

**UFW DOCUMENTATION PROJECT  
ONLINE DISCUSSION  
December 2004 and January 2005**

**Kathy Lynch Murguia, 12/1/04**

**RE: Closure**

Kathy Murguia 1965-1983

As we move to the final days of the Listserve, I am bringing closure to a huge chunk of my life. I don't know about anyone else, but I do reflect back with varied emotions and interpretations of events. It began so simple and it ended up being so complicated. What was public became personal. Thoughts became projected into possibilities and threats. What was personal became public in that it became a test of loyalty. The lines became blurred; boundaries confused. We all participated in this blurring of reality. We hurt each other in our misunderstandings. I had hoped we were headed somewhere...I did believe the farmworkers needed a union. El Movimiento was a beginning. It came as a result of what Cesar called "viva swells". It was the structure that became problematic, and its tolerance for criticism and its ability to resolve internal conflict that became lost in a fog of meaning. Doug you are right. As one that was there at the beginning, I would venture to say we lost the willingness to talk to each other. Yes Abby, the Game facilitated this level of honesty. Mary, I do wish we could time travel into the next decade and be renewed. Marshall, in this interregnum will Cesar's and our dreams survive? What lessons have we learned? I would name one. Responsibility rests within. We invest in history and we have the obligation/ duty to defend what we know to be our experience; to find our voice and to speak, trusting our words, directing these words to those who need to hear what we have to say. I believe CC would subscribe to this.

I recently attended a Peace Conference in Berkeley. The only one I connected with was Rabbi Michael Lerner. The Tikkum Community with the notion of a politics of meaning resonate with the core values that Mary McCartney speaks of. They transcend our history and our experience in the farmworker movement. They remain relevant to the call for economic justice, empowerment, integrity and most importantly compassion for others. We will come together as we continue to water our roots with remembrance and words of truth.

**Fran Ryan, 12/1/04**

**RE: Post Party Purge**

Dear Doug et al,

I remember going to a party in L.A. in perhaps 1967 (maybe earlier). There was lots of revolutionary talk; Dolores and Donna Haber were there along with others I don't remember. The communist "national anthem", the "Internacional" was sung along with Huelga songs. I think Luis Valdez was there. I was a very minimal participant as I was very tired and went to sleep by midnight as they talked on for hours into the night. Very soon after that some of those people "disappeared" from the ranks of the farm worker volunteers and the "gossip" was that they had been asked to leave because they were thought to be too "radical" for the needs of the farm worker movement and that Dolores was the one who had come to that conclusion. It was generally concluded that it was not a good idea to appear too friendly with Sam Kushner so that one's primary loyalty to the farm worker struggle would not be questioned.

Thanks to all the huelgistas who have shared here and especially to LeRoy for setting it up. I do want to say that whatever we non-farmworkers did as volunteers needs to be kept in perspective as: 1. what we were choosing to do. 2. No matter how difficult, it was something we had the option to leave (and go back to or on to another existence) and 3. Our work derived its soul from the fact that we were connected to the meaningfulness of the farm worker struggle. I have felt uncomfortable sometimes as I read comments that have a hint of putting us on a pedestal we don't belong on. It reminds me of my work years ago as a Peace Corps Volunteer: we volunteers

received so much more than we ever gave. Given that, it is clear that the various "armies" of volunteers over the years definitely helped shape what was accomplished.

The many struggles are not over!

ARRIBA !!

Fran Ryan

Delano, Portland, New Cork 1967-68

### **Hugh "Hawkeye" Tague, 12/1/04**

#### **RE: Goonos v Goonas**

I was never full-time in Security, but I was always assigned to this task whenever Cesar came through. My high school "education" had prepared me well.

**SITTING DUCK:** Cesar was at a reception put on by a supporter whose husband was a produce distributor in Cleveland. I had met her before, and she seemed interested in me. So did a lot of other people because, to say the least, I didn't fit into the "categories" that we humans like to put each other in. My security assignment was to put myself between the windows and Cesar at all times. I took this job very seriously. Trouble was that the hostess had too much to drink and she ignored Cesar and was getting grabby with me. This situation was even more uncomfortable because her husband (who, very well may have been mobbed-up) was just across the room.

We went to a bunch of other towns and cities in Ohio during that tour. There was a guy who we saw at 3-4 didn't places. We got nervous about this, but discovered that he was simple a "groupie."

We stayed with Cesar at the home of Richard Celeste who was a state senator at the time. His wife was really cool. She was from Denmark and her name was Dagmar. She even picketed stores with Anita Meyerson on the West Side. Celeste was keeping Cesar up all night and everybody was tired as hell. I told him to knock it off and go to bed. They laughed about it, but went to bed soon after.

Years later, I heard that Governor Richard Celeste pardoned a bunch of women who were doing time for killing their physically abusive husbands/boyfriends. I figured that was really Dagmar's doing.

**VEGANS SHOULD NOT BE IN CHARGE OF THE SLAUGHTERHOUSE:** I was working in a factory in Philly when Cesar came to some college. I was asked to be on guard duty. Cesar was in this professor's room and 3 of us were to keep everybody from walking through the area. This big guy came up and this little Quaker who was a guard asked him to go elsewhere and he keep going. I grabbed him by the arm and pushed him against the wall. Then he was open to hearing why we asked him to move.

This Quaker gave me a hard time about it. Non-violence -is our-strength, etc. I said that we had a job to do and the hit-man or nut that might be after Cesar didn't know anything about non-violence. I told him to go back to the academic retreat center that he came from.

By the way, the Goo\_nas generally made the best guards because they tried harder.

Hawkeye

### **Donna Haber Kornberg, 12/1/04 (1)**

#### **RE: volunteers**

I have been quite dismayed to read in recent emails, phrases such as:

"volunteers overstaying their welcome"

"there was a time that those Volunteers were supposed to step away and they just didn't get it"

During my relatively short experience, there were many different types of "volunteers" -- which I take to mean non-farm workers, although there were in reality many farm worker volunteers. There were students, from all races, including Chicanos, representatives of various religions, and others who wanted to help.

Take the Teatro, for example. Luis Valdez, a student volunteer, initiated the Teatro, and started it with other volunteers like Augie Lira, an ex-farm worker and Kerry Ohta, a volunteer from the Bay Area. I, a student volunteer, joined later, as did Felipe, a farm worker, who moved in and out of the Teatro (he had children and a wife who wanted him to earn some money to support them). There were also Kathy and her boyfriend ????, religious volunteers, and others, Chicanos, whose names I do not remember, who had been drifting around the movement, and who may have done farm work at one time in their lives, but were not farm workers when they joined us.

This heterogeneity was typical of all sections of the then-NFWA, and, so far as I can make out, continued to be so after I was sacked in 1968. Which of us 'outstayed our welcome' and should have known to 'step away?' All the volunteers? The non-Chicano volunteers? The volunteers who had never done farm work?" The volunteers who had done some farm work but were then students?

It is my view -- and I would welcome comments on this -- that without the volunteers there would never have been a movement, strikes, a boycott, contracts, etc. If all volunteers had 'stepped away' at any given time, the whole organization would have collapsed immediately, as volunteers staffed all its services.

Of course, in principle, workers should run their own unions, but in most traditional unions, this means deciding policies and hiring people to implement them. One cannot work in an industry at the same time as administering a union. After leaving the farm workers, I worked for a more traditional union for many years, negotiating on behalf of workers in industries in which I had never worked.

In the farm workers' union, strapped for cash, the administrative positions were filled by volunteers (rather than employees), without whom there would have been no organization.

I am not looking for gratitude for us volunteers, as we did not go into this for thanks, but merely an appreciation of reality.

Donna Haber Kornbert  
Delano, 1966-68, London, 1970-74

**Donna Haber Kornberg, 12/1/04 (2)**

**RE: Post Party Purge**

How very nice to be remembered. Thank you, Fran.

As I remember, however, Dolores and Sam Kushner were quite friendly with each other; indeed, I am quite sure that I remember Dolores complimenting Sam and saying that he was one of the good guys. Anyone know (perhaps Doug?) if this memory is accurate?

Donna Haber Kornbert  
Delano, 1966-1968, London, 1970-1974

**LeRoy Chatfield, 12/1/04 (1)**

**RE: VOLUNTEERS OVERSTAYED WELCOME**

LeRoy Chatfield 1963-1973

Donna Haber asks what did I mean when I wrote that "volunteers overstayed their welcome?"

I begin with the premise that Cesar Chavez was the founder of a movement who needed help in building it., He did not have the means to pay for this assistance so he sought the help of volunteers. The first volunteers were those already present within the movement when the strike began: Helen Chavez, Gilbert Padilla, Dolores Huerta, Julio & Fina Hernandez, Jim & Susan

Drake, David Havens, Chris Hartmire, Lupe Murguia, Bill Esher, Doug Adair, Wendy Goepel (Brooks) and others.. (This is not meant to be an exhaustive list, only a representative one.)

The strike itself produced many more volunteers, people like Tony & Rachel Orendain, Roger Terronez, the Saludados, and several dozen striking farmworkers. I do not include in my thinking the Filipino AWOC strike community because in the beginning months of the strike, they were considered to be allies, but not volunteers in Cesar's NFWA farmworker movement.

As the word of the Delano Grape Strike spread to the San Francisco and Los Angeles areas, outside volunteers, mostly university students, began arriving in Delano wanting to volunteer their services. Donna Haber (Kornberg), Kathy Lynch (Murguia), Ida Cousino, Ed Frankel, Marshall Ganz, Peggy McGivern, and Marion Moses were some of the first movement volunteers, and representative of the dozens who came onto the scene.

Without doubt neither the strike nor the boycott could have been waged without these farmworker strikers and outside volunteers. You heard Cesar say many times: the growers have the money, farmworkers have the time. It was these farmworker movement volunteers who provided the currency of time that Cesar needed to wage his campaign.

Ultimately, in my view it was the use of volunteers – nationally and internationally -- that created the leverage necessary to win the 1970 table grape contracts thus bringing a victorious conclusion to the Delano Grape Strike.

If volunteers were so essential to Cesar Chavez in the building of his farmworker movement, how could they overstay their welcome? Volunteers by definition are temporary and transitory; they serve at their own pleasure. The volunteers came to Delano "to help out" not to take charge, make policy, or otherwise decide what was best for farmworkers. And at any point if volunteers crossed these lines, they ran the risk of overstaying their welcome. Seeking to become insiders or movement leaders, they got caught up in the normal, natural process of a movement's internal politics, and as with any organization's politics, there are winners and losers.

Furthermore, for the vast majority of people, a movement is an unnatural way of life. For most movement Volunteers, this way of life can only be lived for a relatively short period of time. The demands are too great, the human support systems are lacking, true believers are valued above others, and the special needs of individuals are ignored or deemed unnecessary. The farm worker movement, as a movement, did not have the flexibility to take into account all of the human variables associated with living a "normal" life. A life with a spouse, with educational needs for children, with financial planning and security, with career opportunities, with the demands of elderly parents, and so on. The tension between normal living and movement volunteering can only be managed for a time, and even that is determined by such individual variables as: age, single or married, career level, personal financial resources, etc.

I doubt these comments come as a revelation or surprise to former UFW volunteers. One way or the other, we all went through this, and for the vast majority of us, we left either voluntarily, or involuntarily, but we left because as volunteers we had to. Yes, there are a few - a very few - exceptions.

At one point during the documentation project, I wrote that the UFW decision to permit volunteers to serve on the elected board of directors was a mistake because it blurred the distinction between volunteer and elected union official. It is my own view that while this decision was made with the best of intentions, it was misguided, and caused a great deal of institutional trauma and hurt feelings - and, sad to report, caused many volunteers to overstay their welcome.

As does Donna Haber Kornberg, I invite, and welcome comments.

**Abby Flores Rivera, 12/1/04 (1)**

**RE: Meals**

[Kathy Murguia wrote: "*Hepatitis has been mentioned in relation to the hospital kitchens. Well, it was a school cafeteria in Tehachapi that almost did my family in.*"]

Kathy,

You down play the horror of your experience. It was so upsetting seeing how your family was suffering. At La Paz, we all felt so helpless for you; everyone could see how it was affecting you since all of you looked so thin and yellow. I remember Helen fighting back tears whenever she left your home and it continued when you finally ventured out to quickly ask her for something. There I was in the middle feeling badly for all of you and then hurting some more seeing Helen trying to hide her emotions. You and your kids were so brave and I am sorry to learn how it affected Joaquin. I didn't know there was etafiate down by the creek. Leave it to Lupe to know it was there. sin mas/ abby/ r/d/lp

**Ellen Eggers, 12/1/04**

**RE: Purges and discipline**

As usual, Doug, your note was well-written, informative, detailed and interesting. You were someone "always showing up" during my years with the Union, though I can't say that I knew you well. And you may not even remember me... but thanks for your generous offerings to the project. I have so enjoyed them!! Ellen

**Alberto Escalante, 12/1/04 (1)**

**RE: Closure**

Kathy - Your lyrical essay titled "Closure" was truly a beautiful testament of faith. One that I feel will ring true in the hearts and souls of the majority of us who, like you, feel that the Farm Worker Legacy will continue. Mainly because of the inspiration that is instilled in us by the memory of Cesar, who was, is and will continue to be the heartbeat of the movement & the metronome by which that heartbeat is measured as the UFW continues into the future. When my wife and I went to La Paz and finally met you & your beautiful family, it'd been so many years since I'd first met and worked with Lupe, so it was an especially wonderful occasion, something that we will always remember. Lupe's Retirement also gave me a chance to reunite with so many of my other good friends that came to celebrate with Lupe & your family on that memorable evening. Also, your earlier email regarding the terrible episode with Hepatitis that befell your entire family was just a glimpse at one of a litany of troubles that you had to deal with. Things that would have stopped anyone else. Yet you and your family survived and have continued on. Much like our beloved UFW that despite so much adversity and stumbling blocks that have been thrown in its path has survived. And no doubt will continue so that hopefully someday I'll be able to take my grandchildren up to La Paz and let them spend some time apprenticing much like their old grandpa did...Which is why I see the UFW as a circle, something with no end

Saludos y Abrazos para todos, tu Hermano en Jesús Cristo

Alberto y Susan Escalante

(p.s. Susan wanted to know if she could get the recipe for that wonderful salmon dish that was served at Lupes retirement pachanga... as always AE)

**Jean Eilers, 12/1/04**

**RE : Some thoughts on "the movement died"**

I am struck that the "Cesar Chavez farmworker movement" lore still has the ability to inspire. The recent victory for FLOC at Mt. Olive in N. C. I believe was helped by that memory of the movement. Recently, the Farmworker Ministry went with UFW organizers from Oregon working on organizing workers at Three Mile Dairy, to Buffalo NY to deliver a petition with 12,000 signatures to the head of the company that makes Precious label cheese. While the Co. would not speak with them, they found a whole community of people ready to support in Buffalo. There are an endless number of these kinds of stories that could be told I am sure.

So many, many people were touched by their participation in the movement, that the "lore" can be tapped to re-kindle the hunger for justice in other situations. It is a memory that was shared, and

Leroy \* thanks for providing the tool for recollecting on a larger basis and thanks to all who contributed the specifics of their experience.

It always seemed as though, the UFW failed to build a dynamic institution out of the movement at that moment in time when it could have. \*and the stories recounted probably help identify some of why that was.

Hopefully, the scholars or not scholars, will have some insights to some of the provocative questions that will enable us to better direct the energy of new movements we may have the opportunity to be a part of again.

**Alberto Escalante, 12/1/04 (2)**

**RE: VOLUNTEERS OVERSTAYED WELCOME**

In a message dated 12/1/2004 . . . [LeRoy Chatfield] writes:

*At one point during the documentation project, I wrote that the UFW decision to permit volunteers to serve on the elected board of directors was a mistake because it blurred the distinction between volunteer and elected union official. It is my own view that while this decision was made with the best of intentions, it was misguided, and caused a great deal of institutional trauma and hurt feelings - and, sad to report, caused many volunteers to overstay their welcome.*

Leroy,

I believe that if the UFW hadn't opened up it's leadership to allow volunteers to participate there wouldn't have been a union today. The present President of the Union, Arturo Rodriguez began as a volunteer.

Alberto Escalante 2004

**Donna Haber Kornberg, 12/1/04 (3)**

**RE: Purges and discipline**

A correction, Doug, if I may? I was actually told to leave, given no choice -- and also given no reasons, and it was 1968, not 1966. Luis decided to leave as well, as a response to the insult to "his woman (i.e. me)." I think that at the same time Dr. David Brook was also asked to leave. None of us did so voluntarily.

Best,

Donna Haber Kornberg

**Donna Haber Kornberg, 12/1/04 (4)**

**RE: Purges and discipline**

Also, do you know what we were meant to be conspiring about at Sam's party? Don't tell me that we were actually thought to have been starting the world revolution! A bit much, I would think, even for such a talented (!) group. And was Dolores not a friend and admirer of Sam's? I am almost certain that I recall her talking of him in a very friendly manner.

Best,

Donna Haber Kornberg

**LeRoy Chatfield, 12/1/04 (2)**

**RE: VOLUNTEERS OVERSTAYED WELCOME**

Alberto,

Thank you, I note your exception but consider this: (With all due respect to Artie) there is a qualitative difference between being a volunteer, and marrying into the movement. Through his marriage, Artie chose to leave his volunteer status.

You will also note that I wrote about "elected union official" not about leadership. Many, volunteers were leaders in the movement, but they were not elected to the UFW board of directors, nor should they have been. Jim Drake, Jerry Cohen, Chris Hartmire, Doug Adair, Margaret Murphy, Larry Tramutola, Anna Puharich, Nick Jones come readily to mind.

I do not agree that there would be no union existing today unless volunteers had been allowed to serve in elected positions on the board. If you can flesh out your position on this issue, perhaps I will take a different view, I don't know.

Thanks again,

LeRoy

**Marshall Ganz, 12/1/04**

**RE: VOLUNTEERS OVERSTAYED WELCOME**

LeRoy,

Why are these status distinctions so important to you that you have developed such nuanced categories of just who is a what and what procedures allow one to transform themselves from one status into another status?

If Jessica and I had married, would I have been transformed from a volunteer into something else? Or was it necessary to marry into the Chavez family? Or were you eligible for transformation only if you were Chicano? Let's see, I guess Mack Lyons would not have been a volunteer? Even though he had only briefly been a farm worker. Would that have been enough to allow Diana to shed her volunteer status.

The truth is that the leadership of most social movements include people of very diverse backgrounds, often with complicated relationships to the main constituency of the movement. Moses, for example, apparently was a Jew, but was raised in the Pharoah's house as an Egyptian, went off and married into the family of a Midianite priest, then returning to lead "his people" out of slavery. Dr. King was African-American, but had little other than that in common in terms of class, education, professional connections, life options, with black plantation workers in the Mississippi Delta. So was he a volunteer? Or was he a member of the "constituency"?

Then, of course, Dolores never really had a farm worker background at all, although she had grown up in Stockton. And Gilbert, it's true, worked a farm worker as a kid, but not as an adult. And Richard Chavez had been a farm worker in his youth, but became a professional carpenter. And was Jessica, coming from a similar background, a volunteer? So.....what categories do they fall into?

I'm very curious why you seem so concerned about who held title to the farm worker movement (as in Cesar's movement) and who was qualified to own what kind of "shares" in it and who wasn't.

Marshall

**Abby Flores Rivera, 12/1/04 (2)**

**RE: VOLUNTEERS OVERSTAYED WELCOME**

LeRoy,

At first I thought Marshall was talking about Marion when he mentioned Moses. Anyway, that threw me off for a bit. I have always believed that Board Members, past and present, were deserving of their positions. Whether they were farm workers or volunteers didn't make a difference. The diversity always appealed to me, too. Volunteers can't transform into anything but Moses did have a lot in common with his constituency or he wouldn't have had to escape Egypt (reduced to slave status) to return later to free them; Dr. King also had a lot in common because no one asked to see his paycheck or his educational degrees when he entered a bus.

Sadly, it was back of the bus for him, too. But I understand the point Marshall was making. sin mas, abby/ r/d/lp

**Barbara Macri-Ortiz, 12/2/04**

**RE: UFW periods**

Jerry,

Let me give you another perspective on Cesar's move to La Paz.

I was working in the Delano field office when Cesar made the move to La Paz in 1971. One of the reasons for his decision which he shared with the field office staff, was that as long as he stayed in Delano, the workers would naturally look to him for leadership, and it would be much harder for us to develop the local leadership – both staff and farm worker. Cesar was right about that, and after he left, whether we liked it or not, we all had to just do it. It was easier not to look back or second guess ourselves. This was important as the pace was grueling, with all the contracts to administer and worker committees and stewards to train. We made a lot of mistakes but we had more successes than failures, and a lot of worker leadership did develop in his absence. Many of you reading this probably met some of those leaders after they volunteered to go out on the boycott after the 1973 grape strike was called off due to the violence against the strikers. Many of the strikers ended up in Cities all over the country. Some later returned to the fields. Others became some of the Union's best organizers, and later used their talents in other unions and movements. Miguel Contreras and Eddie Cuellar are two that come to mind.

When I worked in La Paz in 1975 (I ran the accounting dept. for 6 months after my brother died), it wasn't a very fun place to be because all the action was happening in the field offices or on the boycott. But the people in La Paz did an amazing amount of administrative work -- in accounting, membership, RFK, etc. – work that had to be done to keep the union running.

I don't know what you mean when you say "La Paz began to become a separate place, important in itself, instead of serving only the purpose of doing whatever it could to help us organize."

As I see it, La Paz was La Paz. The headquarters ended up there because we got a good deal on a piece of real estate. Some of the staff may have been full of themselves, thinking somehow they were it because they worked next to Cesar at the "headquarters." But from my experience, the vast majority of the La Paz staff were hard working people who busted their buns to get their work done so that the rest of the union staff could get their work done, i.e. in your words: "doing whatever it could to help us organize."

Barbara Macri-Ortiz (1969-1990)

**Marshall Ganz, 12/2/04 (1)**

**RE: UFW periods**

Another perspective is that Cesar needed "breathing room", less a matter of developing leadership, the key to which is having already developed the leadership to develop more, than a matter of feeling he needed to control his own space. This seems very understandable. But when LeRoy and I sat for a month with him in La Paz early in 1971 trying to restructure the union from there, the dark side of this choice began emerging as well. Having your breathing room can be beneficial, but allowing yourself to become isolated in the midst of a world you utterly control (or want to or think you need to), can be profoundly dangerous to everyone involved. And it was. We all need accountability, and those of who hold more power, need ever greater accountability (just take a look at what the bushies are doing to the world). But when you can create a community with its own life, relationships, practices, dynamics, boundaries -- you run the danger of creating an "alternate reality" that can consume you and everyone in it (as in Jonestown in 1978 which, for a time at least, slowed down the way the game was being pushed). This is just how we are, how we work, and sometimes we need to find ways to prevent ourselves from doing harm to ourselves and those we care about (as in the myth when Ulysses has his men tie him to the mast of his ship so he can hear the sirens without steering his ship onto the rocks from which they sang). Creating



mechanisms of accountability is one way we can do that. Creating an alternate world that utterly revolves around us is probably one of the worst things anyone can do for their own health, the health of the people with whom they work, and the cause they serve. Dorothy Day seemed to know this, placing her communities in the cities they served; Gandhi seemed to know this, considering where he located many of ashrams.

As for leadership development, Delano was turned over Larry Itliong. Is it your argument that for Larry to develop his leadership skills, Cesar needed to go to La Paz? I've found the you develop leadership by providing support along with responsibility, coaching along with challenge, and not by dropping out. One of the greatest learning opportunities I had was in the spring of 1968, working directly with Cesar on a housemeeting campaign in Earlimart, that wound up targetting a couple of Giumarra foremen. He developed our leadership by working with us, not by heading for the hills.

Finally, I didn't know Eddie that well, but I know his father was an organizer from way back because I met him on the march to Sacramento and he still had his old farm worker union card from the 1930s. Miguel I do know and his father was a ranch committee president in Dinuba, but had never been active until the 1973 strike in Fresno when he and his buddies from Fresno State got arrested and wound up volunteering for the boycott -- and came to work with me in Toronto. This evidence would suggest that father's do have something to do with the development of leadership in their sons, but not much to do with Cesar leaving Delano to go to La Paz.

Marshall

P.S. LeRoy was the one who "found" La Paz and a movie producer, Eddie Lewis, came up with cash to put a down payment on it. But it was clear that the search had been on for a place like La Paz, so it wasn't just a matter of a "good real estate deal". Cesar acted with much more intentionality than that, Barbara.

#### **Kathy Lynch Murguia, 12/2/04**

##### **RE: Purges and discipline**

Kathy Murguia 1965-1983

Doug, you wrote:

*"The organizer (only one, I think) asked to leave was Phyllis Hasbrouk, I thing originally from Chicago and now living in Madison (probably has e-mail), but the issue was complicated, and I never completely understood what was coming down . . . later, Debbie clued me in about Liz, and the concerns of some of the women. . . . I don't think anyone else was asked to leave."*

My take

I'm struck with the notion of the power represented by the panel, and the outcome...the sacking of Phyllis. The message must have been pretty direct... "Callate mujeres" . Today I would hope things would turn out differently. I could expand on this one,,but won't. Kathy Murguia

#### **John Gardner, 12/2/04**

##### **RE: Purges and discipline**

My only incident of actual violence, as opposed to threats against life, property, and other assets, was that after I came out of a cucumber field in Coachella, having exchanged a few words with Teamster organizers who were unsuccessfully attempting to secure authorization cards, the front windshield of my UFW Valiant was smashed.

I wanted to make it a federal issue and proclaim it to the continents. But as we were in the middle of six simultaneous election drives, Eliseo cooled me down and we repaired it immediately, so it could not serve as the intimidation Eliseo believed the Teamster intended.

That was the Maggio-Tostado election, I believe.

Thanks.

**LeRoy Chatfield, 12/2/04 (1)**

**RE: RESPONSE TO MARSHALL GANZ**

LeRoy Chatfield 1963-1973

As usual, Marshall asks questions that are difficult to answer, and even to sort out, at least for me.

I leave any commentary about Moses, and the question about Dr. King to others who are more knowledgeable about these matters than I. The "what if" questions remind me of the kind of moral theology casuistry in which I participated during the early years of my religious training, and with Marshall's forbearance, I will pass on those.

I admit, my definition of a volunteer in the farmworker movement is something of a slippery slope but it is useful and needs to be understood, I think. The volunteers who joined the movement came simply "to help out" and while there was no mutually agreed upon time of service, I believe it is accurate to say that it was generally understood that their service was "temporary", "transitory", and that "they served at their own pleasure." And while the volunteer was free to come, and free to go, it is also true that they were permitted to stay only to the extent that they were useful to the cause, and once their usefulness was over, they had to leave. (Easy to write these words, difficult to implement them.)

The farmworker movement sucked up volunteers, chewed them up, and spit them out in very much the same way that ranked universities recruit high school athletes for their football and basketball teams. Just as with student athletes, movement volunteers were considered, and treated as expendable. The only thing that mattered was the movement. If this sounds harsh, I remind you that the only publicly acceptable outcome for major universities driven by athletics is winning.

YES, I do believe that marrying into the movement would change the status of a volunteer, especially marrying in the Chavez family. In my view, a Chavez family member is not a volunteer, he/she is a conscript, and public expectations about their roles are much different.

Marshall writes that "he is very curious why (I) seem so concerned about who held title to the farm worker movement (as in Cesar's movement). . ." I am only concerned about such entitlement because I seek to explain to others that a movement (for better or worse) belongs to its founder, and until the founder dies, is killed, or is otherwise deposed, the founder holds title. This, in my view, is the reality of founders and their movements. Look to the founder of a business, an educational institution, a charitable organization, a religious order - as long as the founder lives, he/she exercises control, if not absolute control, then by veto power, over the movement. This was certainly true in the farmworkers movement, and both Marshall and I knew this, and accepted it - well, I can say for sure that I accepted it.

**LeRoy Chatfield, 12/2/04 (2)**

**RE: LA PAZ**

LEROY CHATFIELD 1963-1973

MARSHALL GANZ WROTE:

*"P. S. LeRoy was the one who "found" La Paz and a movie producer, Eddie Lewis, came up with cash to put a down payment on it. But it was clear that the search had been on for a place like La Paz, so it wasn't just a matter of a "good real estate deal" Cesar acted with much more intentionality than that, Barbara."*

Marshall is correct when he writes that Cesar had been looking for a place away from Delano. I found LaPaz only because, at Cesar's request, I had been looking for a place away from Delano. Santa Barbara was Cesar's first choice and we looked at a couple of properties I had found there but they did not fit the bill - AND they cost a lot of money. I can't say for sure that I was looking for a union headquarters because Cesar always put the emphasis on having a place where farmworkers and their families could come for recreational and educational purposes. That such a

place would also serve as the national union headquarters did come as a surprise to me but he never emphasized that aspect with me.

