job or rummaging through the trash for pennies a day. Some experts believe that the sale of products made in sweatshops should be banned, and that the treatment of workers in sweatshops is morally critical, and that their working conditions and minimum wages should be raised. And when asked if it would be possible for customers to pay a small additional fee to promote better working conditions for producers of goods, the vast majority said they would. According to a study by Robert Pollin, a mere 1.8% increase in the retail price of clothing in the United States would be enough to offset the cost of a 100% wage increase for sweatshop workers in Mexican clothing factories. But obviously, that's not the case.

My first paragraph will focus on the historical origin and development of sweatshops, and continue to explore the development of the relationship between factories and workers. The second paragraph is the comparison of the development of sweatshops in different countries. Since its origin, sweatshops in the United States have been highly concerned by the American people. In Vietnam, corporate social responsibility alone does not protect workers' interests, as in Hansersk's Vietnam plant, which is the latest example of CSR's failure to protect the health, safety and rights of workers in the global supply chain. The last paragraph I will mainly write about. In the face of the prevailing labor problems, what measures should the government take to protect the interests of workers to the greatest extent while protecting economic development?

2. Literature review

In sweatshop, harm, and Interference: A Contractualist Approach, as well as Sweatshop Regulation and Worker's Choices, both oppose the government's direct organization of workers to work in sweatshops, arguing that it will lead to unemployment. And in Hansae Vietnam's Garment Factories: The Latest example of Corporate Social Responsibility's failure to protect workers, an article details why companies struggle to improve conditions for workers in sweatshops and suggests that the government can play a big role. To sum up, this paper believes that the government should properly intervene in the production of sweatshops, rather than directly prevent the production of sweatshops, and protect the interests of workers while effectively implementing the national labor protection law.

3. Main body

According to Green, the word "sweat" first appears in English usage in the fifteenth century. According to Bender and Greenwald, immigrant women's labor in the textile industry was referred to as "sweating" in 1830, while Hapke used the term "la" to describe those who put in a lot of effort and frequently performed home tasks. Sweat factories are a product of rivalry between producers and business owners [1]. As sweatshops first appeared, the majority of the workers were women, immigrants, and minors, and the factories drastically cut pay in an effort to make more money. The term "sweatshop" gained significantly less attention in the early 20th century in the capitalist nations ruled by the United States. However, the phrase returned to their columns in the 1970s when American journalists were appalled to learn about the working conditions of some of the workshops in their major cities [2]. When sweatshops were exposed, the conditions of the workers there did not appear to significantly change. However, the anti-sweatshop movement that emerged in North America and Europe in the middle of the 1990s elevated the tactic of holding global consumer brand companies accountable to an art form and was successful in creating a vast global network of well-connected activists and ngos [2]. The impact on the brand image of many companies, while these companies have conducted effective public relations, despite public demands to improve the working conditions of workers, the effect seems to be minimal. When developed countries gradually increase their attention to sweatshops and gradually strengthen the protection of the interests of domestic

workers, these sweatshops go to developing countries and continue to harm the interests of workers in developing countries. So I think the fundamental problem of sweatshops has not been solved, it just moves from one country to another and continues to persecute workers' interests.

Sweatshops take many different shapes in America. Although sweater shops are found in practically every business, garment shops are the most prevalent [3]. From the late 1880s through the early 1890s, the word "sweatshop" entered the General English language [3]. The beginning of sweatshops in the United States is very early, so the prospects for investigating and researching sweatshops in the United States include broader labor protection measures. In 1892, the National Committee of the United States House of Representatives investigated the condition of sweatshops in New York, Chicago, and Boston, and proposed national regulations for the intercontinental clothing and cargo transportation industry, which had been proven effective [3]. Because officials went back to the city to inspect goods, and these inspections reflected cooperation that ended every other week in sanitary conditions and sweatshops [4]. Over time, more and more trade unions have developed due to the heterogeneity of workers in terms of gender and nationality, educational awareness, and permanent contract systems. The sweatshops in the clothing industry are gradually being eliminated by workers and women's organizations [5]. The rights of workers are granted by trade unions, while they use industrial intelligence to combat injustice against workers. At the same time, the United States attaches great importance to the promotion of the protection of labor interests in multiple fields. Different from some developing countries, the United States is also trying to publicize the protection of labor rights and interests in the education industry and resist sweatshops. Former Duke University president Nannerl O. Keohane is praised as a leader in higher education who is more receptive to anti-sweatshop movement and willing to join the Worker Rights Consortium. From this, we can draw a conclusion that the protection of labor rights and interests in the United States is more comprehensive and developed than that in developing countries. With the continuous development of labor organizations and labor movements, the United States no longer focuses on sweatshops in its own country, but also begins to criticize sweatshops in other countries.

In the case of sweatshops in Vietnam, we can see the relationship with labor through an example. In Garrett Brown's article Hansae Vietnam's garment factory: The most recent illustration of corporate social responsibility's failure to safeguard workers' rights, safety, and health in global supply chains is a complex of 12 buildings operated by a Korean company in Vietnam and producing clothing for a number of major international clothing brands. This is a crucial point.