Thirty-five years later, I sometimes wish someone else could/ would take "credit" for finding LaPaz, but what can I say?

**Sandy Nathan, 12/2/04**

**RE: LA PAZ**

It took nearly eight months, but something has emerged which everyone on the listserv can agree to: La Paz sucked.

sn

**Abby Flores Rivera, 12/2/04 (1)**

**RE: UFW periods**

Dear Marshall and All:

My husband came to La Paz and was trained by Cesar there. My son is an organizer today. It is a fact, that many did get some long-range training at La Paz. One thing about "alternate realities". When I had my first baby, it made me realize ALL work with the union was an "alternate reality". Being a mommy made me see things differently and to be very protective of my little one. In the real world people weren't living on \$10 per week, working more than 40 hours per week, having their rent and utilities paid by someone elsewhere, living off of food, clothing, household supplies donations, nor were many able to take their kids to the office or to business meetings either. Only certain people in the real world received gas advances or reimbursements and company transportation. In the "other reality" people had extra spending money for such things as baby pictures, family vacations, paying for their child's school lunches. I have used the phrase many times in my e-mail, "in the real world we would have been doing the work of 3-4 people", etc. "In the real world". That was the beauty of working in the UFW movement. Did we pride ourselves for living this way? We must have because we did it. We were doing things very differently from others. Haven't you ever described your union years and our way of life and find that people either find it all too incredible to believe or they can't believe you wanted to live that way?

Be it as it may, I too remember when Cesar spoke to us in Delano about the need to move to La Paz. I also recall him saying that there were too many interruptions sometimes *for* him because people came to him directly instead of going to the person in charge of a particular job, i.e. organizers, Service Center personnel, yes, even Credit Union. As a matter of fact, Cesar could never make it to his office without being stopped for one thing or another and not just by one person. I can still picture Cesar in the middle of crowds small and large. If they saw Cesar who better to help them and, of course, Cesar would stop, listen, then lead them to the person/ department that could provide the help. I won't go on more into this but there was a simple explanation and a real need for him to move to La Paz. I believe those of us present understood where Cesar was coming from although not too many of us wanted to join up there him there at the time.

One thing my husband has always said, each and every time he traveled with Cesar during his years as a guard, Cesar had him pull the car over to talk to farm workers at various ranches. All the workers would come out, shake his hand, talk to him, and have a good visit. Although Cesar moved to La Paz he was still accessible because farm workers came there or if needed, he went to them. Many people do not even realize the number of personal visits to ranches Cesar made because he never spoke about them to anyone but my husband knows that he made them all the time. The other guards can also tell you about these visits. Also, Cesar had many farm worker friends that he stayed with and visited with when he traveled. It isn't as though he closed himself to the world at La Paz. A lot of the work we did sometimes at La Paz or in the field offices that Cesar had us do originated from a farm worker(s) meeting with him or talking to him requesting his help. Many of you might not realize that but it is true. sin mas/ abby/ r/d/lp

**Alberto Escalante, 12/2/04 (1)**

**RE: UFW periods**

In a message dated 12/2/2004 . . . [Marshall Ganz] writes:

*"P. S. LeRoy was the one who 'found' La Paz and a movie producer, Eddie Lewis, came up with cash to put a down payment on it. But it was clear that the search had been on for a place like La Paz, so it wasn't just a matter of a 'good real estate deal.' Cesar acted with much more intentionality than that, Barbara."*

Marshall, Barbara, LeRoy:

In light of the gravity of the exchanges lately...I feel rather silly asking if any of you know anything about the story that the union allegedly "bought" La Paz for a nominal fee of \$1 in a rather magnanimous gesture of support from actor Anthony Quinn who at different times had alluded that he had been born in impoverished circumstances in the state of Chihuahua, Mexico to a Mexican mother and an Irish father. Any truth to that story (the one that the union bought the old T.B. hospital and the land the became La Paz for only a \$1 as a gift from Anthony Quinn?)

Thanks, Hasta la Victoria, Siempre

Alberto (Escalante de Volante)

**Glenn Rothner, 12/2/04 (1)**

**RE: Volunteers, Games, etc.**

LeRoy wrote:

*"The farmworker movement sucked up volunteers, chewed them up, and spit them out in very much the same way that ranked universities recruit high school athletes for their football and basketball teams. Just as with student athletes, movement volunteers were considered, and treated as expendable. The only thing that mattered was the movement. If this sounds harsh, I remind you that the only publicly acceptable outcome for major universities driven by athletics is winning."*

I didn't view my experience with the UFW as part of some athletic-like competition, and the \$5/wk and room and board lavished on me at the outset obviously paled in comparison to the typical college athletic scholarship. But I do agree that winning - over both the short and the long term - was important. I defined winning as improving the pay, benefits, and other conditions of farm workers, a cause so just that I was prepared to make it my career. After three and one-half years, 1974-78, and watching the cause/union devolve into purges, the Synanon game, and many indications that Cesar was pursuing other passions than the union while at the same time choking off the development of rank-and-file leadership, I left voluntarily.

Had I outlived my usefulness? I don't think so. To use an athletic analogy, as I labor lawyer I had just hit my stride. Did I deserve to be chewed up and spit out? Hardly, the important game wasn't over. So, Leroy, was my only other option the one you offer -- marry royalty, that is, into the Chavez clan? I don't remember how many daughters Cesar had, but that would have permitted just a few of us to remain. Or, in a true oligarchy, would marrying Lori Huerta have sufficed?

I don't regret my choice to leave, but the postings on the listserv are a sad reminder that the big game - organizing farm workers - was lost. On a personal note, in 1990, 12 years after I left and the year I got married (to a Reyes but not a Reina), my wife and I visited Delano briefly. As we were pulling into town, we saw a picket line in the vineyards, but no flags decorated with black eagles. We learned from the Delano Record - the local newspaper - that the workers, at a ranch that had been under UFW contract when I left but was now non-union, were striking spontaneously, at the beginning of the season, to boost the hourly wage, get this, from below to just above the level that had been paid under contract when I left in 1978. In other words, not only was there no union any longer, but in both actual dollars and real earning power (weighed against cost of living increases) wages had declined over the course of 12 years.

Indeed, someone had, to use Leroy's terms, been chewed up and spit out, but it wasn't me.

**Joaquin Murguia, 12/2/04**

**RE: LA PAZ**

Sandy,

I will have to disagree with the summation that "La Paz sucked." Granted there were aspects of La Paz that were trying at times, but La Paz, did serve a useful purpose. Having "grown up" there, I think I will always view La Paz differently from others. This was made very clear to me when I returned to La Paz for the first time in nearly 25 years this past October.

I learned many things in La Paz. I worked as a tune-up mechanic, as a key punch operator, did landscape maintenance, worked as a cook in the community kitchen, learned to drive and operate a fire truck, and most importantly, worked in the Financial Management Department under Sr. Florence who became my mentor in what eventually became my career choice.

Despite the bad things, there were many joyous occasions, such as the numerous weddings, like Abby's, and the summer of the babies where it seemed one was born every week. There were the community meals. I particularly enjoyed the holidays. However, I will never forget the lunches when different departments provided entertainment. Anyone else remember the "Lizard of La Paz" and the outstanding musical stylings of the "Farley Brothers"?

La Paz was not for everyone. That was evident by the number of people who came and went voluntarily. At times it was a way station for people to get up to speed before heading out to an assignment. For others, it was a place to spend a university break or earn credits toward a sociology degree.

Yes, the work done in La Paz could have just as easily have been done in Delano or any other place. In the early days of the Union, the Albany house was the place, later it was 40 Acres.

To many, La Paz was just a place. For people like me, it was home and surely didn't "suck."

Joaquin Murguia

Delano 67-68, San Francisco 68-69, Delano 69-70, La Paz 70-79

**Marshall Ganz, 12/2/04 (2)**

**RE: RESPONSE TO MARSHALL GANZ**

So, LeRoy, we're going to have to agree to disagree, because I find the whole idea of anyone "owning" a movement repugnant, was certainly nothing I ever bought into, and, I think, is conveys a profound disrespect for those who become part of a movement, the kind of thinking, in my view, that can legitimate the worst of abuses. People make up a movement, contribute to it, gain entitlement to it, etc. I don't disagree that Cesar may have acted as if he owned the movement -- most particularly when he fired the paid reps, duly elected representatives of their farm worker constituencies -- but that was part of his sickness. It's unfortunate that you choose to dismiss a questioning of your absolute categories as casuistry. I was raised in a tradition where reflection on stories, parables, and examples became a source of wisdom, a way to put one's own circumstances in a broader context. I get some sense of where you're coming from, though, in the last of the examples in your list of examples -- the founder of a religious order. With a religious order it may well be as you suggest, but that is not the history of social movements, especially in democratic countries, or movements organized with democratic goals, and, when it has been, it has more often been damaging to the movement than uplifting of it. It takes many people to make a movement and one of the strengths of the civil rights movement was that it never depended on a single unitary leader of a single organization but was broad enough and confident enough to allow for a multiplicity of centers of power, often bumping up against one another, but adding up to a movement that transformed America. The same can be said of the women's movement, the environmental movement, the freedom movements of eastern europe, the south african liberation movement, and on and on. So if your frame of reference is that of a religious order, you certainly know more about that than I. But if your frame of reference is that of social movements, then I

think you better check your facts as to the reality of what you claim, let alone, the basis on which you could possibly legitimate it.

**Alberto Escalante, 12/2/04 (2)**

**RE: LA PAZ**

In a message dated 12/2/2004 . . . [Sandy Nathan] writes:

*It took nearly eight months, but something has emerged which everyone on the listserv can agree to: La Paz sucked.*

Yo Sandy!

I think that you're way off the beam with your assessment of what's being/ been said. La Paz didn't "suck" to quote your vernacular. Of course like anything in life it didn't agree with some people, but hey, (most) people tried to make the best of the situation. Lots of us who were in Organizing were sent there when the law shut down (1976) and we thought that being "stuck" in La Paz was kind of like being in a cage, only because we'd always been able to move about and didn't like the claustrophobia that being in La Paz could tend to bring on, especially to those of us who were 1/2 nuts anyway) But really, La Paz was rather like a retreat and it's beauty, being located in an Oak Savannah, is undeniable. Well, maybe that's a subjective call on my part. But I've always preferred the natural setting and quiet of La Paz (Except for the trains) but I liked those sounds better than the noises made by automobiles and airplanes. For me La Paz was much more than being in a big city or Salinas, for that matter. I think that what some people are trying to say is that once The Game became a part of the curriculum at Magic Mountain (my name for La Paz) certain legal people freaked out and decided that this wasn't part of their job description, or wasn't something they wanted to be a part of. The straw that broke the camels back. That and the pay issue. It was good hearing from you. Heard from Dan Boone? Or Mo Jourdane?

Alberto Escalante 2004

**Ellen Eggers, 12/2/04 (1)**

**RE: RESPONSE TO MARSHALL GANZ**

Stop, you're both right! We certainly all agree that Cesar ran the union as if he owned it. But Dr. King did not "found" the civil rights movement nor can I think of any one individual that did...same with the women's movement. Both really began as decentralized operations with one or more leaders developing and evolving. So in that way, we can't really compare Cesar and the UFW (true there were many others involved...but from the history that I know and have told, Cesar was the one that started collecting dues and going from camp to camp to begin the organization...). Anyway, just turning the fruits of one's good efforts over to a "democratically elected" board or group is, I suspect, much easier said than done. I'm not really defending what Cesar did to the paid reps, but I can understand his feelings and I'm not sure many of us would not have felt just as threatened if we had been in his shoes. Again, I'm not saying it was right, just fairly understandable. The discussion reminds me of a local Sacramento organization called "Student Buddies," founded by Ellen Raey, someone LeRoy knows. The organization paired needy school children with mentors and was VERY successful. It flourished for many years. In time, Ellen created a Board, which eventually voted against Ellen's core belief that the group should NOT accept govt funds. When that vote took place, Ellen quit her own organization. She felt very defeated. I believe that the program has pretty much fizzled out, though I could be wrong. Losing Ellen, her drive, enthusiasm, etc., sort of took the life out of it. I very much identify with what Marshall and others were attempting to do in the UFW...change the volunteer system, set up locals with their own local leadership, run candidates on the exec bd, become more of a real union. For his own reasons, Cesar was clearly (and strongly) threatened by those attempts and apparently threatened to quit the union, rather than lose his ability to keep it the way HE wanted it. The UFW without Cesar...hmmm...if there had been enough votes to test that, I wonder what he really would have done? And if he HAD left, I wonder how things would have played out. I believe that the Salinas locals would have survived and probably the union as a whole, but

who knows. Cesar apparently believed he (and his viewpoint) was essential. It's too bad he couldn't have been talked into softening his position, but I never saw a lot of evidence that he was capable of that. And most of the time that was a good thing, but certainly not always. Happy holidays to all of you good people. You continue to inspire me!

Ellen Eggers  
LA Boycott 72-75  
La Paz Legal 80-87

**Ellen Eggers, 12/2/04 (2)**

**RE : LA PAZ**

Dang! I hate to be the one to mess that up, but having coming from the Los Angeles boycott, being yelled at by scabs all day long, I considered La Paz close to Nirvana!! At least for the first several years. It was actually quite a wonderful place for a single mom to raise her kids and practice law for La Causa. Everyone kind of watched out for the children, there was daycare, community meals (for a while) and replacement family (which I was thrilled to have since mine were all elsewhere). I fully understand why others had different viewpoints, but when I was on the boycott I remember thinking that it would be pure HEAVEN to live in a place (like La Paz) where everyone supported the farmworkers and no one crossed the Safeway picket line. (See it didn't take much to please a 24-7 picketer!)

Ellen Eggers  
LA Boycott 72-75  
La Paz Legal 80-87

**Abby Flores Rivera, 12/2/04 (2)**

**RE: Volunteers, Games, etc.**

Dear Glenn and All:

Well, I guess I could have done without hearing the Chavez women referred to as "royalty" (although their husbands do/did think of them as "Reinas") especially when I know they worked as hard as anybody else in the movement. They were "fighters" right along with the rest of us and irrespective of why LeRoy brought them into the picture, we should respect that about them. Related to Cesar or not, his daughters (and sons) also held volunteer status and believe me, Cesar did not play favorites not even with his own family. By the way, I believe he fired some of them along the way or they left, like you Glenn, because they wanted to. The door was wide open for all of us when we entered and just as wide for the leaving! The farm workers were not spit out . . . who was it that spoke about Cesar's time table earlier? sin mas/ abby/ r/d/lp p.s. the same also applied to the oligarchyooo thingamajiggers-Lori types (if there truly was such a thing) as it did to the "royalty" you mentioned. Advice: Don't mess with Lori.

**LeRoy Chatfield, 12/2/04 (3)**

**RE: RESPONSE TO ROTHNER POSTING**

LeRoy Chatfield 1963-1973

Glenn Rothner wrote: *"So, Leroy, (sic) was my only option the one you offer - marry royalty, that is, into the Chavez clan? I don't remember how many daughters Cesar had, that that would have permitted just a few of us to remain."*

If these sentences are a stab at humor, they missed their mark, at least with me. Glenn, perhaps you are not aware that Artie's wife passed away a few years ago in the prime of her life, not even 50 years old, leaving three children motherless. She is not present to defend herself from this kind of unnecessary and gratuitous sarcasm. If you were not aware of this, you are now, and if you were aware, then the kindest word I can think of is "insensitive."

Where did you get the idea that I proposed any such option to which you refer? I simply explained to Alberto Escalante my view that Artie's status as a volunteer changed when he married into the Chavez family, and I explained why I thought this to be the case.

I have a difficult time understanding your posting. On the one hand you write that you were prepared to make your volunteer work with the UFW your life's career, but on the other hand because you objected to the course the UFW was taking, you made the decision to leave the UFW voluntarily, and you don't regret your choice. Isn't this the way it is supposed to work? You came voluntarily, you tried your best to make a contribution, but you didn't like what was happening, so you left voluntarily. What's wrong with that?

**Richard Ybarra, 12/2/04**

**RE: Volunteers, Games, etc.**

Interesting discussion, but let me point out something very personal. Unlike some of you I unabashedly and unapologetically joined the Chavez Farmworker movement to follow his leadership and learn how to help as a volunteer in his movement. I respect other's reasons for joining. Following his lead my life and career have only been fulfilling and I left his movement in December of 1975.

But when you flippantly and disrespectfully attack Cesar's family in any form you have crossed the line. Cesar's family became my family and as Abby mentioned and as everyone who was around and in the movement knows, they got and he gave them no slack and no benefits. They were attacked at schools and in the community and due to his voluntary poverty they never new what a new bicycle or doll was like to recieve.

I would suggest you respectfully stay out of that place lest ye know where you tread.... to my knowledge no one in Cesar's family ever showed signs of being other than who they were and they, more than anyone here, kept his feet on the ground at all times. They gave their father to his movement and they gave at the office and in the fields! Artie's wife was a wonderful woman and a wonderful sister in law. I did not know Glen but I knew Linda "Lu". May she rest in peace, with her great father and other antepasados....

**Ellen Eggers, 12/2/04 (3)**

**RE: Volunteers, Games, etc.**

Richard I really didn't hear anyone dissing the Chavez family. The discussion was "volunteer" vs "founder" vs "elected board member" which led to the comment about Artie, since he started in one capacity and ended in another, and was "different" from others in that he was also a member of the family. Being family didn't necessarily mean you were "bound for life" as Cesar was...but that was the origin of the mention of family. No need to go looking for insults is there? Fondly,  
Ellen

**Glenn Rothner, 12/2/04 (2)**

**RE: RESPONSE TO ROTHNER POSTING**

Lighten up. It was humor, whether you found it funny or not. And your invocation of Artie's wife is a cheap shot. I was talking about events of the 1970's - the "Reformation," as you inaply called it - not recent history. My point, in case you missed it, is that oligarchy is not the customary method of rule in unions and that one shouldn't have to marry into the family in order to weather the recurrent storms.

As for my "voluntary" departure in August 1978, I should have made it clear that while I chose to leave then, the legal department had been terminated, en masse, with the only question being the timetable for departure. We understood that there would have to be a transition and, largely by consensus, Jerry established a schedule. In those discussions, I "volunteered" to leave in the first round.



So, LeRoy, it is true that I had been prepared to make a career of the Union. Although it became increasingly difficult for me to accept the approach that you continue to push so ardently - that it was Cesar's movement and he could do whatever he wanted to with it - it was not my choice to end my career with the Union. Rather, I chose to make the break decided on by Cesar quickly and cleanly.

"What's wrong with that?" Well, I guess it depends what "that" is. If you're referring to the process of governing a union by executive fiat and holding that union staff, whether farm workers by origin or marriage or non-farm workers, are expendable and terminable on whim – everything is wrong with it. It deprives rank-and-file workers of the opportunity to control their own union (empowerment) and it deprives the union of dedicated, experienced staff.

The final, albeit overly simplistic, point of my earlier posting was that the proof of the folly of Cesar's and your approach was the pudding. The model of the Union as an extension of its all-powerful leader failed miserably. I know from your earlier postings that you think it would have failed anyway, due to the economic and political power of the growers and their allies. I disagree. I would have enjoyed seeing the outcome had the UFW set about to empower members, develop rank-and-file leadership, and confer authority and responsibility on worker-leaders and experienced staff. Had I not been part of a mass termination, I would have done so.

**Marshall Ganz, 12/2/04 (3)**

**RE: RESPONSE TO ROTHNER POSTING**

Whoa....a little too much self-righteousness here, don't you think? After just talking about volunteers being chewed up and spit out? I must have missed your explanation of just why marrying one of Cesar's daughters changes your status from "volunteer" to something else. In fact, I never heard any explanation of what that something else is. If you make these kinds of "pronunciamientos" don't be surprised if someone calls you on them. . . . It could also be, by the way, that Glen's point was that Cesar made some very bad choices about what direction to take the union in, choices which aren't justified by claiming that as the "founder" he had some kind of almost divine right to destroy what he had initiated, no matter what the cost to all the people involved, farm workers and non-farm workers alike. You are, of course, entitled to believe what you wish to believe but for many of us, claims to uncritical obedience rank right up there with claims of "just following orders" in moral standing. Albert Hirshman, the economist, wrote a book called "exit, voice, and loyalty" in which he argued that one of the strengths of a democratic system is that one isn't left with the only options being exit or loyalty, but that there is a third option, called voice, which creates the possibility of peaceful change, debate, dissent, and evolution. You seem to argue that the only one who had any right to "voice" in the UFW was Cesar because he was the "founder". The fact he was able to more or less get away with this in the end is one of the main reasons the union went down the tubes, but it was never right, wise, or even workable.

**Nonie Fuller (Lomax) Graddy, 12/2/04**

**RE: LA PAZ**

Ellen, you are right about it being a great place for a single mother. When my daughter got home from school she would come running into my office to tell me she was "home". When she went out to play ( to lose still another pair of shoes ) I was nearby if she needed anything. Later, when I moved back to Salinas, all I would get was a "I'm home" phone call and worry until I got home.

I loved the community meals. Thanksgiving always makes me remember La Paz.

Who remembers the farmworkers who would come up to La Paz on Sat night to cook "cabeza" all night as a Sunday treat for all of us?

Key punching was the worst though , but Joaquin you made even that fun.

Nonie

**Hugh "Hawkeye" Tague, 12/2/04**

**RE: Gardner's Comment on Coachella Violence**

Jardinero: Escalante De Los Bolantes was talking about a later Coachella organizing drive than the one we were involved with in October-January '75-'76.

You didn't finish the story; Calacas, upon seeing your cracked windshield gave a critique on the fine art of smashing windshields. I took copious notes. This information was quite helpful to me in the anti-concession strikes.

By the way, Phyllis Hasbrouck's name has been mentioned. I didn't know her during our UFW days, but I did work with her in Chicago. She worked in several sweat shops as a "submarine". There is not a more selfless, decent person on earth.

Hawkeye Tague '71-'76

**Hub Segur, 12/2/04**

**RE: How Did Cesar Do It?**

Hub Segur 1969-1973, 1978-1989

Requesting Permission to Come On Board

How Did Cesar Do It?

(1) History Helped

I had a number of occasions to just chat with Cesar during my two terms of duty. Along with jazz, farm labor unionism in California was a frequent topic. I was impressed by the richness of his historical perspective and his analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of various organizing efforts. We talked of the Chinese and Japanese labor crews at the turn of the century, the waves of Hindu, Filipino and Mexican workers, the IWW organizing at the Durst hop ranch and the resulting Wheatland Riot which first brought the plight of the California farm worker to national attention. Cesar seemed particularly interested in, but also somewhat critical of, the organizing efforts of the Cannery and Agricultural Workers Industrial Union (CAWIU) during the 1930s but perhaps less intrigued with the National Farm Labor Union (an outgrowth of the successful Southern Tenants Farmers Union) in the 1940s and 1950s. He also had a grasp of the economics of agricultural production facing the growers which helped inform his assessment of the organizing strategies and tactics of previous unionization efforts. The initial service components of NFWA and their expansion under the UFWOC banner often mirrored historical precedents from other organizing efforts. Programs similar to NFWA's burial insurance and credit union had proven to be key attractions for mutual aid societies that emerged during the 1920's in Imperial Valley such as the Mexican Mutual Aid Society organized by a consul of the Republic of Mexico.

Stuart Jamieson prepared a thoroughly researched report, some 460 pages, on labor unionism in US agriculture for the Department of Labor which was published in 1945. His work leads him to conclude that the integrated nature of corporate agriculture mandates that labor must organize across field and shed as well as allied industries to produce meaningful collective bargaining power. "In the last analysis, farm laborers can gain economic security and improve their working conditions only if they can organize in large numbers as an economic and political pressure group."

While discussing farm labor activities dating back to the 1890's, Jamieson draws his conclusions from research focusing on the labor's unrest in California during the Depression era, 1930 to 1939. Of California's 140 strikes during that period, the 37 that occurred in 1933 managed to derail the downward agricultural labor wage slide that began in the previous decade. The majority of those strikes, 24 of the 37, were lead by the CAWIU which emerged in 1931 as another Communist affiliate in California organizing the unemployed. Twenty-one of those 1933 strikes lead to "partial increases of wages" affecting some 32,800 workers. The momentum of the strike wave triggered by the CAWIU organizing in 1933 and 1934 encouraged non-organized workers to initiate independent strikes which were often successful. One of Cesar's concerns was that the CAWIU was never able to sustain a membership. The CAWIU was terminated in 1935 after a

raid of its headquarters in Sacramento resulted in seventeen leaders being charged with criminal syndicalism. Organizers Pat Chambers and Caroline Decker were given jail sentences. One commentator suggested termination was inevitable because the CAWIU leaders were more interested in the day to day welfare of the farm workers than selling communist doctrine. It was also the time period when the Communist Party shifted strategy to infiltrating the AFL.

(Aside: Pat Chambers visited La Paz in April 1972, a bit self-conscious that any association he made with us would tint the union with his communist background. I was anxious to hear a bit more about his CAWIU days but Pat seemed intent on offering a sprawling analysis of the divisions in the current labor movement and the difficulty in forming a united labor front. He did indicate that he was jailed in 1935 and held without trial for nine months, finally being released in 1937. He was later pensioned by the Carpenters and was then living in San Pedro, playing pinochle with friends.)

During this '30s period, however, a number of union organizational models appeared that might well have influenced Cesar's thinking. The integrated bargaining structure advocated by Jamieson did prove promising on a number of occasions. In 1934, the independent Filipino Labor Union (FLU) and the Vegetable Packers Association, Local 18211 (AFL) committed to a joint strike in Salinas. Some 6,000 field and shed workers walked out. The agreement was that neither would return to work unless both unions settled. The AFL forced the shed workers to accept an agreement, threatening them with loss of their charter, but in so doing, they isolated the Filipino field workers who were remained on strike. In a short time, vigilantes burned a Filipino labor camp and drove some 800 Filipinos out of the county at gun point. The FLU, however, shifted its emphasis to the Santa Maria Valley. There it colluded with an independent Mexican union of field workers and the Santa Maria branch of Local 18211 shed workers to successfully gain wage increases and other concessions for several years. By 1936, the FLU had established ten branches and built an \$8,000 labor temple.

Within a few years, another Filipino field worker union developed in Stockton. In this instance, the budding union received substantial backing from the local Filipino business community. Representatives from the Philippine Island government were instrumental in building the relationship. When the Filipino Agriculture Labor Association (FALA) emerged in 1939, it conducted a strike in local asparagus fields that immediately produced 258 grower signed agreements for 5,000 FALA workers with wage increases and union recognition. That same year, strike activity in Sacramento County produced wage increases for 1500 Filipino tomato workers and later produced a package of benefits (wage increases, union recognition, seniority rights, better housing) for 2700 celery field and shed workers. The FALA built an active social service component into its agenda which included, in addition to housing/labor camp concerns, a cooperative store, the Philippine Mercantile Association, which provided groceries and products from the Philippines. They also established a systematic monitoring of wage payments for illegal deductions. As with NFWA/UFWOC service ventures, not all the FALA innovations were economically sustainable, but each addressed some major issue for the Filipino farm worker community. The FALA was essentially dissolved as members volunteered for military service when Japan invaded the Philippines. The crews that remained preserved an organized structure and were absorbed by the Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee (AWOC), AFL-CIO, in 1960. In December 1960, a joint venture by AWOC and the United Packinghouse Workers Association set up picket lines in the Imperial Valley lettuce fields, protesting the use of braceros. Federal agents only responded after the harvest was completed.

A number of the Filipino brothers were on the LA Boycott when I arrived there in 1969. I ended up sleeping on a mattress in their apartment for four months. Catilino Tachlibon, George Cargo and maybe Leo and Mariano. I would talk with them about their experiences in the Philippines, Hawaii and working the fields of California. It was mostly just snippets of information but I could not help but notice the revered tone they would use when mentioning "the FALA". I was never sure whether they had been members but their respect and pride in "the FALA" was evident (see, "Snapshots" essay).

In the mid-1970's, Cesar reflected on the union's development and where it had strayed. He told Jacques Levy, "We thought because we had contracts tha there were other things we could do. I'm convinced we can't. We got to do exactly what we did back in 1962, 1963, 1964. We must go back to the origins of the Union an do service-center work."

For the Record:

- (a) I believe the oldest continuing farm labor union in the United States is the ILWU in Hawaii. The initial sugar industry contract was signed in 1945 with pineapple workers under collective bargaining agreement since 1946. This was a direct result from passage of the Hawaii Employment Relations Act in 1945. It granted to agricultural workers the same rights as the NLRA granted to industrial workers. Jack Hall of ILWU, Local 142, was the union leader now credited with being "in the forefront of those shaping Hawaii's destiny."
- (b) While on ILWU string, University of Washington has established the Harry Bridges Center for Labor Studies. It is planning a UFW History Project focusing on Washington State.

## (2) The Boycott That Cleared The Path

I left Delano in mid-August 1969 to join the boycott staff in Toronto. I was given the "Latest Boycott List 6/17/69" updated by hand to August. If I got lost, the car broke down, ran out of money there was certain to be a boycott office within shouting distance. I had 47 names, addresses and phone numbers. In 24 states and three Canadian provinces. The boycott was everywhere. I knew boycott work from spending the winter and spring on the LA boycott staff. I saw the same work in Chicago and Detroit on the trip. Ditto in Toronto. With all those folks putting that time and energy into this project, we had to win if we could keep the momentum going. Some twenty years later, Cesar was asked how the boycott works. "No one knows how the boycott works. It just gets into people's hearts and minds. It's like writing a good poem or painting a picture. If you keep at it, it will come." We did a bumper strip in Toronto, "Do The Grape Thing - BOYCOTT". If you met people and mentioned the farm workers, the response was "Oh, you're with the Grape Thing". We were painting a picture across North America.

Organizational and business school types spend unearthly hours crafting mission statements that identifies the institution and notifies observers as to what they are all about. I was on just another Southwest Airlines flight, from to there, nursing my courtesy cup of coffee and thinking a bit about the Documentation Project and some of list serve comments on boycott dynamics. The coffee napkin was not intrusive, all it said: "Thirty Years - One Mission." I opened the napkin: "Low Fares". Clear, simple and obtainable with good strategy and hard work. Then it dawned on me, we essentially had the same approach: "Three Years - One Mission: Boycott Grapes". Clean, short and sellable. And with the "Little Girl" leaflet, we had the communication link. Then, all it took was time and a couple of thousand people around the country standing in front of super markets. When additional boycott targets could not be communicated with similar brevity and clarity, a power leakage emerged. I can't recall the Napa Valley Wine Nine Boycott really getting off the ground.

Boycotts have been around and have a history of importance in social action. The civil rights movement use of boycotts certainly caught our attention and on a lower profile, Saul Alinsky and the CSO found boycotts effective in community action. And there's something about a Captain Boycott starting it all in Ireland in the 1880's. Boycotts will continue to be with us but I can not envision another boycott, building strength over three years by a revolving army of volunteers willing to get the job done anywhere they are needed. I have wondered if there might have been a link between boycotters having limited funds for entertainment and activities and the level of creativity they poured into their boycott activities. Many of the tactics devised in one boycott city were passed on and adopted by other boycott cities. Not only were they effective but often ingenious and fun. Toronto's Balloon-In and its multiple variations was my favorite (see, "Snapshots") and we didn't do badly with a two-sided leaflet with "Boycott Grapes" on one side and the line-up's for the Maple Leafs and the Red Wings on the other. It was particularly effective

in front of the Maple Leaf Garden during the two hours before hockey game started. After some negotiations, we ended up with a permanent ad in the official Maple Leaf program for the rest of the year. The Barry Radburn Dictum ruled in Toronto: "The grocery store is an anarchist's dream."

(3) On Cesar

Cesar was Cesar. Maybe he wasn't the man some wanted him to be.

Ojo Negro Still Rides!

**Donna Haber Kornberg, 12/3/04**

**RE: LeRoy's definition of volunteers**

LeRoy wrote this, which, I must say, astonished and distressed me:

*The volunteers who joined the movement came simply "to help out" and while there was no mutually agreed upon time of service, I believe it is accurate to say that it was generally understood that their service was "temporary", "transitory", and that "they served at their own pleasure." And while the volunteer was free to come, and free to go, it is also true that they were permitted to stay only to the extent that they were useful to the cause, and once their usefulness was over, they had to leave.*

The emails on this subject seem to have thrown up some interesting points:

1. One of the legacies of the Movement, is, sadly, a great deal of still-existing anger and bitterness. I can understand these feelings in people who gave so much of themselves to the movement, and were then sacked or pushed out. I have never before thought myself fortunate to have been sacked by Cesar after only two years, and thus given the opportunity to move on in life. When I started to work with Cesar again in 1970, I did not give up my personal career.
2. Fundamentally different ideas of what it means to be a 'volunteer.' Mine is worlds away from LeRoy's. Perhaps this is attributable to the different cultures in which we grew up and were educated.

When I moved to Delano, I committed myself and my life, for the foreseeable future, to the Movement. I did see myself as "helping out," but as helping out in a manner equivalent to that of everyone else who was working there. I did not see myself as a servant of the farm workers. I did not see my service as temporary or transitory. I was there to do whatever needed to be done, for as long as it needed to be done, in order to work together to build the movement.

I did not take part in policy decisions -- those I believe, in 1966-8, were made by people like Cesar, LeRoy, Dolores (when she was not being sacked yet again), Marshall and Jim Drake. But I did feel that I had ideas and skills which were valuable to the organization -- more valuable than some farm workers and less valuable than others. I thought myself a full member of the Movement, in the various capacities in which I was asked to work.

Although I may technically have been "free to come and free to go," I did not see it that way. It would not have occurred to me to leave voluntarily while there was work to be done. I was, I thought, there for the duration -- until we, together, succeeded in building a union for farm workers.

LeRoy, the final sentence in the above paragraph makes me feel particularly sad. Were we really seen like this? I hope that I was useful to the cause, but you seem to be saying that I, as a human "volunteer," was equivalent to any other instrument used by the NFWA -- a picket line, a filing system, an office building -- to be used when wanted and discarded like trash afterwards.

In the short time I was first with the union, I worked in three different capacities (while also joining picket lines in the fields) -- as Cesar's secretary, as a staff member of El Malcriado, and as production/business manager for El Teatro Campesino -- and I was flexible enough -- and willing -- to do many other things. How could my "usefulness" (I prefer to think of it as my contribution; it makes me feel more of a person than an artifact) possibly be "over" when I was sacked?

3. Different ideas about what is a volunteer, and who among us were volunteers. It has struck me that some use it as an implicitly racist definition. Chicanos and Filipinos (and our token black couple) were not "volunteers," whereas so-called Anglos were "volunteers." Is this the case? In the Teatro, I saw us all as volunteers (The American Heritage Dictionary: people who assume an obligation voluntarily), but is it true that Kerry Ohta and I would have been seen as discardable volunteers, whereas Luis, Augie, and Felipe would not? Even though I could easily make a convincing case that Kerry and I were more important to the Teatro than was Felipe (whose activities varied between performing, getting drunk, and scabbing -- when his wife pressured him sufficiently to earn some money to support his family)?

Best wishes, to all who contributed so much of themselves,

Donna Haber Kornberg

Delano 1966-1968, London 1970-1974

**Susan Drake, 12/3/04**

**RE: How Did Cesar Do It?**

I'm behind 298 emails on this list alone but did read Hub's perspective -- his thoughts are always broadening for me. I had just become Cesar's secretary in 1970 when I was called to the front of the Admin. building at 40 Acres because someone wanted to see Cesar. At the end of the hall, I found a roly-poly, bespectacled old (probably only 60 but what did I know at 30-something) man whose spirit came through only in a fading sparkle in his eyes. Went back to Cesar, "Some guy named Pat Chambers would like to see you." Cesar practically made 100-dash down the hall, but not before leaving behind a tiny scatching look at my ignorance about this man's importance! Thanks, Hub, for weaving Mr. Chambers into this portrait of the movement.

Susan Drake (1962-73)

**Terry Carruthers (Vasquez) Scott, 12/3/04**

**RE: How Did Cesar Do It?**

Hi Hub and All:

Great insights, Hub! I learned a lot that I didn't know about earlier organizing efforts. Just wanted to say that one of the points you made that really struck a chord with me was, "When additional boycott targets could not be communicated with similar brevity and clarity, a power leakage emerged." This is so true! Remember how hard it was to educate people about all the various brands during the Gallo boycott? (Even the staunchest supporters had trouble keeping all the brands straight.) This has been a problem that has dogged many of the later boycott campaigns that the union undertook. It's true we live in a complex world, but it sure is a lot easier to get people's support when you can clearly and quickly identify the target!

Also, Hub, before this listserv ends, you should really tell the story that you related at the L.A. memorial service for Jim Drake-- the one about the last minute dash to the Bakersfield airport :-)

....

Como Siempre!

Terry (Vasquez) Scott

1973-1988 Various boycott assignments and La Paz

**Jackie (Brown) Davis, 12/3/04**

**RE: LeRoy's definition of Volunteers**

Leroy,

I ask this with great trepidation and hopefully, sensitivity. From reading your essay on the CD, and imagining the sobriety with which you must have had in realizing that Cesar was going to make you the fall guy if the Proposition (73?) failed, and forced to face how dispensible you were, I wonder if that is what has informed your perspective about the value or lack of value about

volunteers? I was so touched after reading your essay that I wrote you personally and recommended that we all read it during one of our quiet times. There is so much history that I did not know about, and so much creativity that you had contributed to the strategies we used and that I had not realized the degree of your influence on the movement. Certainly that moment clarified for you who the movement belonged to. As a friend, and as a partner with Cesar, the weight of that conversation must have been incomprehensibly hard, and I suspect, an impetus for your analysis.

Personally I agree with Donna's thought that I did not see myself as dispensible as long as there was work to do. And though there were grueling and long days, there was enormous fun and adventure in the process, which is motivating as well. We left because Gary wanted to go back to law school and we imagined that we would return when he completed his studies. Since the UFW was not going to help with re-payment of the loan, it was an impossibility for us to return when that time came.

I also want to say that living in La Paz for us was delightful and hard to leave. But that's a very different perspective than whether the move to La Paz was good for the development of the Union.

Jackie Davis  
1971-1974

**Doug Adair, 12/4/04**

**RE: The Revolutionary Period?**

In a message dated 12/2/04 . . . [Hub Segur] writes:

*I was impressed by the richness of his historical perspective and his analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of various organizing efforts. We talked of the Chinese and Japanese labor crews at the turn of the century, the waves of Hindu, Filipino and Mexican workers, the IWW organizing at the Durst hop ranch and the resulting Wheatland Riot which first brought the plight of the California farm worker to national attention. Cesar seemed particularly interested in, but also somewhat critical of, the organizing efforts of the Cannery and Agricultural Workers Industrial Union (CAWIU) during the 1930s but perhaps less intrigued with the National Farm Labor Union (an outgrowth of the successful Southern Tenants Farmers Union) in the 1940s and 1950s. He also had a grasp of the economics of agricultural production facing the growers which helped inform his assessment of the organizing strategies and tactics of previous unionization efforts.*

Dear Hub and all,

Thanks for the historical background. There were many, many old timers in Delano in 1965, including virtually all the Filipinos, who had been through struggles in the '30's and '40's and '50's, and the generation of Cesar and Gil Padilla and Tony Orendain and the Hernandezes were very aware of the failures, as well as successes, had been children but had family who had participated... Fina Hernandez told stories of the Cotton Pickers' encampment at Corcoran, 30,000 workers on strike, a peasants' armed militia guarding the stockade, closed at night to protect against the night riders...

The other roots of the movement were in Mexico, and I remember Tony, especially, but others, too, who had a deep knowledge of the Mexican Revolution, and it's successes and failures. I would guess that if there had been a poll of the workers voting to strike in Delano on Sept. 16, 1965, an overwhelming majority would have endorsed Zapata's vision, that the land, like the air and the water, belonged to the people.

My knowledge of the visions and ideology of the leaders of the union came in large part from discussions in People's Cafe (my apologies to Donna Haber for getting it wrong on her "purge," -- the "party at Sam's" conspiracy theory was just that, in my mind, until Fran said that she had been there, there was such a party). I was never in the inner circle of the leadership, never worked closely with Cesar, can't speak as to what was on his mind. But hearing a really radical perspective on agriculture from folks like Phillip Veracruz and Luis Valdez "opened my eyes," in Abbey's

phrase, to looking at everything in a new light. And they certainly saw our movement as part of a world revolutionary struggle...

It was my impression that Cesar and Gilbert left CSO in part because the CSO vision was so limited, a middle class movement, lots of worthy goals (voter registration, access to better schools, parks, libraries), but also priorities irrelevant to the vast majority of campesinos -- the right to move out of the barrio into "better" neighborhoods, the right to rise in government and corporate bureaucracies, become supervisors and managers and bosses... and the first thing a Mexican American should do if he (pretty macho at that time) wanted to improve himself was get out of farm labor....

It was my impression that the CSO leadership wanted to keep Cesar, recognized how good an organizer he was, offered him most of what he was asking for, but he and Padilla left any way (Dolores joined up full time a year or so down the road; as has been pointed out, she never did any farm labor, her family had a hotel, as I remember, though I see no reason why that should disqualify her from being an outstanding leader of a farm workers' union).

The movement that Cesar and Gilbert began building, one member at a time, was rooted in building a democratic union, of, by, and for farm workers, and from that economic base, push an agenda that would benefit the middle class community as well. I remember criticism in Delano of the civil rights movement in the South, that the organizations were not built on dues paying members with an economic stake in the struggle. Cesar and Gilbert brought to that vision a commitment to non-violence, perhaps more ideological on Cesar's part, from his readings of Ghandi and the Catholic Workers, more practical on Gilbert's part. Padilla seemed more focused on the here and now, what can actually be accomplished, and how. But I also remember his talking about the slaughter of the Mexican Revolution, that in his grandparents' village, regardless of which army marched through, everything edible was eaten, everything movable was stolen...

In People's Cafe, There was no defense of the agribusiness system, plenty of criticism of private property, (especially the land), no thought that the Democratic Party or the Catholic Church or the AFL-CIO would ever do anything to change a system which benefited them so much (cheap food), deep suspicion of government, poverty programs (designed to buy off the upwardly mobile leadership and give them desk jobs), contempt for welfare programs that put more money in the pockets of administrators than in the pockets of the people, and helped subsidize the growers so they could pay below subsistence wages... Self help housing was one of the few programs that got praise, people building on their own land. And the 40 Acres was an outgrowth of that underlying dream, the land... that on that little piece, we could have grown much the food we needed to feed the staff, while training the workers not just to run their ranch committees and contracts, but also to run their ranches... starting to carve out a niche, a space within capitalist society, where we could offer an alternate life style. Kibbutzim, ejidos, communes, family farms, everything was discussed, on the table....

And while Cesar and Gilbert were "founders", the whole idea of building an independent democratic union and structure was basic, a reason not to get sucked in to the AFL union that existed (AWOC), to turn down offers of affiliation from the Teamsters and Longshoremen, who had farm labor affiliates.

The Plan of Delano was our Pronunciamato (sp?) to the world of who we were, our "mission statement," and to me, it is a Revolutionary document, calling for the present social relationships to dissolve. And I gather it was written by Luis Valdez, not Cesar, though surely with input from him. The call to go on strike in the first place was made in a speech by Epifanio Camacho, a Protestant, invoking Zapata and the revolutionary struggle. There was a rejection of the Capitalist materialist world view, but also of the Communist position, that the Party was the legitimate leader of any alternative. We were inviting Communists and capitalists to help us, but on our own terms. The ideology I picked up in Peoples' Cafe was that society was based on the workers who planted the seeds and pruned the vines and harvested the fruit, that bringing justice and respect to that labor was the priority of our struggle, and we judged folks, movements and systems on how they fared in that struggle.



In that sense, the ejidos might be a good idea, but marginalized by the PRI in Mexico, underfunded, neglected... and the official peasant union in Mexico was a hollow shell, controlled by the CTM, which was part of the PRI... there was another, independent peasant union at the time which I was led to believe was much closer to our ideals... peasant movements in Guerrero and Michoacan at the time were viewed with sympathy (and I would be eager to hear Al Rojas' take on what is happening in Chiapas today -- how do peasants deal with defending their societies and rights in this rapacious world of NAFTA and WTO). The Huks in the Filipines were viewed with sympathy, and it was rumored that some of the young Filipinos (Ernie Delarmente?) had gone back to participate in the struggle there...

Of course the merger of the two unions in 1966, in preparation for the diGiorgio campaign, was a major compromise for all concerned. The Filipinos lost their majority status in "their" union, and our union lost a significant part of its independence. There were many supporters on the Left, with the UAW and Longshoremen and Mine/Mill workers and others, who urged us to maintain our independence and revolutionary "purity," And there were farm workers who were also dubious that this move was necessary. I was for the merger at the time, but I remember vigorous debates in People's, and folks did leave after that, both purged and voluntarily moving on....

The Revoutionary tradition continued to infuse the spirit of the union, though the focus became much more limited. As Barbara mentions, the training and growth of the ranch committees in Delano in 1971 and 1972 (and the growth of the Schenley ranch committee between 1966 and 1972) convinced many workers that we might someday be running the ranches, and packing sheds, and wineries, and dealing directly with the capitalist marketing structure. Maybe naive, but we had a very "si si puede" attitude. The 40 acres was central to this vision, our "liberated" land. Even in Coachella, in the late 1970's and early 1980's, workers always talked about buying our own land, for our clinic and offices and service centers.... it was part of the vision that Eliseo promoted when he was here and it struck a nerve...

The Peasant Revolution lost, overtaken by history. Che failed, Allende and the Sandinistas overthrown, the Czech Spring of 1968 crushed, student and peasant rebellions in Mexico crushed, China promoting capitalism, the ejidos and kibbutzim shadows of their ideals.... But we tried, no regrets. I got my union pension check this week, a note inclosed saying 2636 checks were sent out this month to farm workers and their surviving spouses. So many thanks to all of you who helped.

Viva la Causa, Doug Adair

El Malcriado, Legal Dept, David Freedman Co., 1965-1989

#### **Alberto Escalante, 12/4/04**

Pato . . . Congratulations! By receiving your 1st Pension check you're a witness that the Farm Worker Revolution was indeed successful, albeit a tad institutionalized. Look in Webster's New World Dictionary, where Revolutionized is cited as Rev' o-lu'tion-ized [-izing] vt."To make great change in or something completely new"...So I ask you my dear friend, would you have ever received a pension check if it hadn't been for the Juan de La Cruz Pension Fund? Did Cesar have to wear the camouflage garb and beard of the Cuban guerrillas or the black "pajamas" of the Vietminh freedom fighters to be a Revolutionary? No! But under his common man plaid shirt of cotton flannel (He never wore a tie after his CSO days) beat the heart of a true indigenous warrior whose DNA burned deep within his soul with the hot fire of a "real" Revolutionary, someone who would do what ever he had to, in order to insure that the changes he knew were necessary for the good of the Campesino proletariat would be realized in the end. Like your Pension Check for example. Because before Cesar "Revolutionized" the retirement of farm workers (those who had worked under a UFW contract anyway!) all you'd get when you were to old or sick to continue working was, the boss told you "You're Fired, get off MY property!!" And that was something that Cesar despised. It really angered him that the Ranchers and the Farmers had little or no regard for the farmworkers, often treating their livestock better than they did their workers. Pues, Pato, mi amigo, felicitades por recibir tu cheque de pension lo merecedes porque lo ganates! Con tu sudor, tu lagrimas y tu sangre!

#### **LeRoy Chatfield, 12/4/04**

**RE: RESPONSE TO JACKIE DAVIS**

LeRoy Chatfield 1963-1973

**RESPONSE TO JACKIE DAVIS**

I am sorry you feel great trepidation when you write to ask for my opinion about the value, or lack of value, of farmworker movement volunteers. I assure you, there is no need to feel such trepidation. If your feeling is due to my overreaction to a posting that I considered to be disparaging about the Chavez family, please take into account that Bonnie and I had a close personal relationship with the family that dates back even to the pre-strike years of the NFWA. I feel protective, perhaps too much so, I don't know.

First off, let me state again my view about UFW volunteers, not only were they valuable, they were invaluable. It is my opinion that without the work, the dedication, and the commitment of the volunteers, there would have been no farmworker movement, no successful Delano Grape Strike, no ALRA, and no UFW today. Please recall that I entitled the CD of the documentation project essays: "Cesar Chavez and his farmworker movement, 1962-1993. 175 essays written by the volunteers who built his farmworker movement."

So, if volunteers were so valuable to the movement, you ask me, why I write as if they were expendable? (I prefer to use the word expendable instead of dispensable.) I do so because, in fact, each individual volunteer was expendable. Consider this: when you left the UFW, another volunteer immediately took your place, the farmworker movement did not miss a beat. The same happened to me, and to every other volunteer who joined, and subsequently left the movement. There were always volunteers coming into the movement who were able and willing to take the places of those of us who left.

I realize it must sound crude or harsh when I write that the farmworker movement sucked up volunteers, chewed them up, and spit them out.

I am simply hammering the point that each of us came to the movement with a burning desire to help. We did whatever was asked; we went wherever we were told, sometimes on a minute's notice; we worked very long days for months on end without time off or vacation; we worked for the love of a cause, not for money; we were separated for long periods of time from our spouses and children; and so forth. These are only a few examples of the unrelenting, and insatiable demands that the farmworker movement made upon each of us, and we responded with a heartfelt, yes. I characterize this volunteer work period as the chewing up process.

The spitting out process occurred when each volunteer, you and me, came to the realization that for a variety of reasons - personal, ethical, marriage, children, financial, educational, career, parental demands - we could no longer participate, or we did not want to. Some came to this realization because they felt unwanted, or unappreciated, or unneeded, or physically and emotionally spent. I view this voluntary leaving as the normal and natural result of idealistic volunteers who threw themselves headlong into a cause, without thinking about - or even caring about - any personal consequences.

Sometimes the realization that it was time to move on took years to materialize, sometimes only a year or two, or even just a summer, but at some point during the volunteer's service to the farm worker movement, the realization came because it had to. For the vast majority of people, living a Cesar Chavez-type movement is an abnormal life, it can be done, but only for a time.

I pause here to make the point that not all volunteers who came to Delano to help were acceptable to the movement, nor should they have been. Some were lazy and did not have enough personal discipline to cope with the hard work, some came to make policy and run the union, some were unreformed romantic revolution drifters, and others came to peddle their own brand of ideology. Generally speaking, these kinds of volunteers were soon weeded out by requiring them to participate in the grinding, hard work of manning the picket lines in the fields or in front of supermarkets.

Did leaving the movement have to be inevitable? Theoretically, perhaps not, but since the cause was seen as an all-important, life-and-death struggle, the movement was wired to place the needs of the organization above any of the personal needs of its volunteers. The movement

demands upon the individual volunteer were relentless and insatiable, and they could never be met, because there was always a new set of demands waiting in the wings. I compare the farmworker movement to a moving river, a volunteer never stepped into the same river twice. It was a life of constant change, much of it crisis-driven, and semi-organized chaos.

Yes, there were some occasions - infrequent, I say - when volunteers were pushed overboard. Sometimes it was done nicely, and sometimes accusingly - no explanation was requested, no questions were asked, no reasons were given, and no justification was deemed necessary. Cruel? Yes. Unnecessary? Probably so.

During the course of the documentation project, a few volunteers have asked me if I have any inside information about their leaving the movement, because they thought they had left voluntarily, but now, listening to others, they suspect they were pushed out. I do not have any answers to their questions, nor do I have any explanation why terminations were handled in the manner they were, except to observe that the cause itself was deemed so important, that such individual personnel matters paled by comparison, and seemed insignificant and inconsequential.

Admittedly, the leaving part of the volunteer equation is more stressful than either the coming part, or the working part, because leaving frequently generated emotions and feelings of loss, guilt, failure, sadness, anger or resentment. In my case, for example, there was certainly a feeling of loss, sadness, and some guilt. True, leaving sometimes generated feelings of relief because one was returning to a more normal life, but, in my view, this was generally not the case.

The work of the volunteers not only built the farmworker movement, but it prepared the volunteers for their own future careers. They learned valuable organizing skills, they met people from all walks of life, they were exposed to new career opportunities, and they worked in rural and urban areas throughout California, the U.S., and beyond. Many learned a second language, how to speak in public, and all developed a sense of self-confidence with an infectious can-do attitude. Correct me if I am wrong, but because of Cesar Chavez and his farmworker movement, the volunteers ultimately created a more financially secure and rewarding life for themselves and their families. Is there any volunteer reading this posting who has not highlighted their resume to show their involvement with the farmworkers movement? I doubt it.

The views I express about volunteers are, of course, my own, but full disclosure requires me to write that I have read each volunteer essay submitted to the documentation project, and most of what I know about the relationship of the movement to that of its volunteers, resides in those essays, including my own.

I apologize for this unduly long posting.

**Marshall Ganz, 12/5/04**

**RE: RESPONSE TO JACKIE DAVIS**

LeRoy,

On Dec. 4, 2004, . . . [LeRoy Chatfield] wrote:

*So, if volunteers were so valuable to the movement, you ask me, why I write as if they were expendable? (I prefer to use the word expendable instead of dispensable.) I do so because, in fact, each individual volunteer was expendable. Consider this" when you left the UFW, another volunteer immediately took your place, the farmworker movement did not miss a beat. The same happened to me, and to every other volunteer who joined, and subsequently left the movement. There were always volunteers coming into the movement who were able, and willing to take the places of those of us who left.*

You write as if people were fungible, each one a replaceable part, like a tire or a gear. Each person made unique contributions that were lost when that person left, especially if they had accumulated years of experience, understanding, and skills in the work of the movement. Even economists recognize something they call "human capital" -- the accumulation of skills, understanding, and practice that a person acquires in the course of learning, growing, and developing in their work.

And the farm workers movement missed quite a few beats when people left -- when you left, after Cesar asked you to run for secretary treasurer, and you decided it was time for you to leave, the union lost a great deal not only in your skills, but in the relationships that you had built up with Cesar and others that enabled you to be so effective when you were working with the union. No new volunteer just "took your place." When Eliseo left in 1978, as the most viable possible successor to Cesar, no one just "took his place" and when Cesar was gone it was not replaced by anyone with the years of experience that Eliseo had. And on and on. . . I can't believe that you regard the unique contributions people made to the movement so lightly as what you wrote indicates. . . and I don't know why you write it.

*The spitting out process occurred when each volunteer, you and me, came to the realization that for a variety of reasons - personal, ethical, marriage, children, financial, educational, career, parental demands - we could no longer participate, or we did not want to. Some came to this realization because they felt unwanted, or unappreciated, or unneeded, or physically and emotionally spent. I view this voluntary leaving as the normal, and natural result of idealistic volunteers who threw themselves headlong into a cause, without thinking about - or even caring about - any personal consequences.*

Again, the lack of respect for the people about whom you are writing is stunning -- as if we were all children who didn't know any better but finally wore out. A different way to look at it is that those running the union wasted people, were careless with the precious gift of time, energy, talent and commitment they were given, and drove people out, often those that had the most to contribute, at great cost to the individuals and to the movement itself. You write as if you think the leadership of the union had no responsibility for treating people as renewable resources, but it was some force of nature.

*Sometimes the realization that it was time to move on took years to materialize, sometimes only a year or two, or even just a summer, but at some point during the volunteer's service to the farmworker movement, the realization came because it had to. For the vast majority of people, living a Cesar Chavez-type movement is an abnormal life, it can be done, but only for a time.*

For most people, social movements are just that -- movements -- movements from one situation to another, from a segregated America to a desegregated America, from life without a union to life with a union -- they are transitions, transformations, and they don't last forever, nor should they. The mistake may have been in trying to make it last forever, an abnormality when it comes to social movements.

*I pause here to make the point that not all volunteers who came to Delano to help were acceptable to the movement, nor should they have been. Some were lazy and did not have enough personal discipline to cope with the hard work, some came to make policy and run the union, some were unreformed romantic revolution drifters, and others came to peddle their own brand of ideology. Generally speaking, these kinds of volunteers were soon weeded out by requiring them to participate in the grinding, hard work of manning the picket lines in the fields or in front of supermarkets.*

Gratuitous, LeRoy, gratuitous.

*Did leaving the movement have to be inevitable? Theoretically, perhaps not, but since the cause was seen as an all-important, life-and-death struggle, the movement was wired to place the needs of the organization above any of the personal needs of its volunteers. The movement demands upon the individual volunteer were relentless and insatiable, and they could never be met, because there was always a new set of demands waiting in the wings. I compare the farmworker movement to a moving river, a volunteer never stepped into the same river twice. It was a life of constant change, much of it crisis-driven, and semi-organized chaos.*

I remain curious about who it was who were not volunteers. I think it would help clarify your argument if you could be clearer about just whom you are including and whom you are excluding. Was it only "volunteers" who did not step in the same river twice?

*Yes, there were some occasions - infrequent, I say - when volunteers were pushed overboard. Sometimes it was done nicely, and sometimes accusingly - no explanation was requested, no questions were asked, no reasons were given, and no justification was deemed necessary. Cruel? Yes. Unnecessary? Probably so.*

Wow! Probably?