The current perception of sweatshops and their employees is still morally ambiguous. Some people contend that the government shouldn't stop employees from accepting the long hours, low pay, and subpar working conditions in sweatshops because these employees may choose to work there because there are no other options that they would find acceptable and because the sweatshop may not be able to coordinate better working conditions for all employees due to its physical limitations. Some people also worry that if the government bans the operation of sweatshops, some workers will lose their jobs and enter a more difficult living environment. In my opinion, when faced with sweatshops organized by multinational enterprises, the government should take appropriate actions and propose alternatives to difficult and dangerous sweatshop labor, but they should not restrict workers and employers through mandatory supervision, and gradually raise the minimum wage and strengthen the supervision of factory environment. Additionally, in recent years, sweatshops have tended to concentrate in less developed countries, and the working conditions of sweatshop workers are not just a product of economic concerns. From the beginning, sweatshops drew criticism and were the subject of legal action in developed nations. In the United States and the United Kingdom, respectively, the 1894 Anti Khaganate Alliance and the 1907 National Anti Khaganate Alliance were among the groups established at the turn of the century to battle against sweatshop workers. Trade unions and other humanitarian organizations, such as the Methodist Epworth Union in the US or the Socialist

Fabian Service in the UK, however, began to fight against sweatshops [5]. Incorrect factory building construction, a lack of health and safety inspections, dishonest state authorities, and a lack of knowledge of workers' rights are just a few of the problems that contribute to the societal phenomenon known as sweatshop employment [5].

According to these papers, it is not difficult to find that sweatshops appeared earlier in developed countries, and at the same time, the research on sweatshops in developed countries is more extensive and the social attention is higher. In less developed countries, sweatshops are still a difficult problem to solve. We will inevitably find that sweatshops play a greater role in economic development, but their harm to workers' interests is also significant. However, because their economic contribution is meaningful, less developed countries are forced to allow such factories to persist. Since all sides of the sweatshop debate have come to realize that sweatshop work is frequently the best option for extremely poor workers to improve their lives and the lives of their families, and since any attempt to reform sweatshops must be done carefully, I believe the solution to the sweatshop problem should be complex and not focus on a single issue. Therefore, numerous players are urged to act in order to end harsh working circumstances. Government rules that are strictly followed aid in upholding health and safety standards and safeguarding workers from exploitation. Workers' committees and unions can support collective bargaining and, more crucially, fight to increase the openness of social security and pay standards. In order to better safeguard workers from exploitation, new rules regarding employment placement, subcontracting, and public procurement processes will be implemented. Information on workers' rights and national investment in educational initiatives are further requirements. Although it is apparent that customers are also accountable for maintaining sweating systems, history has shown that either consumers are unaware of the circumstances in which sweatshops are kept in operation or they do not want to accept responsibility [6].

4. Conclusion

According to this, this article finds that even if the economic case for sweatshops is based on solid empirical evidence, agents have good reasons to support workers in sweatshops to receive better wages and working conditions, reducing exploitative or coercive relationships [7]. However, if it is just the agent's self-assertion, this is difficult to achieve, and the government should play an important role in the governance of transnational sweatshops. Ann Harrison and Jason Scorse, in their study of sweatshops in Indonesia, found that US government pressure on the Indonesian government to improve the working conditions of sweatshop workers was effective, but also complemented other measures. At the same time, even in less developed countries, there are labor rights bills, and if the government imposes them, workers' rights can be guaranteed. With the development of the national economy, the government should also actively find alternative jobs for sweatshop workers and help them to improve working conditions and wages without losing their jobs. For the future, I think more research is needed to explore the nature of the emergence of these sweatshops and address the root causes of the problem. When the labor treatment of some countries is improved, the government's pressure on sweatshops is increased, and the management is more perfect, the owners of these sweatshops will move the factories to new and less developed countries, and continue to exploit workers in order to extract higher profits from them.

References

- [1] Powell, B., Zwolinski, M. *The Ethical and Economic Case Against Sweatshop Labor: A Critical Assessment*. *J Bus Ethics* 107, 449–472 (2012).
- [2] Place, J. (2014). *Global labor justice and the limitations of economic analysis*. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 24 (1), 55-83. DOI: 10.5840/BEQ20141272

- [3] Ratute, A. (2010). *Expanding social justice knowledge with sweatshop history* (Order No. 1476340). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global; ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global A&I: The Humanities and Social Sciences Collection. (365735354).
- [4] Flanigan, J. *Sweatshop regulations and worker Choice*. *J Bus Ethics* 153, 79-94 (2018).
- [5] Kuyumcuoglu, H.S. *Sweatshops, Harm and Interference: A contractalist approach*. *J Bus Ethics* 169, 1-11 (2021)
- [6] John Trumbour (2021) *Global sweatshops: the history and future of North-South solidarity campaigns in Bangladesh and beyond*, *Labor History*, 62:2, 109-114, DOI: 10.1080/0023656X.2021.1896602
- [7] Garrett Brown (2017) *Hansae Vietnam's garment factory: Latest example of how corporate social responsibility has failed to protect workers*, *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Hygiene*, 14:8, D130-D135, DOI: 10.1080/15459624.2017.1296239