*During the course of the documentation project, a few volunteers have asked me if I have any inside information about their leaving the movement, because they thought they had left voluntarily, but now, listening to others, they suspect they were pushed out. I do not have any answers to their questions, nor do I have any explanation why terminations were handled in the manner they were, except to observe that the cause itself was deemed so important, that such individual personnel matters paled by comparison, and seemed insignificant and inconsequential.*

LeRoy. You've become a genuine Machiavellian here. What about the principle that each person is created in the image of God, deserving of respect, and to be treated as an end, but never as a means? And why do you use the passive voice "the cause was deemed" -- why not, "Cesar decided...." or someone else decided. Decisions about this form of treatment of people were made by other people, who must be accountable for the decisions they made.

*The views I express about volunteers are, of course, my own, but full disclosure requires me to write that I have read each volunteer essay submitted to the documentation project, and most of what I know about the relationship of the movement to that of its volunteers, resides in those essays, including my own.*

I find the views you express here disgraceful and unworthy of a person who has invested so much of their life in caring for other people. But, as you say, these are your views.

Marshall

**Deborah Vollmer, 12/5/04**

**RE: On Volunteer Status, as affected by Marriage**

LeRoy,

You say:

*YES, I do believe that marrying into the movement would change that status of a volunteer, especially marrying into the Chavez family. In my view, a Chavez family member is not a volunteer, he/she is a conscript, and public expectations about their roles are much different.*

I wonder, if Philip Vera Cruz and I had married, would that have changed my status? As it was, we ended up living together for nearly twenty years (until Philip's death in 1994.) Much of this time was after we both left the Union--but clearly during much of our time in the Union we were very much a couple. I vaguely remember one incident, where there was a luncheon scheduled for Board members and their wives, I think it was at La Paz, and I was expecting to go with Philip, but was told by someone (I could be wrong, but I think it may have been YOU, Leroy-- or maybe it was Chris Hartmire--) told me no, I wasn't invited, this was only for Board members and their WIVES.

As it was, I was made to suffer for my relationship with Philip, and he was made to suffer as well. I've detailed some of this in my earlier postings, and if I had the time to go through some old journals that I kept at the time (time that I do not have at the moment), I would have a lot more to say about this.

To summarize for those who are newcomers to the list, or who have forgotten, or who have just been unable to keep up with all these e-mails, and to add just a little to what I have previously written, Philip Vera Cruz was on the Board and Second Vice President of the Union; he was widely respected in Boycott circles around the country, indeed around the world, especially among students and young Asian-American activists. But for some reason, he was disrespected within the Union leadership at La Paz and in Delano, where he had his office. Philip was somewhat on

the left politically, but his left wing politics were very much based in common sense, and grew out of his experiences as a Filipino farmworker. When I came on the scene and we became a couple, I was accused of manipulating Philip to some extreme form of leftism, which is really laughable, because I was then, what I still am, essentially what I now am, a Kucinich (or Wellstone) Democrat. Yet these baseless accusations followed me, and when Philip and I were both no longer active in the Union, but we came to visit Agbayani Village, I was told by someone named Antonia to leave, because I was "an enemy of the Union." Philip and I were both hurt by the accusations about me, and I can tell you that without question Philip was his own person, and did his own thinking. I loved him for it, and I miss him.

Deborah Vollmer ("Debbie")

Student volunteer a few summers, in Florida and New Jersey (?years?) and subsequently full-time 1973-1976 Law Clerk and Lawyer for the Legal Department, La Paz and Delano (mostly)

**LeRoy Chatfield, 12/5/04**

**RE: RESPONSE TO DEBORAH VOLLMER**

LeRoy Chatfield, 1963-1973

Deborah,

Thank you for reminding me of Philip Vera Cruz. I always found him to be a gentle, kind, and thoughtful person, though when provoked by someone like Larry Itliong, he flashed his temper. Oftentimes we sat next to each other through seemingly endless board meetings, and while I was champng at the bit, "to get going, and stop all this talking," Philip sat through it all in rapt attention, and took copious notes. I always admired him for this. Throughout the years we knew, and worked with one another, we enjoyed a cordial and friendly relationship.

I can only speculate about what your status might have been if you had married Philip. Frankly, until you mentioned otherwise in your posting, I always thought you and Philip were married. In some ways it does NOT surprise me that I didn't know Philip and you were not married, because during this time of my life, I was wrapped so tightly around the axle of the farmworkers movement, that I did not pay much attention to things of this nature.

I have no recollection of having anything to do with organizing a board luncheon for UFW board members and their wives. I certainly never attended any such luncheon, but of course, I was never a board member. Perhaps others in the discussion group will have more information about this incident.

Before I close off this posting, I urge you to take the time go through your "old journals" and write more about how your relationship with Philip caused you both to suffer in the farm worker movement. Remember, if you don't write this up, no one else will ever do it. The documentation project would be pleased to receive such an essay, or even the journals themselves that relate to Philip's work in the movement. (Do you know what happened to Philip's board meeting journals to which I referred earlier?)

LeRoy

**Jerry Kay, 12/5/04**

**RE: Come on, folks!**

Jerry Kay (69-75)

Okay, we're back to discussing some top-notch, gut-level issues here, but maybe we can do it without throwing out the invectives at each other. Come on, Marshall, do we have to say Leroy's views are 'disgraceful'? I don't agree that we were all easily replaceable--I'm not sure he really meant it, either. But what bugs me--and I hold strong views about what was right and wrong about the union--is that any of us who had to tell people at any point what to do, or assign them here or there or whatever, had to have made some decisions that they were not always comfortable with.

Many of us did things to the very people we worked with that were really against a lot of the principles of caring and justice and democracy that we espoused. If you are without 'sin', you must have been in some other movement or not have stuck around all that long.

So, I think we can talk about it all and air our gripes, but first, maybe we ought to do a little confessing. I lost a really good organizer, one of the best, who came out of the Salinas Bruce Church wildcat strike in '73 because I told him we had to do some property destruction (on another strike) to cripple harvest operations. This guy was so good and respected by so many field workers, and in a short time came to practice so much of what we, and Cesar all 'preached'--that the look on his face when he told me that he could no longer participate because we were going against these principles haunts me today. There were strikers who put all of their economic security on the line who I had to shove aside only because the few bills we agreed to pay came to a bit too much.

There were times when someone else got something really good going, like a benefit concert on the boycott, and I stepped in and got the glory. There were women in the movement who I did things to that I would still like to apologize about. I wasn't at the level of union leadership to help make policy decisions, and I doubt I could have lasted too long with that kind of stress, but come on--there was often a really thin line a lot of us walked between doing what was 'just' and doing what could hurt, even if people got hurt, used or abused. And a lot of us did it. So, yes, if Leroy really believes all volunteers were expendable and easily replaceable I really disagree. But who of us wasn't playing hardball? If there were 'factions' in the union and one side won out, I suspect if it had turned out the other way, a different group of people would have been shown the door.

Any of you too clean to admit it?

And to keep things in perspective, if one of us ran afoul what happened, we got fired? Gee, lost our whole livelihood? Want to change places with the Teamsters Union?

--Let's keep the memories and analyses coming, but with a little less self-righteousness.

### **Patty Park (Proctor), 12/5/04**

#### **RE: Volunteers**

I guess I missed something about being dispensable as a volunteer. And perhaps it is because my time with the union as a volunteer came to an end in 1975 but as I was recruited to the cause and as I recruited others I saw everyone who was working on the boycott - farmworkers or non farmworkers -- we were all volunteers none of us as dispensable. All of us with a unique contribution to make.

Yes we came from a variety of places and circumstances, and I was well aware of the white middle class privilege I came from, however the expectations of us as union staff members gave us common ground. Our variety of backgrounds was helpful to the union.

We brought different experiences and understanding. I had been brought up in a family of trade unionists and had done human rights work for the Jewish Labour Committee and understood something about how the labour movement worked so I got assignments that let the union use that background. In San Diego during the proposition campaign in 1972 I got sent from La Paz to work with labour there. In ten days we leafleted every major work place. In Detroit it helped with the UAW. I got sent in place of Dolores to a founding Executive Meeting of the Coalition of Labour Union Women (CLUW) because of it. We were not sure they would endorse the boycott(s) because they wanted the Teamsters in CLUW so it was better not to send me and not have an Executive Board member turned down. I think what I knew about labour helped me work in a way that got us an endorsement of grapes lettuce and gallo. Certainly the relationships I had established with UAW union women and their incredible support of UFW all contributed to getting an endorsement (in the case of Gallo something the ALF-CIO opposed)

Other volunteers brought other experiences and we were able to create a dynamic organizations because differences were allowed to flourish.

I was also on staff in Detroit when Artie Rodriguez was recruited as a volunteer.

David Marintinez (also later an executive board member) and exceptionally committed admirer of Cesar, was then a law student at University of Michigan. He would invite Janis Lien and myself to the Chicano Student socials. We would go, have fun, dance some and recruit volunteers.

David who believed that everyone should be as ardent in their support of the union and Cesar as he was would stop the music on a Saturday night and make a speech about the union. Sometimes we thought his timing was not great. We preferred to recruit in a more subtle way at these gatherings.

As we all know "la causa" is what recruited people to become volunteers but as an agent of "la causa" I remember talking to Artie. He was to graduate with his MSW that spring. He talked to me then about wanting to do work with children. I tried to be convincing that he could help a lot more kids if he joined the boycott staff.

We were lucky after graduation we had two new volunteers Sam Baca and Artie Rodriguez both graduating social workers. David quit law school and joined full time. We missed out on Rueben Zamarana as I recall and he went on to do stuff in public health. But we figured 3 out of 4 wasn't bad and the boycott then opened up offices in Lansing which covered Flint and Saginaw and western Michigan including Grand Rapids. Artie was assigned to the north central suburban area of Detroit.

In the fall a new wave of organizers came out from California. Linda Chavez was among them. As were George and Sylvia Delgado, Margaret and Jessie Mirelez, Lala and Roberto Escutia and many others.

I remember Roberto asking me what was I going to do after we won the boycott. He believed he would go back to the fields with a decent contract he was concerned about what I would do.

How I felt about my efforts in the union didn't need to come from the institution they came everyday from the people I worked with. Farmworkers and non farmworker volunteers. It was about farmworkers having a democratic union that they controlled. I didn't pretend I had experienced what the farmworkers had, I knew where I came from and that I had a range of choices that related to a society that distributes power based on class, race and gender. But the unions great accomplishment while I was there was to allow so many to move through those barriers to do something that might change those realities.

Patty Park (Proctor)  
Toronto, La Paz and Detroit

### **Hugh "Hawkeye" Tague, 12/5/04**

#### **RE: Where/ How We Lived**

There was so much response to my posting about WHAT WE ATE, that I thought that we might want to talk about where we lived.

Of course, in many cases we used the need to shelter ourselves as an organizing tool just like we used the need to hustle food.

In Philly the "Boycott House" was an abandoned house that the City gave us in Kensington. This was an area of closed textile mills where white people went to score their heroin. We had a smack house 2 doors down.

The Atlanta Boycott House wasn't in a bad neighborhood but it was pretty inadequate for our needs.

In Tampa we were in Ybor City, the old Cuban section. This was a raggedy house too, but the neighborhood was o.k. and it was a good location for the boycott and the citrus organizing in the Haines City are. The house was sitting up on blocks. This rat used to come up into the oven from under the house. We would open the oven door and throw things at it.



While living here, some of the guys thought that they would play a trick on Joe Moon. They took him out to a "really cool bar". I didn't go because it was during one of my sober periods, but I was told that after a few minutes Jose' started yelling, "que clase de cantina es esto? los hombres estan bailando con los hombres y las mujeres estan bailando con las mujeres!"

In Miami we lived on the edge of Liberty City (the scene of major riots in the 80's) in another wholly inadequate house. I got mugged in midday trying to catch a bus to the highway so I could hitchhike up to Avon Park. There were huge palmetto bugs and these dry-looking lizards that weren't much bigger than them. You had to make sure that you emptied out your shoes in the morning or you might feel a squish when you put them on.

We shared a tiny office with an old lefty from the Distributive Workers which was inside the Meatcutters Hall.

I've already described our shack in Bean City. We were about one third the population of Bean City. There were no beans there. It was all sugarcane. This was at the southern edge of Lake Okeechobee on very fertile land that the Army Corps of Engineers reclaimed. The huge sugarcane crop was basically a foreign policy tool to destroy Castro's economy. Thousands of British West Indians came in from Jamaica, Barbados, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, etc. every fall/winter to cut cane by hand.

We lived in a trailer in Harlem, Florida where most of us were the only non-blacks, The roosters used to walk on top of the trailer and crow all hours of the night when they woke up and saw the one street light. Grinding poverty was evident right outside our side door. Most people had outhouses and common showers and just a cold water spigot out their back doors. In addition to the stray chickens, there were lots of stray dogs too. U.S. Sugar (owned by General Motors at the time) had a huge mill just upwind when Harlem. The thick, black smoke that smelled sickeningly sweet settled fell on the little town. Harlem was in an unincorporated part of Hendry County. Chain gangs (without the chains, but with all of the other trappings) came through periodically to work on the roads.

Mark Pitt (another unsung hero) went to work cutting sugar cane in this bizarre effort that Cesar must have come up with that mirrored his early efforts against the Bracero program. Mark lived in a huge barracks in Belle Glade (now the AIDS Capitol of the South) with a couple of hundred Jamaicans and a handful of white guys sent by unemployment offices. The food there was really bad, but I'll let Mark describe it in detail, as I hope he will.

The whole sugarcane industry was an extremely well run racket funded to a large extent by the Federal government. "Farmers" (General Motors, Gulf and Western (now VIACOM)) etc. were paid to grow sugar on land that they leased from the federal government for next to nothing. They were also paid to not-grow sugar on other lands upon which they raised brahma cattle fed by sugar mill by-products. Now when I watch a movie and the Paramount Pictures/Gulf and Western symbol comes on (the one with the mountain and the ring of stars) I think of them having me arrested for "trespassing in town" or "trespassing in a labor camp".

Dorothy and Eliseo found a nice cheap apartment in BelleGlade for us. It was the nicest place I ever lived to date as far as sometimes having my own room, etc.

CLEVELAND. I mentioned living in a wino mission and a bad East Side neighborhood. I also lived in a house on the West Side that was pretty crowded. Mark Pitt lived under the stairs (literally) with a sheet as a door. There was another apartment on the West side that everybody else called the "Roach House" because it had a few roaches in it. I lived in a much more roach and flea infested place with my family for a while.

The best place that I lived was with Jared Van Wagenen and Anita Meyerson on the Near West Side near the boycott office. They are great people who put up with me and my crude ways and active "social life". It was a neighborhood that was slowing gentrifying from a Southern White/Puerto Rican area into a hip place to live. There were some cool people in the area including a few 'commie catholics' (Catholic Workers) who let us use their phones and shared their food with us. A nearby shoemaker "sold" me unclaimed shoes for \$1.00. One day, an old guy

next door asked me to help him lift something heavy out of his basement. He had this sculpture on a table that looked like Leon Trotsky. He told me that he had been a body guard for Trotsky in Mexico. I had to bite my tongue, but I was thinking that he hadn't done a very good job. We stayed in a former convent on The East Side for a while. There were families and single people there. It was pretty crowded and there was only room to hang one or two nun's habits in the closets. I had a helluva toothache and somebody told me that the U.S. Army had a dental clinic on the West Side where they worked on your teeth for free. When I got there it was closed because of a snowstorm. On the way back I was confronted by 2 guys on the Rapid Transit platform. I knocked one of them down and started pounding him into the platform. The other one took off. The train startled me when it came but I got on it. I looked out the window and he was lying there, not moving. I checked the paper the next day but there were no reports of anybody dead on a transit platform. I didn't mention it to anybody else because I didn't want to here any "non-violence is our strength" bullshit. That was a first for me, getting jumped by white guys in the city. My father told that in the War if you had a bad toothache, they sent you to the rear to have it yanked out because they didn't want you to do something crazy when you weren't thinking clearly.

In Coachella we were living in a trailer that was pretty crowded. My place was on the couch where I hung up sheets to give me a little privacy after waking one morning to the sound of 2 women outside discussing the bulge in my bedsheets. John Gardener and Julie Kersick were a couple of the other people who lived there. I would wake some mornings to the sound of John (Jardinero) outside in the sand doing his karate exercises. Julie wanted to make a nice, happy home for us with cleaning and cooking schedules. I wasn't very cooperative, to say the least (right, Julie ?). You can read all about life in the Coachella trailer in John's short story "Paulo Vento". Ask him for a copy. In it he refers to me as "Tomcat". Of course, I take great offense, but I'll be glad to autograph a copy.

LIFE IN LA PAZ A lot has been written about life in La Paz, much of it negative. I didn't particularly like the work that I did in La Paz. However, I liked touring the field offices with Eliseo. because I got to met all of these great people that I had heard of for 4 years. There were a lot of great people in La Paz who kept the Union going. When I first got there, I was assigned to a room with another guy who left shortly. After a while I was approached by the poor woman who had charge of room assignments who told me somebody else was moving in. I tried to explain that my social life was such that I needed a room of my own. That didn't work, especially after I asked if she was gonna move in with me. I found the smallest, filthiest room in the basement that was unoccupied (and uninhabitable). She said I could have it if a scraped and painted the walls and cleaned it. That's what I did. I wouldn't join a "kitchen" though, that was too domesticated for me. I fixed an old rusty refrigerator that I found out back and just had people buy food for me when they made the run to exotic Bakersfield (the salvage yard and titty-bar capital of the San Joaquin Valley). I helped people with their rooms when asked . If somebody locked herself out, I could always get her back in. This applied to car trunks and doors too, but my hot wiring skills were pretty rusty by then. I liked to paint and helped out with a hospital wing that was being redone as well as with individual's rooms. There was this big plant a short walk behind the hospital that bloomed only at night. What a perfect set up! I needed something Ilike that because I didn't have any etchings to show .

I liked going to Tehachapi to eat peanut butter pies with Barbara Tuttle (another wonderful person) Steve Rivers, Ann Smith, et al.

The best part about living at La Paz was the great group of people who lived there.

PROPOSITION #14 at first we were all in this former seminary or some big Catholic property that has probably been sold off to settle a molestation lawsuit. I slept on a mattress that, I found out later, had been found in an alley. I got a bad case of the crabs. Something I had successfully avoided up until then . May the scavenger of that mattress suffer a long, lingering sickness.!

A group of us were sent to live in Long Beach. This was a "high crime area". You could tell because they had these strong street lights and helicopters at night. This place was too crowded and was cramping my social life so my girlfriend d'jour and I moved into Mrs. Idalia P. Chestnut's

house. She was a great, ancient lady who came from South Carolina. She told us of political campaigns where they had to pay people's poll taxes as part of G.O.T.V.

After Prop. #14, I returned briefly to La Paz and then headed home to Philly. I wasn't purged, but chances are that I probably would have been .I went to work for a union that was run by the members.

Hawkeye Tague '71-'76

#### **Al Rojas, 12/5/04**

##### **RE: The Revolutionary Period?**

Doug

There were three unions, you forgot our INdependent union the United Farm Workers union, that's how the now UFW got its name, so please correct history and that goes for Marshall also.

In Solidarity.

Paz.

#### **Jeff Sweetland, 12/5/04**

##### **RE: Overview 1975-1978**

The start-up of the ALRA on August 28, 1975 ushered in one of the most spectacular chapters in the history of labor organizing. In the next six months, 47,812 farm workers would vote in 423 elections supervised by the ALRB. This tremendous surge of energy was felt everywhere, as the following table shows:

ALRB Region Total votes cast

Salinas	17,535
Fresno	15,834
Riverside	5,595
Sacramento	4,747
El Centro	4,101

(Election figures cited herein are derived from summaries in the ALRB's annual reports for the years in question. Each report covers a July-June fiscal year.)

This was truly a clash of titans, finally pitting the UFW on a level playing field against its arch-rival, the Western Conference of Teamsters, which had "represented" most of the contested workers for several years under its sweetheart contracts with the grape and vegetable growers. This electoral contest would decide once and for all which of them would be the dominant representative of farm workers. The UFW received 23,010 votes and won 214 elections. The WCT received about half that number, 11,459 votes, winning 113 elections, all but seven of which were challenged.

The UFW juggernaut hit its stride by the time it arrived in the Imperial Valley late in the fall. In 22 elections between November 1975 and February 1976, the UFW rolled up 17 victories, including the biggest prize of all, "la Victoria en la Brocha," the victory at Bruce Church. The Teamsters were dealt a decisive blow, winning only 3 of the 22 elections.

Then everything stopped. As we all know, the ALRB used up its entire annual appropriation in its first six months of operation. By the end of February, it had run out of money and had to shut down. The Legislature refused to authorize any further funding without substantial changes to the law, including the curtailment, if not outright repudiation, of the ALRB's controversial access rule.

If the growers and their legislative allies expected this gambit to dissipate the farm workers' energy and momentum, it at first appeared that they had badly miscalculated. In a counterstroke as audacious and breath-taking as the Imperial Valley campaign, hundreds of farm workers and Union staff volunteers descended on California's cities. In little more than one month's time, they - you, we - gathered more than 700,000 petition signatures for a ballot initiative to put a

strengthened ALRA into the State's Constitution. Not long afterward, the Legislature relented and provided funding so that the ALRB could resume its operations without any changes to the Act.

At that point, two directions were open to the Union - either gear up its organizing machinery immediately to resume the massive farm-worker election campaigns of the previous fall and winter; commit all of its resources to passage of Prop 14 in November; or a combination of both. The leadership chose the second option, perhaps sensing that the Union had no choice but to see Prop 14 through to its conclusion, win or lose. The loss was awful, doubly so because the public whose support for the boycott had been so vital had swung overwhelmingly to the growers' side on this one.

Was the Union prepared at that point to restore its aura of invincibility in the fields, where it mattered most, by resuming the previous year's statewide sweep of farm-worker elections? After all, the ALRB was ready to proceed, this time with adequate funding, though with several different Board members. And although the Act had not been enshrined in the Constitution, it remained unchanged, even after the grueling legislative battles. The right of access had been preserved, although the Board would impose penalties on individual organizers who abused it.

In fact, the campaign did resume in the Imperial Valley under the leadership of the two Arties - Rodriguez and Mendoza. The UFW won 14 of 17 elections during the winter of 76-77, receiving 2,160 votes out of 2,689 cast (80%). This seemed a promising start.

But the massive statewide sweep never materialized. Those 17 elections represented more than one-third of all the non-dairy elections (48) held during all of fiscal 1977. Ten of the others were held in Coachella. The UFW received 1,557 of 2,902 votes cast (54%), but won only 4 of the 10 elections outright. The other 6 would have to await the resolution of ballot challenges.

The results were somewhat better in the Oxnard and Delano regions. The UFW won 5 out of 6 elections in Oxnard and all 6 in Delano. In Oxnard, it received 802 of 1,145 votes cast (70%); in Delano, 233 of 315 (74%). The other 9 elections that year were scattered between 4 other ALRB regions.

Why such a contrast between the volume of activity in the fall and winter of 75-76 and the winter and spring of 76-77? In the first partial year, the UFW won 214 of 423 elections, receiving 23,010 of 47,812 votes cast. In the second partial year, it won 33 of only 48 elections, receiving 5,387 of 8,632 votes cast (62%). Those 48 elections represented an 89% drop-off from the 423 elections the previous year.

Various explanations could account for the dramatic difference:

1. Much of the election activity in the first year had been in head-to-head confrontations with the Teamsters. In the second year, that conflict was moving toward resolution, not in the fields, but in Jerry Cohen's behind-the-scenes negotiations with WCT leaders. Under the "peace treaty," the WCT withdrew from the fray. It may have made sense to minimize election activity until we knew that the Teamsters were out.

2. In 1975, the Union had several months to prepare for the onslaught that would begin on August 28, when the Act would take effect. In 1976, on the other hand, it poured all of its resources into Prop 14. After Election Day, it needed time to regroup its election organizing operations. (But remember that, in the previous spring, it had been able to shift its focus from election organizing to the initiative campaign in very short time, to marvelous effect).

If either or both of these things were sufficient to explain the downturn, one would have expected a dramatic upswing in election activity the following year, especially since, finally, there would be a full twelve months of organizing and elections. Instead, the change from the truncated 1976-77 election year was modest, at best. In 1977-78 there were 58 non-dairy elections (up from 48) in which 9,076 votes were cast. That was an increase of only 444, or 5%, over the number of votes cast (8,632) in 1976-77. The UFW won 37 of those elections, including 10 in El Centro and 8 in Oxnard. It received a total of 5,615 votes, only 228 more than it had received the previous year.

The following table summarizes the comparisons:

	1975-76 (6 mos.)	1976-77 (7 mos.)	1977-78 (12 mos.)
Total elections	423	48	58
UFW victories	214	33	37
Total votes	47,812	8,632	9,076
Votes for UFW	23,010	5,387	5,615

Thus, points 1 and 2 do not adequately explain the post-Prop 14 downturn. Two other explanations might account for the long-term reduction:

3. The Union knew it could not digest a second feast of elections as bountiful as the 1975-76 one, so it made a conscious decision to scale back on organizing. That way, it could concentrate more of its resources and personnel on election certification, contract negotiations, contract administration and central services. Only in that way would it be able to solidify its base among the workers at ranches where it had won elections in 1975-76, and avoid the mistakes of 1971-73.

4. Even without the 1976 hiatus, there would have been a drop-off in elections after the initial spurt. Many of the 1975 elections had been at ranches where, for years, workers had been preparing for just that moment. The election landscape in 1976-77 was much different. Election preparation at each ranch would be a much more grueling and painstaking process. At many ranches, even where there was support, workers would often need to be organized "from scratch." In short, the UFW was now entering the "real world" of labor organizing, where each victory would be as precious as ten had been in 1975.

Were there, however, other explanations, ones that were purely internal? During the same period of time, other developments were at work within the Union. First, Cesar, as its chief executive officer, embarked on an ambitious restructuring of the Union's internal operations. This included the rationalization and modernization of administrative systems and processes at La Paz, so that it could deliver services more quickly, more efficiently and more effectively to field operations. Examples included the Crosby Milne "management-by-objectives" program, Sr. Florence's rationalization of financial administration, the microwave system, the telephone chat protocol and the collective-bargaining training program. Some of these efforts were very successful, others less so, but people and resources were allocated to all of them and away from organizing.

The effort to restructure operations was a logical response to the challenges posed by point 3, above. Two other internal developments of the period, however, are as controversial and questionable today as they were then. The first was the use of purges, public "kangaroo courts" and the Synanon Game to remove staff whose services were no longer desired ("assholes" and "spies") and to discipline all of those who remained. The second was the precipitous decision, in mid-1978, to jettison first the legal department and then, three months later, the clinics. Both had been mainstays of the Union's strength throughout the previous decade. Now, almost impulsively, the Union would go on without them.

Was there a direct correlation between the Union's internal dislocations during the period 1976-1978 and the dramatic down-turn in election activity? Did the Union's leadership and staff become so preoccupied, after Prop 14, with real or imagined internal problems that they rendered themselves incapable of repeating the monumental achievements of 1975 and early 1976, even if they had had the desire and opportunity to do so? Put another way, could the Union have repeated or come close to those triumphs if leadership, staff and worker supporters had been as unified in purpose after Prop 14 as in 1975? Maybe not, particularly if points 3 and 4, above, are close to the truth. But it would have been a wonderful thing to see.

LeRoy has suggested that we try naming the various periods in the Union's history. It may be a bit presumptuous to give former staff the naming rights. It may also be a bit fatuous trying to come up with one- or two-word names (pithy ones, of course) that are supposed to capture the essence of so many streams of action by so many thousands of people so many years ago.

If I had to give a name to the period in which I served, 1975-1978, I would call all of it after April 1976 the Union's "years of dislocation." Perhaps that glorious spring day, when those tens of thousands of petitions were given to the Secretary of State, was the Union's high-water mark, a

moment when the Union seemed able to shape events almost at will. In the preceding year, it had amazed its friends and confounded all its adversaries. That moment was heartbreakingly short. It seems that all that followed, beginning with the fateful march toward Prop 14, was beset with difficulties, the hardest of which often turned out to have been of our own making.

Jeff Sweetland  
1975-1978  
Long Beach boycott, Calexico, LA Legal, Salinas Legal

**Richard Cook, 12/5/04**

**RE: SALINAS Fall, 1975**

Jeff's reminiscences of 75-78 reminded me of an episode or two . . .

One of my tasks, in the fall of 75, squeezed in between Marshall's mandatory late night and pre-dawn meetings, was to help lead a sit-in of the newly opened ALRB office in Salinas. Yep. We just took that puppy right over. Spent the night, I think. Protesting ALRB inaction certifying elections, I suppose. I called Cesar from the ALRB, who spoke words of encouragement to some of the workers as we passed the phone around. I have a very hazy recollection that we also got Jerry Brown on the phone . . . .

This was also the assignment when I went, more than once, to the INS office to try to pry out of detention someone who had been picked up and was getting deported. I remember banging hard on the INS combination office-jail door, really hard, to try to get in, or get someone's attention. I don't think you should try that anymore.

Deportation, back then, was more an inconvenience than a real hardship for at least some of the pickets and picket captains, one of whom was deported on a Friday and was back by the following Tuesday, or so my failing memory tells me.

My housing back then was over in Pacific Grove at the home of a widowed British women, a supporter scooped up somehow. I slept in a room with about a thousand old Life Magazines. I shared the house with a South Indian housemate, who cut my hair once in a while. "Cut my hair" is not a euphamism for anything. He would just cut my hair. I hardly ever saw the kind British lady, as I was gone by 4:30 AM or so and not back until at least 11 PM if not midnight. I also remember a borrowed sleeping bag on a floor someplace when the drive to Pacific Grove just did not make any sense.

I recall thinking at the time that a lot of our action plan may have had the purpose of simply providing grist for Marshall to try to figure out what was going on. That was enough of a rationale at the time. You could have put on my tombstone, "Died so Marshall could figure it out"

And by the way, Marshall, your response to LeRoy sounded like a cry for help to me. Beside the SEND button, every keyboard should have a I-am-fucked-if-I-send-this Button.

Can someone on this list get Roberto Garcia to beam up? or down, as the case may be?

Richard Cook

**Marshall Ganz, 12/5/04 (1)**

**RE: SALINAS Fall, 1975**

Richard,

Perhaps you could clarify?

Marshall

**Marshall Ganz, 12/5/04 (2)**

**RE: Come on, folks!**

On Dec. 5, 2004, [Jerry Kay] wrote:

*Okay, we're back to discussing some top-notch, gut-level issues here, but maybe we can do it without throwing out the invectives at each other. Come on, Marshall, do we have to say LeRoy's views are 'disgraceful'?*

I'm sorry, Jerry. But did I miss what was being said?

**Richard Cook, 12/5/04**

**RE: SALINAS Fall, 1975**

Marshall,

You wrote of LeRoy,

*"I find the views you express here disgraceful and unworthy . . ."*

That is just so over the top.

Everyone of us carries a lot of emotional baggage from those long ago days, when we were a lot younger, and full of ourselves and of hope and expectation for great things to happen and to be a part of them. I suspect you are reacting as much to those times, as you are to LeRoy in 2004, who may or may not have made the correct distinction between farm workers, organizing themselves a union and others who were not farm workers but who wanted to help.

To clarify precisely to you, Marshall, I did not mean, literally, that you are crying out for help; that is a turn of phrase, a suggestion that we dial back the personal invective, such as is cited above. Humor, not hurt, was what I intended. I hope I got it right.

Or, were you asking for clarification about the tombstone remark or about my "barber?"

**Alberto Escalante, 12/6/04**

**RE: Late night and Pre-Dawn meetings**

In a message dated 12/5/2004 . . . [Richard Cook] writes:

*late night and pre-dawn meetings*

Richard,

I don't think we ever met. But I worked for Marshall and I know a little bit about those late night & pre-dawn meetings. They often meant whether **YOU WON or LOST AN ELECTION!** I'm sure that if Marshall asked you to attend those meetings he was there, too. The information, stats and strategy discussed at those midnight oil sessions & madrugadas were how we kicked the Teamsters out of the fields! I feel pretty darn lucky to have been able to work with and for a chingon dude like Marshall. I know that the only thing he wanted to see and hear were positive results. But if the going got too rough for you, you could have tried to work in the fields. Believe me the demands that Organizers were expected to endure were Duck Soup compared to working hard enough in the fields to earn a living! No llores tanto Chato! Si era muy duro tal vez no debias de estar alli! La Vida es Cabron, Vato! Pero una Victoria te puede quitar mucho de la dolencia!

La Revolucion no es un defile! Ni es un juego.....

Alberto Escalante 2:00am 12/06/2004

**Richard Cook, 12/6/04**

**RE: Late night and Pre-Dawn meetings**

Estimado Alberto,

No me endendiste bien lo que dije, Chato.

Para mi, era un trabajo bonito participar en la lucha. Tambien tenia yo mucho respecto para Marshall y todavia lo tengo. Estaba yo acordando aspectos del trabajo, incluso los mitins que tomo lugar temprano y tarde. Por supuesto, Marshall estaba presente, por que el se encargaba de manejar todos ellos. No dije nada al contrario.

Richard Cook

**Mary Mocine, 12/6/04 (1)**

**RE: Purges and discipline**

Albert,

Did this kind of thing happen to you often? I recall representing you against Kimura Bros about your car being rammed by Kimura.....

yours, Mary

**Abby Flores Rivera, 12/6/04**

**RE: Where we lived**

Hi Hugh:

It wasn't the boycott but the description you gave is a blow by blow description of where I once lived in Richgrove a few years before we went on strike. In a super-duper *boxcar* no less; it was the warmest place I ever lived in though because we had a pot belly stove where we would burn dried grape stumps and vines. (My comments are inserted in parentheses):

**“The roosters used to walk on top of the trailer (our *Boxcar*) and crow all hours of the night when they woke up . . . (in Richgrove it might mean a rooster fight somewhere). Grinding poverty was evident right outside our side door. Most people had outhouses and common showers and just a cold water spitot out their back doors. (Yep, forget showering there in winter; as for the outhouse, hopefully you could hold it until morning because baby it was freezing outside.) In addition to the stray chickens, there were lots of stray dogs too.”** (Our dog went straying at night because we never had enough food to feed ourselves much less our poor old mutt.)

**I guess like people, a city has its twin somewhere.** sin mas, abby/ “r” for Richgrove/ d/lp

**Gary Brown, 12/6/04**

**RE: VOLUNTEERS OVERSTAYED WELCOM**

I was a volunteer and I got a membership card. That made me more than a volunteer. It made me a member, period. I cannot see the argument that a volunteer can out stay their welcome. It's not the volunteer that must leave, they earn the right to stay. It is the need for volunteers that goes away.

GARY BROWN

**Mary Mocine, 12/6/04 (2)**

**RE: Purges and discipline**

I knew about what happened with Liz and it is one of the major regrets of my time with the union that I didn't go to Eliseo an her behalf. I am very sorry. I didn't know that the women of Coachella were involved about it, nor did I know Phyllis, so far as I recall. But Liz was a friend from Yolo County and I wish I had been more active.

Dear Liz, I am very, very sorry I wasn't more active. I had the impression that you didn't want to make an issue of it beyond what had already happened but I think I could have encouraged you more and done more myself. I haven't written of this because I always felt it was your news. I hope you are well and happy.

love, Mary

**LeRoy Chatfield, 12/6/04**

**RESPONSE TO MARSHALL GANZ - 2**

LeRoy Chatfield 1963-1973

RESPONSE TO MARSHALL GANZ



*"A few days before the summer program came to an end all the volunteers were called to a meeting in the front yard of Harvard House. LeRoy Chatfield spoke at the end of the meeting. He said he knew a lot of us would be leaving soon, heading back to college. "Ask yourselves this question. Can you think of anything more important to do with your lives right now than to help farmworkers build their union?" I did and I couldn't." - Chris Schneider, L.A. Boycott*

Chris Schneider included this anecdote in his essay written for the documentation project. I don't remember the date or the setting, but without doubt, those words are mine. I was a true believer in Cesar Chavez and his farmworker movement, and thirty-five years ago I could not believe there was anything more important in life - especially in the life of a college-age student - than the cause of the farmworkers. Do I believe that now, at age 70? No, I don't, but that is due in large part to the fact that I am no longer a true believer in anyone, or in any cause, and never will be again.

When I offer my views for this listserv discussion about the role of volunteers in the farmworker movement 1963 - 1973, I am recounting to the best of my recollection, the reality of that time and place. I am not passing judgment about what should have been done, or what other alternatives there might have been, or whether I (or Cesar) was "right or wrong." I seek only to describe and explain the world of the movement, as I knew, and experienced it. If Marshall and others remember it differently, then I would be pleased to read their recollections and analyses. Marshall and I go back many years together, even to the years of the pre-strike era, so I do not take offense at his characterization of my views as "disgraceful" and "unworthy" because Marshall is Marshall; but my first preference is to hear from colleagues who were there with us, about whether my recollection and analysis is accurate or not. And if not, why not? The farmworker movement documentation project is not about "good or bad", "right or wrong", "should have/could have" but about what was.

Those of you who worked with me, for example, on the Los Angeles Boycott, remember that I ran a tight ship. I demanded long hours, if not seven days a week, then at least six. Late into the evening without fail, I called each area coordinator, for a complete accounting of what had been accomplished for the cause that day, not generalizations mind you, but specifics. How many customers turned away? Why so few? How can you do better? How many community volunteers showed up to help? Can you recruit more? What feedback did you get today from customers or store clerks that show we are having an impact? If I had personally checked on their parking lot work, I discussed my findings with them. And so forth.

No matter how much I realized that the boycott coordinators hated this one-on-one grilling about the accountability of their work and leadership skills - I knew they detested it because I was a keen listener, and I kept my ears open - the harder I pressed them. I showed no mercy, accepted no excuse, I was the daily organizing thorn in their lives. They hated it, but they produced, and that was the only thing that counted with me.

When a volunteer dropped out, or fell by the wayside, I did not wring my hands and mourn their loss, rather I redoubled my efforts to replace them with someone as good, and sometimes as luck would have it, with someone that was twice as good. What happened to the volunteers who dropped out? Sad to report, I had no idea, but since they were no longer part of the movement, or at least my piece of it, I didn't even think about them. They were gone, the struggle of the farmworkers had to go on. I had no time - and made no time- for those who had departed.

Aside from the recruiting efforts of the National Farm Worker Ministry, and the staff boycotters themselves, I don't know how or why so many volunteers found the Los Angeles Boycott, but they did, and when they showed up, if they were not hard at work on the boycott within a few hours after their arrival, I felt we were letting the cause of the farmworkers down.

Intense, day after day, months at a time, I don't see how the volunteers did it, I don't understand how I did it. But then victory was in the air, you could feel it, and besides, there was no such thing as a defeat, because the seeds of victory were always "sown" in a temporary setback. Nothing was impossible, everything was possible, and God was on our side.

I don't know how the description of my boycott leadership of the L.A. Boycott strikes you, but even though I believe it to be accurate and true, I cringe as I write these words thirty-five years

later. Years later after my farmworker experience, when I had several opportunities to build other organizations, I studiously avoided many of the "true believer" characteristics I had embraced so easily during my farmworker movement years. I don't know if it made my later work any better, but I felt better about myself, and about the relationships I had with the people with whom I worked. Perhaps, I felt more human, I don't know.

As effective as I might have been on the boycott, and there were many signs of affirmation from Cesar and the farmworker movement that I was effective, I could not hold a candle compared to the work of Marshall Ganz. In my view, Marshall was the most accomplished and effective organizer in the UFW. No exceptions. But here is my admission: as a UFW volunteer, I could never have worked for Marshall because he was too tough, too demanding, too detailed, too intolerant of incompetence, too insensitive, and required too many meetings. And while many, many volunteer organizers thrived and prospered under his direction and leadership, I would not have been one of them. Aside from this being a curious point, I raise it only because it reflects my state of mind during my years of service with the UFW.

I'm sorry again for this much-too-long posting, please cut me some slack because of my advanced age.

**Marshall Ganz, 12/6/04**

**RE: RESPONSE TO MARSHALL GANZ - 2**

LeRoy,

This is very helpful, sounds much more like you, and makes an important distinction between what "was" done, and what "ought to be done". I thought this important distinction got lost in your earlier postings - and it was to that that I was reacting with my descriptives. I often marveled at your talent for matching people with tasks, asked you about how you did it, and tried to emulate in in my own work. I always had the greatest respect for the way you managed your people and I think you may be being too hard on yourself as you look back. Although, to be sure, many of us behaved in ways that we would later look back on, wonder what we were thinking about, and, hopefully, learn from.

Marshall

**Maria Fuentes, 12/7/04**

**RE: RESPONSE TO MARSHALL GANZ - 2**

Dear LeRoy,

I'm one of the many boycott volunteers who worked with you on the LA Boycott. I am saddened by some of your comments. You impacted the lives of the many volunteers that worked with you more than you'll ever know.

As I shared with you when I first heard of the Document Project - I will always be grateful that I was part of the LA boycott under your direction. This experience as short as it was changed me and my life.

I experienced what you describe in your e-mail. Yes, you made sure we learned to work hard, not letting any opportunity to gain support for the farm workers escape us. You constantly asked us what we had accomplished -- thus letting us know that everything we did -- each person turned away from the store we were boycotting -- was important. The way we worked gave us confidence and a desire to give all that we had for the farm workers.

You were our teacher. You kept us informed though weekly meetings where you brought us together as one big team with one clear mission -- a successful boycott so that the farm workers could have a union contract. You kept connected to what was happening with the union beyond the LA boycott. You were sincere and you modeled for us the importance and meaning of our work. We learned to do what would seem impossible in order to help make better the lives of the farm workers. For me just the acts of convincing shoppers older and wealthier than I to get into

their car, drive a few blocks in order to help farm workers have better salaries and health insurance were unexpected accomplishments that had real meaning para la causa.

You did it LeRoy. You did everything possible to help the boycott accomplish its goal and I am certain you helped develop many great and committed leaders in the process who have gone on to "change the world" in countless and untold ways. When you look back, I hope you look forward at this as well.

I hope you will continue to believe many more causes....not because things are ever perfect (we know they are not) but because maintaining the faith, having hope in the future is vital to the future of our world -- for our children and grandchildren and beyond. The young college students and volunteers you inspired continue to work and sacrifice for what we believe. You as part of the leadership of the UFW helped make that happen.

And as I said, I will forever be grateful.....as are the many people of my own and the next generations to whom I have passed on the same teachings, messages, expectations and beliefs. We must maintain our faith in what's possible and carry on the dedication and discipline to make it happen....I don't think I would be saying this had it not been for those three months of hard work and sacrifice on the LA boycott.

Sorry too, for this too long letter.

Un abrazo fuerte, God bless you.

Maria Fuentes

LA Boycott Summer 1970

#### **Rick Tejada-Flores, 12/7/04**

##### **RE: Volunteers or Marrying into the Family**

Dear Friends,

I've been reading the posts for several months - what an amazing collection of ideas!

I was particularly struck by the convoluted twists and turns of the discussion of volunteers outliving their usefulness to the union, unless they crossed that line by marrying into Cesar's family.

I wonder if there isn't another way to look at the situation? Part of the unique quality of this discussion is that everyone involved is someone who was really close to the issues and events and that they are discussing -- it comes from real experience.

Certainly volunteers represented a huge financial investment by the union that needed to have some sort of payoff... and having volunteers on the executive board might be construed as the tail wagging the dog. But the volunteers also had a really important symbolic value - they represented an open structure, where the union could take contributions and be enriched by ideas and energy. Remember that the "volunteer" class didn't just consist of college students looking for meaning in their lives... They were also the nuns and wonderful religious people, the union members from other unions and trades, the lawyers, the doctors, journalists, nurses, accountants, and on and on. The magic of the UFW was that it wasn't just farmworkers, it was farmworkers and people from all walks of life coming together... supporting each other, learning from each other... a chemical reaction that created new activist compounds.

Some intentionally came for just a short period, but many, myself included, didn't set limits of time and energy. If we hadn't been forced out many of us might still be there.

None of us was indispensable. But there came a time when Cesar decided that he didn't need the college students, he didn't need the lawyers, he didn't need the nuns; and the UFW began to contract into a relatively closed system. A Japanese friend of mine says that there is a special word in Japanese for this, that translates as "small island mentality." When the doors were closed to new ideas and new energy, things began to slow down.

But we all know that whatever it was that made the UFW work hadn't run out of steam. People like Jim Drake building low cost housing in New York, Eliseo and the Justice for Janitors campaign in Los Angeles. I was never an organizer so perhaps I have an overly romantic view of the process, but I think we all know that whatever happened with the union didn't happen because the skills and knowledge that people brought to bear in it didn't work any more. Marshall once told me that he felt that it wasn't just a question of blaming Cesar for this or that, but really that everyone who was involved in the process has to take some responsibility for it. But I think that we can also be proud of it as well.

Rick Tejada-Flores  
La Paz, 1972-73

**Mark Pitt, 12/7/04**

**RE: RESPONSE TO MARSHALL GANZ**

This discussion centers around one of the important issues in the larger debate. While I think it would be appropriate to say that there was a farm workers movement, the UFW however was a labor union. I believe that there are important distinctions.

A founder of a movement might indeed be entitled to hold leadership "forever", while at least in theory a President of a union must be elected. Participation in a movement is normally open to all who share in the goals and beliefs. Membership in a union is reserved for individuals who meet certain criteria and obligations (dues etc). In the U.S. membership in a union normally is reserved for individuals who work for employers covered by a collective bargaining agreement. This fact makes labor unions unique. I believe they are the only "membership" organization that does not have the ability to determine who actually is eligible for membership. The employer first must hire the workers, before the union can recruit them into membership. This certainly would be the case in an industrial union such as the UFW.

The question as to what qualifications should be necessary for a individual to be eligible to hold office in a labor union is one that has been debated by many individuals and organization. Some labor union require that an individual must come up through the rank and file of the organization and therefore limit the ability of paid staff being elected as an officer while other unions do not have such requirements. Indeed some union will not even hire an individual (minor exceptions) onto the staff unless they come up through the rank and file

As a volunteer/staff I always struggled with the question as to whether or not I was or should have been considered a member of the UFW, however I never considered myself a farm worker, even though I cut sugar cane in Belle Glade, FL for a short period of time so I guess I could have tried to make that claim. I personally did not believe that it was my place to tell farm workers how to run their union. Including, I might add, the right to decide who they would and would not allow to hold office, it was their decision to make.

As we all know that as a "volunteer" from 1972-1977 I had no way of addressing issues and/or problems that were of concern to me and/or my family. I got married and had a son during this period. Needless to say things changed. Rather than fighting to change the institution and certainly being branded as an "insurgent" to use a popular term of the day, Madeline and I, like many others, exercised the only option we had and quit (un-volunteered). At the time I thought that leaving was the honorable thing to do.

In 1977 I went to work as a paid (\$200/week !!!) staff for the ACTWU. I started as a organizer in South Carolina working on the J. P. Stevens campaign. While again I was not a textile worker, the union did not have any such requirements to hold office. During my career I held many different appointed an elected positions and retired in 2001 as an elected Vice-President and member of the executive board.

I consider my years with the UFW to be a tremendous and rewarding experience. I have no regrets. I can not, however, wonder what might have been if so many committed and talented people in the UFW would have had some other options then walking away, or being run off.

PS: Currently there is the beginning of potential upheaval within the afl-cio. I suspect that many "radicals" outside the labor movement would think that this is a good thing. I do not know how many would appreciate the fact that it is being led by three International Union Presidents who are all ivy league graduates, and probably never worked a day in their respective areas of jurisdictions.

Mark Pitt (1972-1977) – Washington, DC/ Belle Glade, FL/ Cleveland/ Columbus, OH/ Chicago/ LA/ Delano/ Santa Maria/ Coachella

**LeRoy Chatfield, 12/7/04**

**RE: WELCOME RICK TEJADA-FLORES**

LeRoy Chatfield 1963-1973

Rick Tejada -Flores wrote: *"Remember that the 'volunteer' class didn't just consist of college students looking for meaning in their lives... They were also the nuns and wonderful religious people, the union members from other unions and trades, the lawyers, the doctors, journalists, nurses, accountants, and on and on. The magic of the UFW was that it wasn't just farmworkers, it was farmworkers and people from all walks of life coming together..."*

I am so pleased that Rick has weighed in with his (as usual) thoughtful comments. Let me just pick up on one and make a very short comment.

If you read the essays of the volunteers written for the documentation project, you will soon realize that every person: nuns, religious people, other union members, lawyers, doctors, nurses, accountants, etc. - all found "meaning in their lives" because of Cesar Chavez and the farmworker movement.

The struggle for social justice always gives meaning to one's life.

**Alberto Escalante, 12/7/04 (1)**

**RE: Mark Pitt – Organizer Extraordinaire**

Hey Mark ( and Madaline) - I still remember the nice letter that you sent to me from the JP Stevens action. I appreciated your kind words and offer of employment but I was nowhere near the class of organizer that you were and needed. I was only an anomaly who happened to fit the square peg in the round hole dictum. Luckily though, I was always surrounded by people like yourself, so in a crowd shot of that caliber the overall picture looked pretty good even with me in it! And I also remember the inaugural drive we took when I arrived in **Delano** for **"Mondo Giumarra 1977"** Also known as **"The Night of the I wanna"**.. So if you're ever out this way (Oxnard, CA) give me a call OK? \* \* \* \* Anytime, I'm retired, too! We can go fishing.

Saludos y Abrazos your pal,

Alberto Escalante 2004

**Alberto Escalante, 12/7/04 (2)**

**RE: "And then along came Mary..."**

In a message dated 12/6/2004 . . . [Mary Mocine] writes

*Albert,*

*Did this kind of thing happen to you often? I recall representing you against Kimura Bros about your car being rammed by Kimura.....*

*yours, Mary*

Namaste,

Hi Mary, each time I think of you my spirit soars and my heart is filled with joy. You and I will be forever linked in my memory of many memorable and auspicious moments. Like the time we were in an ALRB ULP hearing (Possibly Kimura) And the opposing counsel began to eat his cigarettes...Remember? Oh Yeah! Or when I spent 3 daze (day's) drawing little "monitos" to

explain just how it was that the driver of vehicle #1 happened to hit but not kill the driver of vehicle #2. Then we all went out and inspected the car which the ALRB had impounded to preserve any damage that Kimura was alleged to have inflicted on the old Plymouth sedan (it looked like Cesar's grey sedan, except the door was all smashed & bent up!) Marc Grossman even wrote about it in his book "The White Pages" (1976) that was released to document some of the worst of the Unfair Labor Practices (ULP's) like the wanton & gross acts of violence, intimidation and other notable incidents of complete & sustained disregard of the ALRA that happened in during the first 6 months of the law's existence. You were such a curve ball. When you walked into a hearing you really scared those vampires from the damn anti labor law firm of "Hitler, Mussolini and Fascists" They were used to dealing with litigants in tennis shoes, Levis and open collared shirts and maybe a sport coat...but you weren't a Jerry-clone. You were the real magilla! A take no prisoners Lawyer who was all business, not that the others at Cohen, Nathan, Peyton & Boone weren't... I just knew that the first time I saw you when you came to spring me outa jail on that trumped up Access Violation during those "Now you do, now you don't have Access" days immediately following the initial enactment of the law. But even though I didn't impress you with my rather sophomoric attempts at trying to tell you that you were the most beautiful person who had ever passed the Bar, I meant every stuttering word of it! To me you were proof that God must be a woman! That's why I say that I remember you with a great happiness in my heart and a soaring of my spirit! I salute the Divine in you and when I am in the Divine in me we are as one.

Namaste,

Alberto Escalante 2004

#### **Kathy Lynch Murguia, 12/7/04**

##### **RE: Movement/ Union**

Kathy Murguia

What I recall re: movement/union was that structurely, the UFW was considered a part of the movement. There were several entities that came under the umbrella of the movement which included the Service Center, the Health Group, the Credit Union, etc. each functioning with their own articles of incorporation and Board of Directors. There was alot of overlap in terms of the leadership their missions were different from the Union's, although the overall goals cascaded into servicing farmworkers. I got lost for a minute in the discussion of union vs movement.

Ojo Negro: thanks for the history lesson. Although it's been inferred there will be a reunion in Delano, who's organzing it ....the Union? Also does anyone know how many farmworkers are under contract at this time and how many contracts are being serviced????

#### **Hub Segur, 12/9/04**

##### **RE: Road Tripping**

Hub Segur 1969-1973, 1987-1989

A car load of La Paz staffers left Santa Maria during the late afternoon headed for Keene. Early August, 1972. All returning from a farm worker picnic and rally which was a great success. Any event with the Flores' putting the food together is a success. We headed east on Route 166 which was fairly deserted as it wandered around foothills and over barren land. A great location to film a western, maybe another High Noon or Shane. It took the rest of the trip to get the casting straightened out:

Nancy Kleiber - the Deputy Sheriff, the sheriff never appears

Susan, Tommy and Matt Drake - stage coach passengers

Gonzalo Morales - stage coach driver

Blase Bonpane - traveling snake oil salesman

Jim Drake - land baron cattle rancher

Larry Borcello - farmer holding on to his water rights against the cattle ranchers

Kevin Brown - rallying the vigilantes to action only to find no one following him

Marshall Ganz - manager of the quasi-ethical Dead River Land Company

Pedro Lopez - with shades, sits in the corner of the salon at a table with a whiskey bottle and a glass, just watching

Bernice Rincon - dance hall girl

Gayenne Feitinghoff - madam

Jack Quigley - elegant vice lord of the town

Ralph Magana - Jack's top dealer

Mike Kratko - Mike Kratko

Robert Garcia - out of town trouble shooter

The Mothers (need Barbara Cook back from Arizona) - WTCU

John McLaughlin volunteered to cast himself as the sneaky villain: "I just want to shoot someone in the back"

We brought the concept to Rick Tejada-Flores and he wouldn't touch it.

#### **Hugh "Hawkeye" Tague, 12/9/04**

##### **RE: *Unsung Heroes/ Heroines***

I worked with a wide variety of people over my years in the UFW. Some of them were great organizers or administrative support people. Dorothy Johnson was both.

DOROTHY JOHNSON : DJ could be in the midst of bedlam in an office while talking to you in English and typing 100 words/minute in Spanish. She was good at juggling the finances of a boycott operation or field office. She just generally brought order to what anywhere else would be chaos. I'm sure that Eliseo would not have been nearly as effective as he was without her.

She was also a good strategist and organizer. In the Coachella campaign in '75, she was assigned to Superior (an oil company, really). They had grapes, onions and citrus. We didn't have the grape workers because of how the contracts were administered in '70-'73. DJ timed the election for when there were enough citrus and onion workers (where we were strong) and a minimum number of grape workers, and she won .

She was a steady, solid person that many of us relied on. She always managed to look calm and fresh regardless of the current crisis. She's also due a PURPLE HEART for putting up with me for several years.

META MANDEL [Mendel] Meta was a very serious organizer. When I first met her in Oxnard, a few hours after my arrival at the field office and a few minutes after I got out of the Ventura County jail, she was trying to speak Spanish to somebody in a very graphic way. She used all kinds of hand, head and shoulder movements while having a very concentrated expression on her face. She learned Spanish in no time, like she learned everything else.

Later she had a variety of assignments in the field offices and on Prop. #14, including coordinating the petition drive in Sacramento where she squeezed out some impressive numbers. Later still I heard that she got into trouble for doing the right thing in Coachella. Despite her best efforts to look plain (scruffy clothes, no make-up, short hair) her beauty was always evident. Whatever she's doing now, I'll bet she's doing well.

MARK PITT: Now here's a solid guy! Mark joined the boycott in D.C. and then wound up down in Belle Glade, Florida where we were working in the sugarcane industry. He went to work

cutting cane. It was really hard work that was dirty and dangerous. This is one case where I'll agree with the growers that Americans do not want to cut sugar cane.

In May of '73 we went up to Cleveland with Eliseo's crew. He did a good job there too. He was particularly good with the union people because he was from a blue collar background. He had been in the Retail Clerks and Steelworkers Unions while going to college.

He was later put in charge of the Columbus, Ohio Boycott Office and eventually the Chicago office.

I remember being with Eliseo when we visited Aggie Rose (another unsung heroine) when she was running the mushroom strike against Dole near Oxnard. EM read the reports from the boycott offices about their informational picketing at Dole operations. Mark's Chicago report was the best ! They were turning away delivered trucks at obscure Dole subsidiaries and causing all kinds of commotion.

I worked again with Mark during the Prop #14 campaign. He was in charge of South LA (Long Beach, the Harbor Area, etc.) He did a good job there too despite the conditions.

Mark wasn't big on theory. He was just a straight union guy that wanted to get the job done. He went on to become a leader in what is now UNITE HERE. The UFW screwed up when they lost him. He would have stayed for many more years if there was true union building going on.

JOHN GARDNER (juan jardinero) Here was another serious organizer! He belonged to the same organizer's "religion" as Meta. He, however, had no trouble hiding his beauty, unlike Meta who would have looked good in "sackcloth and ashes".

Jardinero was in Oxnard when I got there from Philly. I think that he was disappointed. Eliseo had given everybody this story that this great organizer, Hawkeye was arriving from the East.

He, Julie Kersick, me and several others lived in a trailer in Coachella while we were organizing in the Fall of '75. He is a big guy and seems to be omnipresent. He's a great story teller and was very proficient in Spanish too. I learned a lot from John Gardner.

I'm sure that he left the UFW because the organizing stopped. True organizers are like sharks who need to keep feeding.

RUTH SHY I worked with Ruth in Philly (when I was a volunteer while working in a factory) and in Coachella. She was a tireless, no-frills organizer. She seemed to be devoid of an ego. This was not one of Jardiner's problems. She didn't take any shit, though, when it came to getting the job done. She also could throw a helluva fast ball. Without people like Ruth, we would never have won so many victories. She did the day-to-day work that is necessary.

The above named people are just some of the fine people that I worked with.

Joe Moon Vive! Hawkeye Tague '71-'76

**Patty Park (Proctor), 12/9/04**

**RE: Road Tripping**

[Hub Segur wrote: "A car load of La Paz staffers left Santa Maria during the late afternoon headed for Keene. Early August, 1972."]

I remember this. It was absolutely wonderful and so much about how Hub made our life at La Paz work. "A MASH episode without the cameras". Obviously I hadn't been there long enough to get a part but I can assure you that being part of the chorus was just OK.

Thank you Hub for this great recollection.

Patty Park (Proctor)

**Mark Pitt, 12/10/04**

**RE: UFW Florida**



Included in the many entertaining entries in the last month or so from Hawkeye Tague he has mention our efforts in Florida a couple of times. I would like to add the following:

In 1972 the union was involved in an effort to organize vegetable workers in the Belle Glade, FL area. While there were some "migrant workers" from Texas as I recall most were local African Americans. As Hawkeye has stated the living and working conditions were almost sub-human. The area was dominated by the powerful Sugar Companies led by US Sugar Company (Big Sugar). Each year a couple of thousand cane cutters from the Caribbean were brought in to live camps and to cut the cane.

Arguing that the wages and conditions for the local workers were being suppressed, the union had filed a law suit to stop the importation of the workers. As Hawkeye mentioned the employers position was that American workers either could not or would not do the work. The union countered that the conditions were inappropriate and that they should be improved, and there would be a lot of available workers, since most local workers were unemployed during the can cutting season. The final result was that the judge ordered that the companies did not need to make improvements, and they could continue to bring in the workers as long as they did not deny American workers a job. They also had to make some half-hearted effort to recruit Americans.

As a result of this decision the union started a drive to organize the sugar cane workers ( the same ones we had filed a suit to keep from having a job in the first place) and it recruited people to take jobs and try to organize from within. In January of 1973 I became a cane cutter for the Florida Sugar Cane Association. The union movement referees to this type of organizing as "salting", this was particularly appropriate term since I was the only white sugar cane cutter in the state of Florida.

The camp was overcrowded and the food was terrible. Each morning we were served two hard boiled eggs and some very sweet porridge. Lunch, which was served in the field, and dinner consisted of a mixture rice and ox tails. Meal time for me was like a screen out of an old James Cagney prison movie. Initially I refused to eat and questioned how anyone could eat such slop, by the end of the week I was diving right in and wondering if a second helping was available.

I did not last long as a cane cutter. After about three weeks I was fired for not being able to complete the required task. I had gained a fair amount of inside knowledge about the system, which we had planed to use as part of the continuing legal strategy. Hawkeye and I then set out to document the conditions of all the sugar camps in the area. We had devised a check-list for each camp. The number of beds, showers, toilets etc. Each morning after the workers were transferred to the fields we would sneak into a camp and do our inspection. I can still remember Hawkeye and I being chased through a camp, by some of the camp goons, with Hawkeye counting the number of toilets on one side and me counting the other side. This seen was repeated over and over until we completed our "inspection" of every sugar camp in the area.

Right before we left Florida to join the boycott in Ohio, a couple other major events took place. First there was an outbreak of Typhoid Fever in a labor camp in Homestead. Hawkeye and Eliseo went there and spent a couple of days helping out and trying to see what we could do. About a week later Hawkeye got sick and I took him to the ER in Belle Glade. He had some type of flu. I mentioned the possibility of Typhoid and the docs laughed and said something about how far Belle Glade was from Homestead. As I recall they stopped laughing when we explained that he had been in the typhoid camp the week before. Since Hawkeye did not drive I had the task of taking stool samples to the hospital for the next couple of days.

The employers submitted legislation that would outlaw the use of a "hiring hall" for agriculture workers. This of course was aimed at eliminating the UFW contracts with Minute Maid and stop the threat of unionization throughout the state. We were gearing up for the Senate hearings when publicity broke about a "slave labor" ring working in North Carolina and bringing indigent men to camps in Florida. The workers were held against their will until the paid all of their "debts" to the employer.

Eliseo told Hawkeye that he needed to find one of the workers, so we could take him to testify at the hearing. Hawkeye used his superior knowledge of all the run down "juke joints" in town until

he found someone. We took him to Jacksonville with Eliseo's admonition of "don't let him out of your sight." He made a wonderful witness. The legislation was defeated and the newspaper proclaimed the Senate Bill "died of typhoid fever in a slave labor camp."

Mark Pitt 1972-1977

### **Jerry Kay, 12/10/04**

#### **RE: Florida Sugar Cane**

Jerry Kay (69-75)

A couple Fl. Sugar cane stories:

I was sent to Florida when we ended the field strikes and re-ignited the boycotts in Sept'73. I spent more than a year working on and then directing the Miami boycott. (By the way, Hawkeye, I remember our office in the Distributive Workers Local with Osceola and the old NY radical Jewish guy).

So Florida has the huge citrus industry, lots of winter vegies and tomatoes, flowers and house plants and of course, sugar cane.

Most of the sugar cane workers were imported from Jamaica, worked under really tough conditions and were sent home. One day we hear that a truck carrying sugar cane workers from the camps to the fields drives into an irrigation ditch by the roadway, some of the workers may be dead and many injured. They had been riding carrying their machetes and when the enclosed truck hit the ditch, the knives cut them all up. Two of our Migrant Ministry ministers, Augie Vandenbosch and Frank Smith, along with the incredible Irish priest, Fr. Frank O'Loughlin, drive up there pronto to find the hospital and see how they could help. The lack of transportation safety had long been one of our issues, in Ca. as well.

They find the workers in the hospital, many in terrible shape and begin to talk to them to find out what happened. After a short while the hospital people tell them to leave and soon after the police or sheriff show up to tell them they will be arrested.

They leave for the afternoon and decide to return the next morning. Upon returning, not ONE of the workers is in the hospital and they are told they have all gone back to Jamaica.

Another story I vaguely recall is when the Fl. legislature conducted an investigation of camp conditions and toured various sugar camp facilities. A few of us from the UFW go along. I recall going into some rustic sleeping quarters with bunk beds all equipped with different pastel colored sheets and freshly painted walls. I asked one of the workers when the walls were painted and they got colored sheets, and he said, "Oh, yesterday."

### **Dan Spelce, 12/11/04**

#### **RE: The Kintz Resignation**

One of the most memorable campaigns undertaken by the UFW boycott staff during my brief tenure (Labor Day 1975-the day after election day 1976) was the firestorm we generated to oust William Kintz, serving as ALRB chair, if I remember accurately. I was amazed we were able to succeed. Later, I walked into some hearsay from other former UFW staffers, acknowledging that the campaign was largely a dramatic power flex for the UFW. The hearsay I came upon--again, if I'm recalling it all correctly, but this is the way I've remembered the story for years--was that Kintz was a prominent, liberal labor lawyer recruited from a prestigious university to chair implementation of the ALRA and the work of the ALRB. But when the growers toyed with and abused the new law, Kintz found himself unable to process all the UFW complaints about the growers' pioneering shenanigans. Kintz was limited by budget and facilities, as well as trained staff, and was still early on the learning curve for building an effective organization. When the UFW outcry besieged Jerry Brown and Kintz, the pro-union ALRB leader eventually resigned, feeling unfairly maligned and leaving with a broken spirit.

Do I have the story accurately recalled? Was Kintz attacked simply as a sacrificial lamb to try scaring the growers into honoring the ALRA, and thereby avoid the risky and costly Proposition 14? (The UFW pursued Proposition 14 in 1976 when growers persisted in disregarding and abusing ALRA/ALRB procedures.) What became of William Kintz? On reflection, was the boycott organization used to smear and discredit an otherwise loyal ally, or disparage a genuinely fair-minded public servant?

Looking forward to comments.

¡Adelante!

Dan Spelce

San Jose Boycott, 1975-1975; Salinas field elections, fall 1975; Coachella field elections, fall 1975; Oregon Brown-for-President, 1976; Hayden-for-Senate, 1976; Sacramento Prop 14 signature gathering, 1976; San Mateo- San Francisco Prop 14 election campaign, fall 1976

### **Jerry Brown, 12/11/04 (1)**

#### **RE: How Did Cesar Do It?**

Jerry Brown

Delano – Toronto – Miami (1966-1976)

Thanks Hub for putting things in historical perspective and inspiring me to add a little of my own. So much of this recent discussion has been about Cesar and his shortcomings as a leader of the farm workers movement during "the Purge" period of 1977-1981. However, during the exhilarating early victories of the first Delano Grape Boycotts (1966-1970), Cesar and Fred Ross (the Mother of All Volunteers) were inseparable - it was Fred who personally trained all of us who flocked to Delano at that time to be "organizers." So, the question should really be: How Did Cesar and Fred Do It?

Many of you will recall that Fred was an Saul Alinsky-trained community organizer, schooled in the tactics of building the people's army and in the strategies of conflict and confrontation; and Cesar of was a Gandhi- and Martin Luther King-inspired advocate of militant non-violence and direct action. In my view, Cesar and Fred mobilized the people's army of farm workers, volunteers and boycott supporters in the U.S., Canada and Europe, and planned and carried out a series public confrontations and campaigns to gain power over the grape grows and to win contracts, on July 20, 1970, with 26 Delano-area table grape growers at the Forty Acres.

They did it through a combination of: Gandhi's truth force and moral jujitsu, which involved turning the growers' and Kern-Tulare County police and officials' power back against them (moral jujitsu) to build and sustain the broadest national and international coalition possible of support for the grape boycott - which was the only real power the union ever had over the growers and their agribusiness plantation system.

As I wrote in back in 1972:

"In order to fully appreciate Chavez' skill as an organizer, UFWOC's confrontation tactics must be understood as they related to key domestic political issues which preoccupied the American public between 1965 and 1970. The arrest of the "44" occurred shortly after the massive March on Washington by civil rights groups, the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, and the violent police response to civil rights marchers that took place in Selma, Alabama. The pilgrimage took place the height of President Lyndon Johnson's federal War on Poverty program. Chavez' 1968 fast provided consolation and reassurance that "non-violence still works" to Americans, who were stunned by urban riots and minority violence after the assassination of Martin Luther King. Finally, UFWOC's court showdown with the Kern County Agricultural Commission, and its new strike demand that grape growers sign contracts which forbade the use of hard pesticides, coincided with growing public concern over the ecological dangers caused by oil spills, air pollution and the use of DDT.

Chavez [and Ross] was able to anticipate how the growers and their allies would respond to UFWOC's actions. By precipitating a series of confrontations with them, he led UFWOC to two

important organization victories. First, he succeeded in linking the Delano grape strike to the pressing national issues of civil rights, poverty, minority violence and pollution. Secondly, he solidified support for the boycott among a large segment of consumers by providing the growers and their allies with the opportunity to take public actions which indicated that they were opposed to civil rights for Mexican-American farm workers, to the elimination of poverty, to the use of non-violence, and to pesticide controls."

Cesar said that the poor have to do with time and patience what the rich can buy with money. Lacking funds for national advertising, Cesar and Fred used time and these confrontation tactics and campaigns: to keep the grape boycott in the media limelight, to link it to the national political concerns that pre-occupied all Americans of good will, and to keep the Delano strike and grape boycott issue alive and vital to an expanding group of supporters for the three long years it took for the boycott to drive down table grape prices far enough, so that first the Coachella and then the Delano grape growers were forced to sign contracts.

This quote and additional history of the Delano grape strike and boycott can be found in Jerald B. Brown, *The United Farm Workers Grape Strike and Boycott, 1965-1970*, Cornell University, 1972, available in the Walter P. Reuther Library, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI.

**Jerry Brown, 12/11/04 (2)**

**RE: RESPONSE TO MARSHALL GANZ**

[On December 2, 2004, Marshall Ganz wrote:]

*So, LeRoy, we're going to have to agree to disagree, because I find the whole idea of anyone "owning" a movement repugnant, was certainly nothing I ever bought into, and, I think, is conveys a profound disrespect for those who become part of a movement, the kind of thinking, in my view, that can legitimate the worst of abuses.*

"We do not see things as they are, we see them as we are." - Talmudic saying.

**Steve Pitti, 12/12/04**

**RE: YALE PROFESSOR PITTI**

LeRoy Chatfield

Farmworker Documentation Project

\* \* \* \*

December 12, 2004

Dear LeRoy,

I write to ask for help in finishing a forthcoming biography of Cesar Chávez and La Causa. I've been hard at work on this project for more than three years and plan to complete the final stages of my writing in 2005. I've scoured the library archives at Wayne State, Berkeley, Stanford, Yale, Texas, and elsewhere, and I've devoted a great deal of time to newspaper coverage of union activities from the early-1960s forward. As you might imagine, my office now boasts piles of xeroxes related to Cesar and others involved in the Movement, and I have more than 3,000 pages of typed notes on my computer.

It's been a lot to manage, and I'm happy to have composed roughly a hundred pages of the book, mostly covering the years before 1962. My goal is to present Cesar's life from his birth forward in a way that pays considerable attention to the contexts in which he lived and worked. This means in part writing about his family home in Arizona, his years as a youth in California agriculture, his service in the Navy, and his political work in the CSO. I've already written about the Community Service Organization in my first book (*The Devil in Silicon Valley: Northern California, Race, and Mexican Americans* [Princeton, 2003]), a study of San Jos?, but of course the bulk of this biography will focus on Cesar's last thirty years. This requires paying significant attention to the pivotal events and key participants who helped define the NFWA, AWOC, UFWOC, and the UFW. It means making Cesar's life a window for examining the challenges facing the Movement,

and for understanding the strategic choices he and others made. It means describing Cesar as an organizer and an administrator, but also recognizing the work of volunteers, staff, and union members who played their own roles in conducting boycotts, negotiating contracts, and shaping the life and legacy of la Causa.

Project members may be interested to know that this book developed from my courses on Chicano, California, and labor history at Yale; from my experiences teaching farmworker kids far from their homes in the Ivy League; and from my own contacts with UFW members as a young person in Sacramento. I should also make clear that Yale University Press will publish this study in 2006, that I intend the final product to reach both academic and non-academic readers, and that the press expects also to publish an edition in Spanish.

Of course no good history of postwar social movements can be written without considerable input from those involved, and I write to ask the Documentation Project to assist in the completion of my study. The value of this book will depend heavily on the input I receive from those who knew Cesar and labored within the Movement. I am eager to hear advice or words of guidance, and I hope that some former volunteers might give me tips on additional documents (personal testimonies, letters, photographs, diaries, memoirs, and so forth) that record union activities prior to Cesar's death. Perhaps most importantly, I would be very grateful to anyone willing to answer some of my questions, either via email or letter, or in a phone interview. I know that help of this sort is a great deal to ask of busy people, and I promise that I will take every step to assure that their efforts produce a far better book.

\* \* \* \* Thanks for considering this request for help, and thanks to all who have participated in the Farmworker Movement Documentation Project, an indispensable resource for anyone interested in this critical aspect of U.S. history.

Sincerely,

**Steve**

Steve Pitti, Ph.D.  
Associate Professor of History and American Studies  
Yale University

**Alberto Escalante, 12/12/04**

**RE: The End or the Beginning?**

Hermanas y Hermanos Voluntarios,

During the years that I spent organizing and developing leaflets for the United Farm Workers I was fortunate enough to have met and worked with some of the most incredibly talented individuals of the last 50 years. I have often wondered "Why me? How was I able to be a part of, and a witness to, some of the most interesting times in Farm Worker history by being in the midst of all of the changes, and the historical pageantry that followed the passing of the ALRA, which enabled California's farm workers the right to self determination regarding whether or not they wanted to have union representation or not at their place of work. Before then, farm workers were treated like so much chattel and not like humans. Dignity was something they could only imagine having because up until then farm workers had always been at the mercy or whim of their Employer or Farm Labor Contractor. Then in 1975, a few months before the ALRA went into effect, I began to meet some very dedicated, extremely hard working and really quite remarkable group of people when I volunteered to join the ranks of the United Farm Workers. We all worked tirelessly trying to accomplish the seemingly impossible task of explaining the new Farm Worker Law, as the Agricultural Labor Relations Act was also being called, telling the Farm Workers that the new law was also going to be bringing a new era of prosperity for most California Farm Workers. A time when they could actually discuss the merits of Unionization or not without any fear of reprisal or intimidation. Having the option to decide for themselves, something they'd never had before. And when the new law went into effect, the possibility of justice and equality, better wages and safer working conditions dawned for thousands of unrepresented farm workers who had toiled in the fields daily to insure that the markets and canneries of our nation had plenty

of food to satisfy the appetites of all the consumers markets. Yet, as ironic as it may sound, very often the same people who harvested the crops, and kept an abundant and steady supply coming into the marketplace very often didn't make enough money to properly feed their own families! The farmers and opponents of The UFW would try to say maybe it was because the farm workers couldn't speak English that they also didn't know how to manage their money, or it was because their family was too large or they bought beer with their paychecks instead of food! Anything but the simple truth, which was that the average farm worker earned sub poverty wages which were too low to allow them to pay their rent, utilities and their transportation costs back and forth to work and still be able to afford to feed their family enough food as deemed necessary by the USDA to be able to maintain proper health. Instead they had to make do with few meager meals, while the rest of society was able to have their choice of plentiful foods all courtesy of the back breaking work provided by these same underpaid and often forgotten farm workers. And I, like many others who had gone there before me, listened to and was enthused by the quiet yet intense messages from Cesar Chavez, the person who had done more to alleviate the ills and injustices that were being perpetrated on the farm laborers of the farms and fields of California, Arizona, Texas, Florida and every other area where farm work was being done by a poor, over-worked, under-paid, almost "captive" work force. Captive because they had no other recourse but to continue to work, work and work so that they wouldn't starve. Many were forced to accept the sub poverty level wages that they were paid because they were undocumented and thus felt vulnerable and did not want to anger their bosses for fear of possibly losing their job or worse yet, face deportation in reprisal for the insolence of wanting to earn enough money to live and support his family or for wanting to be able to work in an atmosphere free from deadly pesticides. Wore yet, for wanting to be treated with the same dignity and respect afforded to any other worker in any other industry or trade in the United States. Why should he be treated any different than other laborer in respect to wages, benefits, job security and seniority? Actually all things equal (which they weren't) the work performed by Farm Workers was actually an essential industry. Because you could somehow get by without any other product all except that is, for FOOD! And that was why I believed so much in the work Cesar Chavez was doing. And in the message and rallying call of the farm worker movement "La Causa" or "The Cause". The message that I heard was that once organized the Farm Workers would represent an incredible economic and political force. One to be reckoned with, that's for sure! I had listened to something that Cesar had said and responded to it, he said that there was a need for volunteers. People like myself who were willing to stop what they were doing to come and assist with the day-by-day needs of the union when it began to grow in size and strength with all of the new members who we'd get as the elections started to produce the effects that we knew they would. Because as sure as the work of harvesting the crops to be done, if we won an election at that farm at peak harvest, whatever that amount of workers was, would soon be members of the UFW AFL-CIO. And with that growth we would need people who could see beyond the difficult periods that rapid growth and expansion intrinsically brings, although now in retrospect it appears as if nobody seemed to have thought about it into the UFW Equation then or ever. Also back then, 1975-1977, who would've thought, or ever imagined that Cesar would pass away in 1993 at age 66 and anomaly since the Chavez family members rarely die at such an early age. Those of us who'd had the privilege of meeting his parents can attest to the fact that both had been much older than he when they died. Anyway if for some reason he was to have died or been killed the first choice is said to have almost been a lock-in the likely successor would be Eliseo Medina, a Member of the Board, an ex-farm worker who had many of Cesar's charismatic features. And so it was just assumed that he (Eliseo) would be the one to carry the mantle, if Cesar were to ever step down, or pass away. And when Eliseo left, he left a huge hole, but I'm sure that he left because he had outgrown and probably felt very limited by the confines of his situation with the union. We all know what happened when Marshall tried to let some of the leaders of the rank and file test the waters of union leadership! Cesar made it seem as if Marshall was somehow attempting a coup d'etat. Anyway that in effect was Marshall Ganz's Waterloo. And also the death of any large scale Organizing attempts. The ones that only Marshall could pull off! All other minor attempts at power grabbing were crushed by the politics of insider power. The same with anyone else who felt they could take the throne away from the President. Nobody ever got past the 1st round. Only Cesar's sudden and unexpected death in 1993 allowed someone else to take over, and hopefully that person, Artie Rodriguez, who

was personally tutored by Cesar will be able to successfully navigate the new UFW through what some soothsayers are saying are the most turbulent times the UFW has ever faced. With the current President having said he favors the importation of cheap labor reminiscent of the Bracero Program as well as being an Anti-Labor President, possibly the worst ever... Many predict tough times ahead for the UFW. And in the past whenever there were problems that occurred or difficulties were thrown into the path impeding the forward progress of the United Farm Workers, a call for help would go out and almost immediately Volunteers would sign up to help the UFW out. Now with the age of electronic mailings, if the call for volunteers would go out, would I again Volunteer? Of course I would, in a way I guess I've never left, I just didn't write or draw Political Cartoons quite as often as I used to!

Si Se Puede!

Alberto Escalante

**Mary Mocine, 12/12/04**

**RE: YALE PROFESSOR PITTI**

Dear LeRoy et al.,

I have assumed that the transcript of the deposition that I took over many days of the political burglar, Jerry Ducote, is available at Wayne State or somewhere. Ducote was the burglar who broke into our offices in Delano in about 1967. He also broke into Fred and Ginny Hirsch's home and Saul Alinsky's home as well as the offices of Ramparts Magazine and The People's World. He said he was put up to it by the FBI, Jack Pandol, Di'Arrigo (I forget which one) and the Farm Bureau. He met with the police chief of Delano and the files he shared were later found in the chief's safe. He tried, much later, to sell our files back to us in a meeting with Jerry. Jerry refused and tried to turn the matter over to law enforcement, who were not so interested. It all came to light and Ducote was prosecuted much later. Ducote said he was contacted by the growers and told to meet with a person to get instructions. He met with a man with the look of the FBI. The man gave him a half of a torn dollar bill and the man kept the other half. This was their signal and authentication. When an assignment came up, Ducote would meet the man, check the bill pieces and get instructions as to where to go, how to get in and where the desired files might be found and which ones to take. The instructions were accurate. Ducote understood that his employers were searching for connections between the Communist Party and the UFW so that they could use it to smear the UFW. Apparently they didn't find anything of use as I never heard of anything coming of it all.

I recall that when we went through the remains of the stuff he stole, just odds and ends at that point, a man who used to work for Ramparts (I don't recall his name and can't recall if his home was burgled or if it had to do with Ramparts. I think he was an former FBI agent or some such who had turned against the war in Vietnam and worked with progressive Catholic whatever) AT any rate, he found a book of matches that had gone missing. It was important to him because the matches were from Jack Ruby's club in Dallas and he had picked them up at the time of the assassination. Ah, the trivia of history.

I never knew just how much to believe but I tested him at one point and it checked out. He said that Aulinsky wore a half-set of false teeth. I asked Fred Ross Sr. if that were true and he said he knew nothing of it and would be surprised if it were true. Fred gave me the home number of Alinsky's widow and I called her to ask. She was very very surprised. She confirmed that it was true and said he'd kept it very private.

At any rate, the deposition is very thorough and I hope it is available somewhere. Please feel free to share this with Professor Pitti. If no one has a copy of the depo, I am still intouch with the lawyer for the People's World and maybe she has access to a copy.

yours, Mary

**Elfie George Ballis, 12/13/04**

**RE: The picture I am getting**

As I have read all these stories, the old days drift back into soft focus. "We was great and committed." I especially smiled through the food stories.

However, the sharpest picture I am going away with, as we fold our memory tents, is pain and anger. This sharp picture is also the greatest lesson for me. Here's how it bubbles up. Whatever the "cause" is, all we have is the moment we are in. All we have is this dance. This process. So it is an imperative challenge for me to try and move in my moments as I would have the society move when they embrace whatever my "cause." I try to joyfully act the future I am seeking. To the extent that I can pull off this near impossible mission, win or lose, diminishes the times I will be compelled to cry the saddest of all songs, "What if..."

I thank you all for your painful anger stories which have focused this crucial lesson for me.

Smiling Seriously,  
Elfie George Ballis

**Susan Drake, 12/13/04 (1)**

**RE: The picture I am getting**

Amen, Brother Elfie! Let the ooze of anger be salved [is be salved correct Ingles?] by dancing bodies and spirits! And that's not just 'cuz I live in Santa Cruz area!

Susan

**Mary Quinn Kambic, 12/13/04**

**RE: link of UFW with Saul Alinsky and IAF**

Jerry Brown writes that: "*Fred was a Saul Alinski-trained community organizer, schooled in the tactics of building the people's army and in the strategies of conflict and confrontation.*"

Speaking of the IAF reminds me to ask if this thread of farmworker history resonates today. IAF, I believe, employed Jim Drake as one of their lead organizers, and many of us (myself included) live in areas of the country where the IAF and its affiliates are still strong and are major players in the political and economic life of cities. Why do I ask? My church is a member of an IAF affiliate, and if any organization truly mastered the art of the purge and silencing critics, it is IAF. It took me several years to realize that their way of organizing was definitely not the way I wanted to go, and it took BUILD (IAF), a much shorter time to see that I should take a hike. Later, in conversations with community organizers in Pittsburgh and here in Baltimore, I learned that many others considered the IAF strategy to be effective in the short run, and completely disastrous over the stretch. Many organizers really do not like IAF at all. Some of the folks in Pittsburgh still blame IAF for a Lutheran minister's fatal heart attack (chisme).

As I was only about 21-25 when I worked with the Pittsburgh Grape and Lettuce boycotts, I was not yet aware of the intricacies of the organizing strategies. Now I see the UFW in a new light, if indeed, Alinsky left his stamp on Chavez and the movement. I had occasion to meet Fred Ross Jr. at the US Catholic Bishops Social Ministry meeting where a loose confederation of Catholic labor activists have been meeting in DC in February. However, I didn't bring up the IAF question as my Irish face tends to turn beet red whenever I even think of the organization. If I go from a stroke, I would rather it be on a picket line or such, and not over Alinsky. However, I do feel that IAF attracted volunteers by playing on old truths: religious folks could be brought in by busloads, because many church people tend to go along with the pastor, whatever he or she says. And the religious aspect was really played up; priests I know who hardly ever wore clerical clothes in public would be shining in liturgical glory at BUILD meetings. I thought this was manipulative. Then again, religious people were more attentive to labor in the old days. Wouldn't it be interesting to investigate where this coalition broke down?

My face is not red, writing to those of you I see as friends, even if we never met!  
Mary Quinn Kambic



Pittsburgh Grape and Lettuce Boycott (three-month staff person and 1968-1975 community volunteer)

**Susan Drake, 12/13/04 (2)**

**RE: link of UFW with Saul Alinsky and IAF**

I wish Jim were alive to comment on this. I know that after he died, some of his followers left IAF, but I don't know if that's because they were too attached him rather than the work or what. He and Marshall became close; Marshall can you comment?

Susan Drake (1962-73)

**Kathy Lynch Murguia, 12/13/04**

**RE: Permanent Revolution**

Kathy Murguia 1965-1983

At this point it matters little to me as a volunteer, that LeRoy believes what happened between 1963-1993 was about "Cesar Chavez and His Farmworker Movement". I reacted negatively to this characterization initially, and then after some discussion realized, how true it was. History remains however in my opinion what we say it is from our experiences, selected fields of research/interviews etc. I really didn't think the movement belonged to Cesar when I was working my tail off. I thought it was about a union for workers, and our work in building a viable power base from which workers could negotiate contracts, etc., etc. The Constitutional Convention in "73" solidified the fact that Cesar was on a good track. Also I did think Cesar's vision included an international union contrary to what LeRoy suggests. I think it played into his notions about paying staff.

In 1977, he talked a lot about the fact the Union wouldn't be able to move on to an international movement if we started paying wages. His idea was that in struggle and playing "the game" a series of strong farmworker communities would be organized turning the power structure on its head. This movement wouldn't have borders and it was permanent revolution. This at least was what he expressed to some in the early part of the LeRoy's "Reformation Period".

Cesar also also talked a lot about "proprietorship" at this point. He wanted others to buy into the idea of owning his vision. When it began to conflict with his ability to accomodate other interests and priorities in organizing workers among the leadership, things got bizarre.

Cesar was persuasive as we all know. He was also convinced he embodied the will of the workers, and spoke for them. Tactically and strategically he was brilliant at wielding power and knew it, as well as did all of us.....and he wouldn't and couldn't be contained.

**Hope Lopez Fierro, 12/13/04**

**RE: Pain and Anger**

Regarding Elfie's entry on 'the picture'

George refers to the the whole process of reliving the past as tainted with pain and anger.

I think of it more as the 'grieving' process.

The later postings seem to have mellowed out, but the fact that the injured parties were given the opportunity to ventilate, and get some of that hurt out, even if it was on the Internet, seems to have 'salved' - Susan's word, - las heridas.

I bet some of you have never taken the time to sit down and write, as much, and as often as you have done in the past few months, about your good and unfortunate experiences con los campesinos.

It also helps to remember the 'great and committed' times along with the purges, the Games and other ego blasting goings on, experienced by some of the staff. Hey. We lost something we dearly loved. Keep on venting until it becomes a pleasant memory.

Hang in there kids.

Hope Lopez – '68-74

**Jane Yett (Kiely), 12/14/04 (1)**

**RE: The picture I am getting**

Thank you, Elfie-G!

When you wrote about moving "as I would have the society move when they embrace whatever my 'cause", I thought of a person who embodied that principal for me: **Fred Eyster** of the Migrant/Farm Worker Ministry.

**I felt Fred treated me as a woman/a person would be treated in a fully conscious society. It was startling to be treated so well.**

Fred, who died many years ago, has remained an example for me of **living as though we had already reached that social clarity we long for.**

And when we do, we have.

Thanks to Fred. And thanks to all of you on the listserv.

Remembering Fred Eyster and his capacity to live now in the world we are still working to build[.]

Janie Yett  
(Janie Yett Kiely long ago)

I'm sending a separate email with stories of being hired by Safeway in 1972 to study their relationship with the UFW!

**Jane Yett (Kiely), 12/14/04 (2)**

**RE: Safeway hired me to do UFW/ Safeway study**

Before the year ends, I want to say something of my experience in 1972-73, at the height of the Safeway boycott, **of being hired by Safeway, to study their relations with the UFW. Best job I ever had.** - Hired through a program to get graduate students into and inspired by the corporate world(!).

Cesar said to me a number of years later, "We really got them that time, didn't we!" I did an honest report for Safeway, telling them they deserved to be boycotted as long as they sold Teamster lettuce.

Einar Mohn was head of the western 13 states for the Teamsters, and their sweetheart contracts for lettuce workers. When I interviewed him for my Safeway research, Mohn told me the **Teamsters couldn't have union meetings for farm workers or let the members participate in the union, until the "brown workers in the fields were replaced by white workers on machines", and then "we can have a real union"**. And other such comments that I really should detail for you (they are in LeRoy's Documentation Project CD).

The LA Times, Associated Press, CBS, El Malcriado, etc., carried the conclusions of the Safeway study, featuring Mohn's outspoken racism.

No, Safeway didn't like the results of the study they had funded.

But the UFW used the report as orientation reading for incoming volunteers (it included historical background on the union). It was called the "Kiely report"; I was Jane Yett Kiely at the time. The Safeway study grew into a doctoral thesis, and Fred Eyster (Farm Worker Ministry) was on my dissertation committee.

But more interestingly, the report was one more action that helped to expose the ugly racism of the Teamster leadership, to validate worker complaints of racism, and to support the UFW's legal actions against Teamster racism, and the larger efforts to get the Teamsters out of the fields.

Well....long time passing.

**Organizing is still where it's at. And the listserve has been a lesson in some of the grace and pitfalls of organizing, especially in alliance with a person of great moral standing.**

**The guy whose concepts I used in my dissertation on farm worker organizing, Reinhold Niebuhr, warned specifically about the particular dangers of moral stature and its corruptions, essentially predicting much of the dialogue in this listserve.**

Thanks to all who have dared to speak to their experience.

Long road walked, long road to go. Rocky. Better sing as we go walking.

Janie Yett

formerly Jane Yett Kiely

Author of the "Report to Safeway on the Lettuce Labor Dispute," 1973

Currently a photographer, activist, fund-raiser for non-profits (Global Fund for Women, a clinic in Nicaragua, African Women's Development Fund, Global Greengrants...) and an organizer for donors in social justice movements. Tree-hugging rabble-rouser with two school-age kids, in Santa Cruz.

If anyone can find a copy of the 1973 El Malcriado story on the Safeway study (they did a big center spread), I'd love to have a copy. Thanks.

**Jerry Brown, 12/14/04**

**RE: Safeway hired me to do UFW/ Safeway study**

Jane - you recently wrote:

*Organizing is still where it's at. And the listserve has been a lesson in some of the grace and pitfalls of organizing, especially in alliance with a person of great moral standing.*

*The guy whose concepts I used in my dissertation on farm worker organizing, Reinhold Niebuhr, warned specifically about the particular dangers of moral stature and its corruptions, essentially predicting much of the dialogue in this listserve.*

Your comment brings me full circle to one of the first postings I sent about Cesar, which after reading much of this fascinating dialogue, seems now even more relevant, and therefore worth repeating before we sign off:

"Greatness is a transitory experience. It is never consistent. It depends in part upon the myth-making imagination of humankind. The person who experiences greatness must have a feeling for the myth he is in. He must reflect what is projected upon him. And he must have a strong sense of the sardonic. This is what uncouples him for belief in his own pretensions. The sardonic is all that permits him to move within himself. With this quality, even occasional greatness will destroy a man."

- Frank Herbert (science fiction writer), *Dune*, 1965.

From much that has been written about the later years, Cesar appears to have lost his sense of the sardonic and become a prisoner of his pretensions.

And, certainly, from the bitterness of a few of the comments, some of us needed to project our own mythic expectations on Cesar, and felt deeply betrayed and angry when he did not live up to our myth-making imaginations.

Jerry Brown

Miami Beach, Florida

(Delano - Toronto - Miami, 1966-1976)

**Kathy Lynch Murguia, 12/14/04**

**RE: The picture I am getting**

Nicely put Elfie . . . The snapshot of life is what we choose to give our attention to and how we focus. I thought I had my album pretty well sealed re: the farmworkers, then there was LeRoy's call. Ouch, didn't know what some of those late night postings were comin from. Hope Lopez. . . Life is indeed a pleasant memory. As Benito put it more or less eloquently . . . "I't sall good. . . It rings . . . somewhere, everywhere in the universe it's all good." Kathy

**Jerry Kay, 12/14/04**

**RE: Coming to no conclusion**

Jerry Kay:

And so my friends and comrades, what can we say? That this man, Cesar Estrada Chavez, came along at the right time in history with a cause that inspired us; because we were young, because we did not want to repeat the lives of our parents; because we were adventurous, soul-searching, revolutionary, looking for a new way, fell in love with campesinos and Filipinos.

We thought Cesar could be the fallen Martin Luther King, or Gandhi, Christ, or Lenin--an American peasant genius--a jitterbugging, vegetarian, non-violent Mao. We all pictured him as we wanted to see him and we all saw for however long the infinite possibilities of the organization he started and the movement we all created and the incredible wave we all furiously paddled into and rode.

Look how many of us came; from so many different backgrounds, with so many different hopes and desires, tastes and likes and dislikes.

Oh, we came so close, didn't we? We really thought that we could change America, the world, ourselves. What disappointments we have suffered because we dreamed so fantastically, worked so hard and today, really, have so little to show? And we really came so close, so painfully, beautifully achingly close. Do we blame the person who did not live up to our expectations? Do we blame the enemies who did? Do we blame ourselves?

Do we look back in bitterness, with nostalgia, "if only--"?

What a grand chaotic lot we were and what we did with so little.

We came so close.

**Virginia Munsch Nesmith, 12/14/04**

**RE: National Farm Worker Min., fw organizing nationwide**

Dear Friends,

I am writing as former staff (beginning with Prop 14) and current director of the National Farm Worker Ministry, [www.nfwm.org](http://www.nfwm.org). I have been following some of the listserve, but only now finding time to weigh in. With over forty national and regional member organizations, individual supporters nationwide, and staff on both coasts, NFWM continues to mobilize faith based support for farm workers. Chris Hartmire, whom many of you have referred to, serves as a consultant to us.

Cesar's work and influence did not end with the controversies being debated in this forum or with his death, but inspired farm workers to organize all around the country. In addition to the UFW organizing campaigns (two that we're currently supporting include Gallo of Sonoma and Threemile Canyon Dairy in eastern Oregon) FLOC has been organizing in North Carolina's cucumber fields and just won a landmark victory there covering 8000 workers. This labor agreement, the largest in the South, was signed on September 16th with the North Carolina Growers' Association and the Mt. Olive Pickle Company, target of a five year FLOC boycott. PCUN (Pineros y Campesinos Unidos del Noroeste - Oregon) recently dedicated the Cipriano Ferrel education center, named after their founder who is now deceased. Cipriano was a former UFW staff member who went home to Oregon to organize workers there. Part of PCUN's current work is on the legislative front - to ensure that a grower sponsored farm worker collective bargaining bill is not passed. Next door in Washington, Chateau St. Michelle, the state's largest

winery, just signed their third UFW contract. The Coalition of Immokalee Workers, while not a union, has drawn national attention to Florida's tomato fields through their organizing there, a national boycott of Taco Bell and their fight against slavery. Artie Rodriguez joined their march on Taco Bell headquarters in Irvine last spring. The UFW and FLOC have both supported the efforts of Centro Campesino a new union organizing in Minnesota. They came to the dedication of the Cesar Chavez Memorial Garden and stayed for a meeting to learn what they could from the UFW - which was candid and helpful about what has worked and not worked for them. CITA, or Centro Independiente Trabajadores Agricolas, based in Western New York is currently seeking an executive director with labor organizing experience to expand their organizing efforts.

I started this work on Prop 14 in the Central office in LA, went to Florida to assist Richard Cook in opening an NFWM office there (with Stephen Robeson directing the UFW office down the street). I left NFWM in '79, was an active supporter over the years while I attended seminary, raised three kids with my husband Charlie, co-directed the St. Louis Economic Conversion Project, lived on an island in the Atlantic for four years, and came back to the movement as UFW staff on the strawberry campaign in '97. (Working on Monsanto which owned Garguilo which became Coastal Berry - 1700 workers currently under contract.) I was hired as NFWM director in '98.

I am not naïve, nor is our board. We have several board members who have been with us since the '70's. Some of you may remember Olgha Sierra Sandman, Jeanne Giordano, Rosie Cooperrider, Sam Trickey, Bruce Hanson, Gene Boutilier or Mary Jean Friel. We know what farm worker conditions were like in the '60 and '70's. We know what they are like now. Could the UFW, or others have done or be doing this work better? I would think so. Could NFWM be doing something differently or better? I ask myself that personally and we ask it as an organization all the time - Is it that we need new methods or simply to work harder at the old, is it human error and frailty, funding, personalities, politics, events beyond our control? What parts of it can we change, what can't we, etc., etc.?

At the same time, we could also ask why the labor movement in general isn't doing better?.or how about the peace movement? or the political left or even the democratic party? And how did we end up with so many working poor, so many uninsured? What about our effectiveness in fighting global poverty? Why are people still so desperate south of the border that they risk their lives to come here?

What I do know is that we meet with farm workers at our board meetings in different parts of the country twice a year, who are either sharing what a difference a contract had made in their lives, or telling us why they are fighting for one and need our support. We have started a new youth and young adult network for the many young people who are interested in this issue. Let's not forget the Mother Jones mandate folks. Pray for the Dead and Fight like Hell for the Living!"

You can visit [www.nfwm.org](http://www.nfwm.org) for campaign updates or to order "shopping guides" of both boycotted and union label produce and wines, to make a donation to NFWM or to get our email or mailing list.

Happy Holidays,

Virginia Munsch Nesmith  
National Farm Worker Ministry  
NFWM '76-'79, UFW '97, '98, NFWM Director '98-present

**LeRoy Chatfield, 12/14/04**

**RE: "FOR MOST PEOPLE**

*"For most people, social movements are just that -- movements -- movements from one situation to another, from a segregated America to a desegregated America, from life without a union to life with a union -- they are transitions, transformations, and they don't last forever, nor should they. The mistake may have been in trying to make it last forever, an abnormality when it comes to social movements." - Marshall Ganz December 4, 2004 (Underline by LeRoy Chatfield)*

I have been musing about Marshall's posting of December 4, 2004. Marshall raises a good point when he points out that "for most people" social movements are transitory, are not meant to last forever, and it is abnormal to attempt to do otherwise.

I agree. Most people cannot live in a movement for an indefinite period of time, let alone for a lifetime. At some point, "most people" must return to a more normal way of life, or in the alternative, the movement must make adjustments to permit "most people" to live a more normal way of life.

For my part, I would have preferred that the some of the ideals of the farmworker movement - for example: living and working in voluntary poverty, sublimation of all personal/family needs to the immediate demands of the cause, the concept of servant-hood to farmworkers, etc. - could have been relaxed for the sake of meeting the needs of "most people" who "might have wished" to make the social justice struggle of farmworkers their life's work and/ or career. Presumably, the first step to modify Cesar's farmworker movement ideals could have started with the proposal in 1977 to pay (modest) salaries, instead of volunteer stipends, but we know that the proposal was defeated by a vote of the executive board.

The problem, as I see it, is that the norms applicable "for most people" do not apply to a Cesar Chavez, the founder of a movement, or his true believer followers. They see it differently. The ideals on which the movement was founded were sacrosanct, and any proposed compromises for the sake of accommodating "most people" was untenable.

Because the vast majority of farmworker volunteers fell into the category of "most people" their only reasonable option was to withdraw from the movement when it was time for them to return to a more normal way of life, and that is exactly what happened with the vast majority of farmworker volunteers.

**Abby Flores Rivera, 12/14/04**

**RE: The Doc. Project; not the Projects**

Dear LeRoy and All:

Richgrove is now a booming little town with more than the 500 residents who lived there in my time. I guess you could have called the entire town a Project by the looks of it back then. (It has gotten a little better.) We did have a fire station though with one fine Fire Chief, Ben Maddox, of 40 Acres fame. Thank goodness mighty things happen even in small towns like Cesar coming to distribute his leaflets asking us to fight for our rights and join the union.

I feel good about what I have written since I am not one who believes in rewriting history but in telling it like I saw it. No final recapping of events to form a tidy perspective either. I will walk into that *goodnight* one day feeling just fine. No "what if" for me. My journey began a long time ago and it still continues. Cesar did not keep us ignorant about what it would take; not in sacrifices nor in years. For those who walked with us, thank you. For those who did and continue, you are more valuable than precious jewels and are true believers in helping the poor for the simple reason that it is the right and just thing to do. Back in 1976, I almost left the union until I saw a mother working in the fields in the Arvin-Lamont area with her toddler locked in her car with the window opened just a crack. I had seen that so many times before and knew things were not going to change overnight. That is when I accepted that it was to be a lifetime fight after all and why kid myself. Back at La Paz, many people reported on that picket line that day, how we kicked butt and how the farm workers listened to us, etc. No one spoke of the child in the car.

Many have said that I admired Cesar. I did. Some say that I looked upon him as a saint, etc. Wrong! I never looked at Cesar like that although he was rather perfect in many ways, but he never knew that is what I thought. Nor was I into trying to please him either. If the truth be told, with Cesar I pretty much spoke when spoken to and left him alone. I have always been extremely grateful though that Cesar did come into our life, mine and my parent's. However, what I always saw were the CHILDREN not Cesar. When my muscles ached and I wanted to drop dead at a picket line, human bill boarding, door knocking, etc. or when my arm wanted to fall off from sitting running numbers through my adding machine all day, what kept me going were the

children. Children sleeping in cars, under grapevines, and inside prune boxes. I was once a child who would turn a couple of prune boxes upside down to form a flat bed to take my mid-afternoon naps. I am not a writer nor have I ever professed being one, but I hope you can understand my heart when I say that NOBODY needed to draw me a picture to make me understand what Cesar was getting at when he came to us with his plan for a union. When he spoke, it was with a "clarity" that I understood because he had walked in our shoes. I will be eternally grateful to him that he did not leave his vision at the "what if" stage and that he asked us to join him. ¡Es propio, Cesar; con todo gusto!

All of you continue in your good work doing great things in your life. Like Brother Pete Velasco might declare, waving his arm in the air and then with a final salute, "Wherever you are, whatever you might be, brothers and sisters" (a more-or-less quote). The best to all of you. Sin mas, Sinceramente, Obdulia "Abby" Flores Rivera, ...Chavista a morir!!!! ...CESAR CHAVEZ ...PRESENTE

### **Hugh "Hawkeye" Tague, 12/14/04**

#### **RE: Miscellaneous Comments**

JERRY KAY; Re: "We Came So Far" Yes we did! Thanks for mentioning Rev. Frank Smith and Rev. Auggie VandenBosch. They were EARLY supporters in Florida and unsung heroes. They were active before Manuel Chavez got there in '71. Frank Smith was a quiet guy who had been thrown out of Taiwan by the government for trying to organize the Formosan poor people who were being exploited by the wealthy Chinese "refugees".

Auggie was Jose Luna's "twin". That's what Jose called him because they both were short and round and had prominent warts on their noses. Auggie always came through for us. I remember when we had a party and he brought many pounds of meat that he hustled in Miami that wasn't sold during the "meat boycott".

MARK PITT; Right on ! to your UNION VS MOVEMENT comments.

ABBY; No, I didn't get typhoid fever.

KATHY MURGIA; No, the hostess didn't get me. I'm not that kind of guy.....

GEORGE BALLIS; Well said!

CORRECTION; I spelled Meta's name wrong. It's MENDEL. Everything else I said about her is accurate.

ADDITION; I left out that Jardinero is anal retentive. This is a trait that can sometimes be helpful in organizing, but it can also get you maimed by your co-workers.

### **Tom Nagle, 12/14/04**

I'm involved in this project pretty late in the game and just want to share a few thoughts.

I met Richard and Barbara Cook in St. Louis in the fall of 1973. Getting involved with the UFW was a little like getting caught in a wringer washer. First my little finger got caught in the wringer, then my hand, my whole arm... and so it went. I went to a meeting. I helped a fund raiser. I joined a picket line. Then I became a picket captain. Then I was recruiting other supporters. Richard and Barbara encouraged me to go to Los Angeles and work as an organizer for the summer of 1974. I went to Los Angeles thinking I would work for the summer... I stayed with the union for 3 years. I met my first wife, Tessa Aguilar, the mother of my children. My daughter was born in the union. Los Angeles, St. Louis, Oxnard, Visalia and Santa Maria. Thank you Richard and Barbara for offering me such a great experience.

Working for the union had an important impact on my life. It changed my me. It shaped the way I view the world and the way I understand politics. Some of the finest people I've met in my life I met and worked with during those three years with the UFW.

I had really good organizing teachers. Richard Cook, Jim Drake, Terry Carruthers (Vasquez Scott), Eliseo Medina, Larry Tramatoia, Scott Washburn, Gilbert Padilla (sort of in that order) I learned about how to listen to people. How to talk to people that we want to have work with you. I learned about planning and reporting and being accountable. I learned about being creative.

From union members themselves I learned about courage and perseverance.

I had great people working on my small staffs. Sr. Betty O'Donnell, Mike Jongorius, Paulino Pacheco. And I worked with inspiring people like John Gardner, Julie Kerkisick, Michael Savage and Bill Monning.

It was the best job I ever had. Organizing election campaigns in 1975 through 1977 was a tremendous experience. I worked with farmworkers who had never voted for anything in their entire lives. Now they were organizing crew committees, voting in secret ballot elections and beating the Teamsters, almost all the time.

I recall during the Gallo boycott in Los Angeles in the spring of 1975. The liquor salesmen would come out and set up counter pickets and try to harass us. They would give out a phone number to area liquor stores who were to call them if we showed up to picket. We'd look in a store when we arrived and see these guys making a phone call, then 20 minutes later a car load of salesmen would show up to set up their picketline. One Saturday Jan Peterson called five liquor stores that we were targeting on Slauson Blvd. She told them that she was with the Gallo salesmen and that they were not to call the regular number because they had found out that the UFW was eavesdropping on that line. She told them to call a different number (where she was sitting in some church basement, and that she would dispatch the counter pickets when they called.) So these liquor store owners would call Jan saying "the UFW is here and there making a lot of noise and I don't like this" and Jan would say, "You know were really sorry we can't send you any pickets today. They're all busy." The guy would call back in awhile and Jan would ask "Are the pickets turning customers away?" The guy would scream "YES" Then Jan suggested well, you can't be expected to have your business hurt. Maybe you should take off the Gallo wine." We cleaned out five stores that day.

I recall going to a union convention in Fresno, probably the summer of 1976. When the convention was over, we, a few thousand of us marched with Cesar, I think to Selma. We were walking down this old black top road, past orchards and vineyards, singing and chanting. We passed a small house with a sign out in front "free puppies" Richard Cook started a chant "Free the Puppies! Free the Puppies!" The man made me laugh hard.

Santa Maria in early 1977 when the Teamster's local with Bart Curto was filing election petitions right and left because he didn't like the jurisdictional pact that was being negotiated between the western conference of Teamsters and the UFW. Pete Cohen was working hard to stop the elections and I was working hard to win them. Pete and I would meet late each night and review the day and plan for the next day. Pete would say... "I think we can stop that election"...and I would say, "interesting...I think we can win it" Working in Santa Maria was like that. Both of us working as hard as we could toward different results, with different goals, but we were working together.

Paulino Pacheco and I did a radio show on Sunday mornings in Santa Maria called "EI Voz del Valle" One Sunday Paulino would interview me as a special guest. The next week I would interview him as a special guest.

The last year I worked with the union, I worked in Visalia and Santa Maria. Both offices were small and not the focus of much attention. I never played the game and rarely visited La Paz. I was uninvolved in the politica and left in June of 1977 for personal reasons unrelated to the internal struggles in the union.

I know that I worked hard. I also know that I had a tremendously rewarding experience. I am honored to have worked with the UFW.

Gracias a todos,

Thomas Tagle 1974-1977 Los Angeles, St. Louis, Oxnard, Visalia, Santa Maria



**Richard Ybarra, 12/14/04**

**RE: National Farm Worker Min., fw organizing nationwide**

Dear Virginia,

Thank you for the update and the reminder that Cesar's movement did not die when I left it in 1976 and again in 1982.

Your work and those who preceded you was always the third wing of the eagle's flight. Thanks also for mentioning your board members who also gave more than they ever got - I still have great memories and lessons learned from each of them as well.

Though he went on to do his thing in Oregon with PCUN I read with great pride in my Late Homie Cypriano "El Sipe" Ferrel who I along with Ben Maddock recruited to the union. Like you and others Ramon and PCUN keep on rolling while others of us continue a spirited dialogue on what was, wasn't or might have been long ago.

The other group we need to note here is Cesar's second union, the United Domestic Workers/AFSCME who now represent 70,000 home care workers in California.

For anyone who does not know the story Cesar and I met Ken Seaton-Msemagi and Fahari Jeffers during Props 22 and 14, after which I suggested to Cesar that they were the people he had been looking for to start this new union.. He agreed, sent Fred, the board agreed to send some seed money and the third union begun by people of color in the U.S. was started.

In addition to PCUN, UDW, LeRoy's Loaves and Fishes, some of Jim Drake's projects one or two movements previously mentioned here as begun by boycotters, are there other movements begun by former Chavistas? I mention this because Bill Traynor, a community organizer friend in Massachusetts recently said, "the UFW people did far more than you will ever give yourselves credit for doing. The multiplier effects that the UFW learned and contributed to other movements across the country are immeasurable!"...

Thanks again for the reminder that movement life, La Paz life and life itself was fun and upbeat then and now...

Richard Y de L/H

**Marshall Ganz, 12/14/04**

**RE: "FOR MOST PEOPLE"**

Ah, Leroy. Trying to make a social movement last forever, which may serve the interests of those whose needs, wishes, or ambitions may be served by it is the aberration. "Most people" don't get to live the life of a movement elite (let's face it, what "needs" did Cesar have to go with out with his dogs, gardens, drivers, and the capacity to indulge whatever whim he desired to -- "most people" don't get to live a life of such privilege and, at the same time, get kudos for self-sacrifice, voluntary poverty, etc. This is the kind of "voluntary poverty" lived by church leaders who occupy mansions, have servants, get perks from everyone who has need of them.

Movements contribute what they have to contribute if they accomplish the changes for which people joined them -- and it is all the large numbers of people that join that makes it a movement. An isolated leadership cadre living in the hills may be a cult, a commune, a community, the remnant of a movement, or perhaps a shrine to a movement, but it is not a "movement." So, yes, it takes lots of ordinary people to make a movement. But, no, it's not about trying to make the movement last forever. In China, for example, Mao tried to prolong his movement through the cultural revolution, a disaster that set China back decades, incurred a huge human cost, but didn't cost Mao too much because he was well taken care of no matter what.

The values that launched the UFW and drew so many of us to it - farm workers and non-farm workers - were far different than the values that drove Cesar's perversion of the movement from about 1977 onward. It wasn't a consistency of values that isolated Cesar from the movement he once led, but the inversion of those values: a movement that had been committed to openness,

innovation, risk taking, organizing, leadership development and the empowerment of farm workers became closed, rigid, risk averse, withdrawn from organizing, suspicious of new leadership and resistant to the empowerment of farm workers. It was Cesar who abandoned the movement, not the other way around.

**Angie Fa, 12/14/04**

**RE: Lasting Legacy**

Richard wrote: *In addition to PCUN, UDW, LeRoy's Loaves and Fishes, some of Jim Drake's projects one or two movements previously mentioned here as. Begun by boycotters, are there other movements begun by former Chavistas? I mention this because Bill Traynor, a community organizer friend in Massachusetts, recently said, "the UFW people did far more than you will ever give yourselves credit for doing. The multiplier effects that the UFW learned and contributed to other movements across the country are immeasurable!"...*

There is a lasting legacy of the farm workers movement. In the words of one of the earliest volunteers, the late Reverend Jim Drake, "No good organizing is ever lost." Movements grow and decline. Scholar activists have documented how on a personal level individual activists have to choose between making history and maintaining daily life; on an institutional level, how movements some times run out of steam, get co-opted and institutionalized. But movements leave behind an incredible infrastructure of talented individuals, organizational models, and institutional reforms. When many new movements develop, they often draw strength from the resources, songs, stories, lessons and institutional allies of earlier movements.

The power of the farm workers movement is that within a decade, the striking farm workers and the consumers who supported them transformed a small rural strike into a mass movement powerful enough to affect many of America's institutions and social movements. Activists who learned critical skills in the UFW applied these lessons in new settings after leaving the union. Many activists who assisted in building the union, then went on to influence much of America's public sphere, revitalize labor unions, shape institutions, and energize other social movements. Years ago I did a dissertation trying to document the lasting legacy of the farm workers movement, which I have been trying to re-write. 17 million Americans supported the grape boycott and the farm workers movement influenced many of this country's popular institutions.

Farm worker veterans helped to transform how modern political field campaigns are conducted. Even before he started the UFW, Cesar Chavez began his political activism by organizing massive voter registration drives that registered half a million new Chicano voters and by helping nearly 50,000 Mexican immigrants become naturalized citizens. With lobbying from UFW co-founder Dolores Huerta, California immigrants won access to government assistance programs before they became citizens. From Chavez, Huerta, and their mentor Fred Ross, farm worker volunteers learned how to influence political elections: registering and turning out voters, helping to elect candidates who supported farm worker rights.

After leaving the union, veteran organizers UFW alumni helped to reshape today's labor movement -- the people, organizations and institutions trying to improve the lives of workers nationwide. Before the UFW, many people believed that immigrant Spanish speaking workers could not be organized. Many of today's union organizers and labor leaders got their start as farm worker volunteers. Former farm worker volunteers revitalized established unions and the farm worker strikes and boycotts convinced the labor movement that low income, immigrant workers can be unionized.

The farm workers movement had a critical impact on America's cultural institutions. Luis Valdez, veteran of the first 1965 grape strike, integrated Broadway and Hollywood. People who learned how to organize in the farm workers movement shared their skills with other emerging social movements -- for women's and gay and lesbian rights, nuclear disarmament, and peace with justice in Central America. Former farm worker organizers helped popularize Take Back the Night demonstrations in the women's movement, and campaigns for domestic partnership rights for gay and lesbian couples. They helped develop such a powerful boycott of Nestle products that for the first time a transnational corporation signed an agreement with a grassroots organization,

ending deceptive marketing of infant formulas that put babies in developing countries at risk. They also assisted in building a boycott of General Electric to stop the corporation from promoting and producing nuclear weapons. Farm worker trained organizers mobilized thousands to oppose U.S. funding of the Nicaraguan contras and death squads in El Salvador. Latino and Filipino farm workers and their union were instrumental in motivating the emerging Chicano and Asian Pacific movements.

Many volunteers from the farm workers movement have inspired new generations of young people, born in the decades after the 1965 Delano grape strike and boycott. Former farm worker volunteers went into education, counseling, or other programs supporting young people. Farm worker activists went on to develop the world's largest and oldest existing youth conservation corps, the California Conservation Corps. The farm workers movement has tried to pass on the lessons of the UFW and Cesar Chavez to new generations, inspiring them to learn by performing community service.

The farm workers movement has also helped to transform the way consumers eat and the choices Americans make about our food. The boycotts paved the way for the growing popularity of local farmers' markets, with their direct connection to the people who actually grow the produce. The farm workers movement played an early role in challenging corporate agriculture's pesticide use, which placed profit over health. Cesar's last fast called attention to the problems of pesticides creating health hazards for both farm workers and consumers. Rising awareness of the dangers of pesticides has led to a growing market for organic produce.

The farm workers movement has shaped our world in lasting ways. The powerful movement growing from a small farm workers strike in 1965 improved not only the lives of Delano farm workers but also the lives of consumers, working people, youth, women, and people of color throughout the country. Through incredible volunteer efforts, over 17 million Americans made boycotting grapes and later lettuce and Gallo wines, a part of their daily lives. The volunteers who built this movement and learned how to organize from Fred Ross, Cesar Chavez and Dolores Huerta, have continued to influence American institutions, develop new organizations and build emerging social movements throughout the country.

In the last days of this documentation project, it would be wonderful to hear other examples of how farm worker organizing has helped to shape our world in new ways. For example, did the movement inspire changes in the ways that healthcare and legal services are provided to immigrants and working people? Others have documented how the movement changed religious institutions. Thanks to all of you for all your insights and all of your good work! Angie Fa

**Ellen Eggers, 12/15/04 (1)**

**RE: "FOR MOST PEOPLE"**

I hear what you're saying LeRoy, but I didn't leave the union in 1987 because I didn't like the voluntary poverty, or because I had two children and started worrying about their future. I left because, by then, I had lived at La Paz for seven years and I had had the opportunity to witness first hand how Cesar operated, at least at that point in history (1980-87). It was not that I didn't still admire him, and appreciate everything he had done and tried to do. But I did see a side of him that made me feel like I just MIGHT be wasting my time. He kept starting new projects, only to abandon them a few months later, when he'd be off starting something else. While I was intrigued by his interest in trying new things, I was eventually pretty turned off by his dropping the ball and going in a different direction, while the previous project lay dormant. He always had a ready and loyal contingent of volunteers, willing to drop what they were doing to embark on the new project...and many of us kept doing it, year after year. But after enough years, I saw the pattern (I actually saw it several years before I actually left, but because of the lawsuits I was involved in, felt I really couldn't leave). I don't say this to be mean-spirited or to disparage Cesar and I mean no disrespect to him or his family, but I think that something happened to him that began to make him flounder, for lack of a better word. It was almost like he lost his way, or ran out of ideas about how to keep things going. I think that both you and Marshall have accurately described what was going on...it's just that Marshall was there for the years that followed your departure. I really can't

disagree with Marshall's assessment. I don't have the bitterness that a lot of the volunteers have, or that perhaps Marshall has, because when I left, I left on good terms and on my terms. But by the time I left I really had this feeling that there was not a whole lot happening that was worth sticking around for. I don't know if that was the fault of the ALRB, politics, the Executive Board, Cesar, the quality of the staff....or a combination of all of those things. But I do know that when I left the boycott to go to law school in 1975 things looked GREAT, and I couldn't wait to get back to California. When I returned in 1980, things looked pretty dismal and I spent most of my time in the legal department defending lawsuits, including suits filed by farmworkers. I enjoyed the camaraderie of my fellow lawyers and paralegals (a lot) and it was fun working in La Paz and being around Cesar, but eventually all of that was not enough. I did not see the union going anywhere and I basically lost faith. I was all for the volunteer system, and never had a problem with it, but there wasn't a movement anymore that I could see. Maybe some would say not much of a union either. I don't know, since I have nothing else to compare it to. Probably none of us will experience anything like that again in our lives. I miss that and am certainly grateful that I was part of it ( esp 72-75) and that I got to meet all of you. Ellen Eggers

**Ellen Eggers, 12/15/04 (2)**

**RE: Lasting Legacy**

What a wonderful piece by Jim Drake...and how true. I always tell people that even though I've been a lawyer for almost 30 years, I feel that I am first and foremost an organizer, because of my experience in the union. When I started with the Union I was terrified to speak in front of a group. I never would have imagined becoming a lawyer or EVER speaking to a crowd. My boycott experience changed all of that. I have never stopped organizing...for the Folger's Coffee Boycott (to stop the war in El Salvador), a boycott started by Fred Ross Jr's Neighbor to Neighbor; later with US - El Salvador Sister Cities, and currently with Death Penalty Focus..to end the dth penalty. My experience with Cesar and the union changed the direction and fabric of my entire life.

**Khati Hendry, 12/15/04**

**RE: Lasting Legacy**

Angie wrote:

*In the last days of this documentation project, it would be wonderful to hear other examples of how farm worker organizing has helped to shape our world in new ways. For example, did the movement inspire changes in the ways that healthcare and legal services are provided to immigrants and working people? Others have documented how the movement changed religious institutions. Thanks to all of you for all your insights and all of your good work!*

I am sure that the farmworkers' movement was responsible for changes in health care, far beyond my own personal experience. During the 1970's, there was a surge in community health centers, quite a few with a focus on Spanish-speaking and rural populations. There are now hundreds of community health centers in California which see a large number of underserved people of varying languages and ethnicities, well documented through the California Primary Care Association. I personally know several people (including Kate Colwell) who started work with the farmworkers and who continue to provide leadership to progressive health services in the state. Boycott organizations at medical schools (there was an active one at UCSF) engaged young health professionals at a key time in their development, and people I knew then have gone on to work in underserved communities. My own choice of medicine as a career developed through farmworker activity, and the eventual choice to work at La Clinica de la Raza was heavily influenced by this. La Clinica was founded in 1971 by Latino public health and political activists inspired by the farmworkers' struggle. It is no accident that the clinic logo includes the aguila. From the outset, it included a community health education component with a clear vision that health depends on the social and economic conditions of the population, and they still use the Paolo Freire model to train community health workers on community diagnosis and action plans. The clinic attracted community staff and idealistic young people of all backgrounds, including some with very direct

ties to the UFW (e.g. Catalina Govea and others). The impact of this highly motivated, dedicated staff surely played a part in helping La Clinica grow into the major community institution that it is today, with nearly 400 employees, multi-million dollar budget, 5 major primary care and dental sites, and multiple other services. It is not an exaggeration to say that La Clinica has been a leader on local, state, and national levels in the community health movement. During clinic growing pains, the staff organized itself into a union, and leadership in that also came from people who had been inspired by the farmworkers' union. The experience of working at La Clinica, being a patient there, participating as a community "promotora", or in other ways being a partner with the organization has certainly resulted in an extensive spread of the seeds planted by the UFW. Of course, La Clinica is only one of many such stories, and I hope you will hear many more. The UFW was also part of "the times" so can't take credit for every progressive cause, but certainly it influenced the movement in broad and often intangible ways.

Khati Hendry

**Abby Flores Rivera, 12/15/04 (1)**

**RE: National Farm Worker Min., fw organizing nationwide**

Dear Virginia,

Thank you for remembering my good Delano High School and fellow UFW friend, Cipriano Ferrel (Cipe). He was a quiet, kind and thoughtful person who followed the direction of his heart to help organize los piñeros. It is good to learn about an Education Center being dedicated to him. The last time I saw Cipe was at Cesar's funeral standing inconspicuously in a corner both of us aware it was not a good moment to speak to each other. Viva PCUN/ Abby

**Abby Flores Rivera, 12/15/04 (2)**

**RE: "FOR MOST PEOPLE"**

Well now Marshall, you have killed two birds with one stone with your comments. One, about Cesar and the second, my father, who was a S. Baptist minister. I don't know what mansions you speak of or perks for that matter but my Dad had to walk long distances to get Spanish speaking churches started throughout Texas. Salary? What salary? Not much of one. He lived by the Good Book doing for others and doing without which means that the "doing without" trickled down to the rest of us, his family. He was a first rate church organizer/ builder and so was my mom. The mansion they now enjoy was the only one they ever sought. Now about Cesar. Most of the freebies I recall him getting were from people who would treat him to dinner once in a while. Hey, but many of the rest of us got treated to the same by our friends and family. You know Marshall, if I can vouch for one thing, and I can, it is that I witnessed Helen going through a lot of hardship to provide for her family making her money stretch as far as possible. She taught me wonders by example on managing my household once I had to rear my own family in the movement. As I recall, Cesar never wanted guards, (drivers) and his dogs were gifts given to him. They were also used for his protection. Many of us in the MOVEMENT did quite a bit of fancy footwork to get little perks now and then if we want to be honest about it. Let's talk about them, Marshall. You suggest that Cesar abused his position to help himself. How dare you! Quit it Marshall. It is unfair to Helen whom I saw struggle right along with the rest of us. She went to great lengths to make life comfortable for Cesar i.e. packing his lunches when he traveled, buying or borrowing items for him that he needed when he traveled, etc. Nobody gave her shit to help with all the added expense of having Cesar traveling all over the place. I truly believe we should have done more for him in that respect. I also know she was vocal whenever she saw abuses so she would have been the first to put Cesar in check. Would you begrudge Cesar a garden? Then you do it to the rest of us. Was that so grand a thing to have? He grew the garden for *US* to have extra food at La Paz. Get it? Oh! I forget; maybe you don't know how family networking pans out. In our culture, our family helps out when they know we are *doing without*. Cesar and Helen's kids and family helped them a lot! Is that wrong? They would have done it with our without the *MOVEMENT*. Are you angry about that, too? I am sure the same was true for many of us in the movement. How many of us wrote home for help...or like myself, just drove there for a good home cooked meal. Those who didn't have family gravitated toward La Paz where they were treated like family by everyone,

especially by Helen and Cesar. Ha! Cesar suspicious of new leadership! You kill me! What he was doing was developing new leadership but you were too blind to see it, and you were too angry to let it happen his way instead of yours. Go back to your tower, Marshall before you're carted away. I thought you were nicer. I am certain Helen does not deserve hearing what you say about her husband. sin mas/ abby

**Angie Fa, 12/15/04 (1)**

**RE: "FOR MOST PEOPLE": Effective Leadership Structures**

Marshall wrote: *"Most people" don't get to live the life of a movement elite...*

Trying to figure out what lessons can help build effective leadership structures in future social movements. Don't know how much of this is an issue of individuals and how much it is an issue of creating effective structures. The American media wants to create movement leaders, activists want heroes. Being a movement leader certainly changed Martin Luther King, and Gandhi. From the civil rights movement Bob Moses and from the free speech movement Mario Savio wrestled with the price of this fame of being movement elite.

From a short term experience as a local elected official, I know that being even a minor public figure can change a person. You get used to people deferring to you, doing what you say, acknowledging your presence, and you lose anonymity, you are always on display. It can be a dehumanizing process that can transform the personality of some.

In addition to fame, the relentless pressure of assassination threats can also change you. King mentioned to friends the media who were always trailing him, some there just waiting for him to be shot at. After working with gay elected officials in San Francisco political campaigns, who have had to deal with death threats (which are taken seriously after Harvey Milk) I have seen how hard it is to be a regular person with relentless pressure of death threats.

The double whammy of fame and assassination threats, plus the responsibility for the future of a movement changed King and it must have changed Cesar. Don't know whether that kind of massive responsibility can be lightened with effective organizational structures. What lessons are there from the farm workers movement to building effective and humane leadership structures in future movements? To be at all effective and viable, the boycotts, using short term volunteers effectively had to be strongly hierarchical, with coordinators and directors. A "90 day wonder" to use Fred Ross' term could not come in and dictate strategy to the farm workers who were lifers.

Other effective structures are lots more difficult given the relentless nature of the work. Once as an experiment for a few days I tried to do a get out the vote election campaign as a collective enterprise. A few friends, all experienced who knew what they were doing, were volunteering full time, the candidate was a shoe-in but there were real benefits for coming in first (which we did). But it took very little time to realize that things go a lot more effectively and efficiently when one person is directing and has overall responsibility.

What structures insure both effectiveness, and quality movement leadership that does not drain our leaders? One of Fred Ross' many incredible traits was a brutal honesty. The coordinators who I have appreciated most are the ones who have taken the staff away to planning sessions and been truly willing to put anything up on the butcher paper for consideration, without preconceived barriers on what was off limits. Then once everyone has had a say and agreed to the plan, we have all been on the same page.

Definitely don't think that staff unions would have been the solution. But I wonder If a year or so probationary period and then some kind of grievance process for staff past the probationary period would have worked. What other structures would people have liked to set up to insure effective leadership and spread the awesome responsibilities around? Angie

**Abby Flores Rivera, 12/15/04 (3)**

**RE: Lasting Legacy**

Angie Fa wrote about former UFW staff:

*"They helped develop such a powerful boycott of Nestle products that for the first time a transnational corporation signed an agreement with a grassroots organization, ending deceptive marketing of Infant formulas that put babies In developing countries at risk."*

What always seemed ironic to me about Nestle was that while the company was aggressively promoting formula feeding campaigns, mothers in the United States were being encouraged to nurse their babies. La Leche League could be found practically everywhere in the states yet we had managed to do so much damage in the third world making women feel that nursing their babies was unnatural; something only lower animals did. That idea had to be in place in order for mothers to accept the idea of formula feeding. Even my 24 year old daughter, who also nurses(d) her babies, remembers the Nestle boycott to this day. You are right, Angie, we might have been ignorant of a lot of issues but our UFW involvement gave us a panoramic view of the world and the need to be involved. In solidarity/ abby

**Deborah Vollmer, 12/15/04**

**RE: UFW Documentation Project: On Deadlines, and Resources**

LeRoy,

Meet Mark Pulido. Mark Pulido, meet LeRoy Chatfield. Mark is one of those people who probably should have been involved in this Documentation Project from the beginning. We have just been talking on the telephone, and now he knows about it.

Mark was one of several people who made possible the publication of Philip Vera Cruz, A Personal History of Filipino Immigrants and the Farmworkers Movement. It might be helpful to let Mark join the listserv--I know there are just a few weeks left, but I am sure that he has a lot to say.

I believe that the book about Philip is still available from Kent Wong at the UCLA Center for Labor Research and Education. Mark, can you confirm this, and let us know where people should write or call, if they would like to get a copy of the book? For those of you on the listserv who are not already familiar with the book, I recommend it. It is my understanding that some within the Union leadership were unhappy with the viewpoint expressed in this book when it was first published. But Philip's experiences and the viewpoint expressed are very much a part of the UFW story, and should be read and understood.

LeRoy, in answer to your earlier inquiry, I don't know where Philip's notes from the Board meetings might be, but it is possible that they are at Wayne State, as Philip passed on many of his papers there, with the help of an anthropologist friend, Albert Bacdayan.

Also LeRoy, I never mentioned this to you, but I was in contact with Prof Henggeler earlier, before his death, and I shared some of my thoughts and experiences that Philip and I had within the UFW, with him. I don't know if anyone is continuing the work that he started—do you know? (I do have electronic copies of my e-mail correspondence with Prof Henggeler.)

As for my preparing an essay for this project, I am afraid I simply do not have time, within the framework of this project. I have Holiday plans which preclude my working on this right now. I have kept several handwritten notebooks from my years with the UFW, and it would take me a while to sort out the details recorded there in order to put together a coherent essay.

As you know, I have periodically contributed to this project through the discussion on this listserv. I am afraid that this is all I have time to do right now.

One day, I may collect my thoughts, and write more. But as with many who have contributed to this discussion, the subject matter is in many ways painful to recall and record. You no doubt have gathered that from my comments to date on the listserv. Many of my experiences and feelings are also reflected in the Philip Vera Cruz book, which I helped to edit.

Peace,

Deborah "Debbie" Vollmer

Student volunteer a few summers in Florida, and with Boycott in New Jersey (?years?)

Full-time 1973-1976 Law Clerk and Lawyer for the Legal Department, La Paz and Delano (mostly)

Close associate and life partner of Philip V. Vera Cruz, Second Vice President of UFW

**Richard Ybarra, 12/15/04**

Marshall,

It's always interesting for us to revisit the movement you who left in 1981 and me in 1976 and 1982. I appreciate your owning up to your leadership role in much of what you protest. Of all the folks here you were granted the most in title, privilege and decision making power.

No matter what you or I now think and say, Cesar Chavez freed Mexican Americans, farmworkers and others from generations of fear and poverty, inaction and what some refer to as "temor reverencial" for all things Anglo-American. "Most people" today believe he was a pretty incredible man and leader. You and the others of us here supported him and brokered him, his image and his actions as much or more than any others in the movement. Cesar more often than not gave you more in terms of resources, choice staff and his time than "most people" for any number of good reasons. Your song was always upbeat and one of praise for Cesar until after you left the union. You were even fun to work with for some of us.

As I recall the turbo european car that the Democrats wrongfully criticized you for in 1988 was worth far more than every driver/security guard car that Cesar ever rode in and did not own. On that point I am sure you recall you and other board members voted and supported his need for those private "drivers" (at times against his objections); and it was perhaps due to the real death threats and plots hatched by enemies and opponents and shown to us by any number of law enforcement people.

As you know the dogs and the guards were not some scam and he was entitled to hobbies within his movement....His wonderful dogs (who were unconditionally loyal), the gardens that he worked along with others in La Paz , were no mansions their were no servants around that I recall except for his spirit of serving farmworkers...and we all remember the growers and Cesar haters in Delano who accused him and his family of taking tunnels at night to their mansion in Delano instead of their earthy Delano and La Paz 2 bedroom 1 bath bungalows where he, Helen and all their kids resided.

LeRoy was and will always be one of our star mentors from the movement at its peak. It would be hard for some to believe that Cesar or the former Brother Gilbert were delusional, lived in aberrational times or in mansions paid for on the backs of farmworkers... I would also bet that Helen Fabela Chavez and their offspring would disagree that he lined their pockets with anything but real poverty and the expectation of hard work and a lifetime of earning their keep and fending for themselves. As LeRoy and others have suggested here, honest debate is always good.... exchanging personal insults should be done by those who know less about our pasts than we do. Good luck in your future and in any movement you choose to found or lead. I am sure your experience and knowledge will find success.....

**Angie Fa, 12/15/04**

**RE: UFW Documentation Project: On Deadlines, and Resources**

The Philip Vera Cruz book is now available through University of Washington Press, not the original source of Asian American Studies at UCLA. Take care, Angie Fa

**Alberto Escalante, 12/15/04**

**RE: Helen Chavez comes to our rescue....**

Dear List,



I'd like to share a little bit of unknown UFW/ La Paz History. Something that was probably never divulged nor discussed by The Board of Directors or written about in El Malcriado nor in Food and Justice. In fact, except for about 10 "soldiers" of the Organizing Department who found themselves "stranded" in La Paz when the Organizing Department Hierarchy went off to Oregon in the spring of 1976 to work for the Jerry Brown For President campaign, this story is probably not even very important or of much significance. But speaking for myself, I'd like to express my gratitude and humble thanks to Helen Chavez who had heard of our dilemma. We were all living in one of the vacant trailers w/o any utilities except water, cold water! During the day we worked in the organic garden, putting in Cesar's French Intensive Gardening plots (3 ft. deep X 2 ft. wide). Well after working out in the sun digging in the rock pile known as "Cesar's Garden" we were pretty tired, dirty and very HUNGRY! I don't know who told Helen about our dilemma, maybe she figured it out for herself as we dug ourselves by her house and down to the trailer we had been provided to sleep in. We couldn't cook in it because although it had an oven... the oven wasn't hooked up. Luckily we could shower at the Hospital or staff housing area. But we were stuck without anyway to leave La Paz to buy any food or even just get some fast food. All of our cars had been "conscripted" or taken by the Organizers that had gone to Oregon with the Brown for President Campaign. Anyway Helen heard that we were hungry and she let us have the use of the MAIN KITCHEN at La Paz. Until CEC returned from the trip he had gone on. And then like magic we suddenly had a stove that worked, plus a refrigerator full of food and a car that Ken and Wendy magically put together for us to go to work or shopping in Tehachapi or Bakersfield. But if Helen hadn't allowed us to use the kitchen we probably would've left and gone home until we were told to return or we'd been fired! At that point we didn't care. Thank goodness Helen intervened and she gave us the key to the Community Kitchen. The 1st meal we ate was Chicken and Mole, Beans and Rice and salad! And it was really good! I don't know if she even reads this list but if she does... "Thank you for your concern, Helen! We really appreciated being able to fix ourselves some warm food in the Main Kitchen."

Alberto Escalante

**Graciela Martinez (Herron), 12/15/04**

**RE: Bard McAllister**

And of course, before all of you came on board, my ex-boss, Bard McAllister, whose position I now occupy so many years later, did a tremendous amount to raise awareness not just locally, but in the Bay Area about this quiet, small farmworker who saw the need to do something to bring our people out from under the blanket of oppression and ever-increasing poverty for Valley farmworkers. I am somewhat disappointed that Bard's name has not been mentioned, unless I missed it, and sincerely hope that his name appears several times in the end result of this project. In my mind, Bard was one of Cesar's first "volunteers". I remember traveling to San Francisco with Bard, to report to our regional office about the escalating farmworker movement and water issues in communities such as Teviston and Allensworth, as he (and sometimes I) traveled up and down Fwy. 99, visiting all those little towns, bringing hope and assistance to so many people largely ignored by the outside world. It was Bard's and other Friends' efforts that Self-Help Enterprises was born and still continues today, bringing to life the dream of 35 years ago that farmworkers and low income people be able to own their own home. Bard was great friends with Fred Ross, and some of the "bigger" names I've heard mentioned. I believe Fred Ross and others involved in the Huelga, including Cesar, worked for the AFSC at one point. Bard's connections in the Bay area - Berkeley, San Francisco, Oakland, helped a lot. I sincerely hope that before this project ends, I'm not the only one who pays homage to a man even greater, in my mind, than Cesar. It was the encouragement, guiding hand and motivation Cesar received from these great men, that helped to bring so much national attention to this effort. In spite of my disappointment about Bard's invisibility in all this, I hold close to my heart and the best of memories still cling in my mind towards all of you whom I knew and worked with there, at the 40 acres, so long ago. I pounded an old typewriter, starting the complaints that led to the improved working conditions our farmworkers enjoy today, although many have now forgotten what it was like 30, 40 years ago. That's why our program is so important - we keep working, because even if we succeed now, in a few years there will be others who also need to learn and succeed. Does anybody else remember

my beloved mentor, Bard McAllister and his beautiful family? If so, please say a few words about his role in the Huelga movement. Bard passed away 3 (4?) years ago, but he left behind him a wonderful legacy that while not as widespread as Cesar's, is strong and durable nonetheless.

In the meantime, everybody please have the happiest of holiday seasons, surrounded by all your loved ones.

**Kathy Lynch Murguia, 12/16/04**

**RE: "FOR MOST PEOPLE": Effective Leadership Structures**

Angie...I think Cesar had implemented many of the structures that you suggest when it came to staff/ volunteers. What happened in my thinking is that we lost touch with the rank and file farmworkers. They so much wanted to understand where Cesar was headed. But it wasn't where they wanted to go. He did want to blow away the power structure with his ideas of farmworker communities, built by the cohesiveness of struggle and resolving conflict through the process of playing the "game". He did lose touch with his base. Were his ideas relevant?...Yes. Were the workers ready for where he wanted to go? I think the conflict experienced during the "79" convention was about that. Keeping leadership grounded, having what in the old sense was a "court" that did include the devil's advocate, the counselor, etc. Cesar became isolated during the last half of the 1970's. He often expressed how much of an "oddball" he felt in dealing with his peers. (the core leadership group). That should have been explored. I believe we all looked to Cesar for the answer in the early years. And indeed he came up with a game plan. During the first fast he was puffed up by the adulations. I don't think that phased him until he became so unsure of his path, and those around him saw him floundering. The "brown giant" as he referred to himself was just that. Like the mummies tale, the play was over and he had lost touch with his base..the workers. Structurely I think it means remain connected with your base..in this case his audience the workers... in dialogue...Cesar did this, but then didn't give them the power.He didn't incorporate their voice in the political process of the Union. These are my thoughts. Kathy Murguia

**Deborah Vollmer, 12/16/04**

**RE: Information on the Philip Vera Cruz book**

Folks,

I don't know whether Angie Fa is on this listserv, and it doesn't appear to me that this got on. So at the risk of being repetitive, here is the latest on where you can get the Philip Vera Cruz book--from the University of Washington Press. If anyone has any more detailed information (phone numbers, addresses, or e-mail addresses for ordering), please let me, and this listserv, know. Thanks --

Deborah

**Susan Drake, 12/16/04**

**RE: computer for Maria Rifo**

Maria's holiday asked if I'd help her replace her broken computer so she can get back on e-mail. Anyone in No. Calif. who has an old working one to give her and deliver to her in Santa Rosa? She got her first one at age 90 but it doesn't work anymore, and I don't know if she's tried having it repaired. I'll coordinate the effort.

For those who don't know Maria, she's the Chilean refugee who translated lots of the labor contracts and worked hard at La Paz--one of us fired ones!

Susan

**Mark Pulido, 12/16/04**

**RE: Information on the Philip Vera Cruz book**

Hi Debbie (and listserve folks),

It was great speaking with you the other evening. Thank you also for introducing me to LeRoy and the listserve.

Regarding Manong Philip's book, as you know the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> editions were published jointly by the UCLA Labor Center and the UCLA Asian American Studies Center. Kent Wong and Glenn Omatsu, respectively, were the main contacts at those centers. \* \* \* \*

Here is what I know about the 3rd edition from University of Washington Press:

\* \* \* \*

[Reprint of University of Washington Press synopsis of Craig Scharlin and Lilia Villanueva, *Philip Vera Cruz: A Personal History of Filipino Immigrants and the Farmworkers Movement* (2000)]

I hope this is helpful.

Unfortunately, I do not know how to get a hold of Craig Scharlin and Lilia Villanueva. If anyone can help me reconnect with them by email or phone, I would be very grateful.

Mark Pulido  
Agbayani Village Pilgrimage Organizing Committee

**Susan Drake, 12/17/04 (1)**

**RE: Maria Rifo's computer**

Ask and ye shall receive. Barry Winograd donated his old computer, Carolyn Purcell taking it to Maria. Aren't we a terrific bunch! No moss growing under us!

Susan

**Susan Drake, 12/17/04 (2)**

**RE: DOC PROJECT HOUSEKEEPING**

\* \* \* \* Yet again, thank you [LeRoy]. What a service, on paper and in the way we all now have reconnected this dedicated spirit for justice. Watch out, Evil Doers; we're reignited.

Susan Drake (1962-1973)

**Abby Flores Rivera, 12/17/04**

**RE: Information on the Philip Vera Cruz book**

Dear Debbie and All:

Philip's book is available at your local library.

Debbie, when Philip visited Seattle (1974? early '75?) he wouldn't hear of staying anywhere but with me, his little Richgrove neighbor from across the street. He called me out of the blue and let me know he had been invited to speak and would be staying with me. He just stated it as fact because that is the kind of friendship we had, and I excitedly prepared for his stay. I never knew that meanwhile the students at the UW who had invited him to speak had made housing arrangements and were determined to whisk him off. He was adamant, "No, I am staying with Obdulia", no wavering on his part. I got some unfriendly, disappointed looks and felt guilty; but knowing Philip I knew there was no way I could convince him to go with them so I didn't try. I got the impression they had thought I might be taking advantage of him; who was I a total stranger anyway? (Does it sound familiar, Debbie?) They didn't relax until I mentioned we were neighbors from back home. Being neighbors shed an entirely different light on my dilemma. In both our cultures, it would have been a grievous insult on my part *not to* have Philip stay with me so that ended the stalemate.

After the meeting at the Cultural Center where he met with the Filipino students we went to my place finally camping out in my small studio floor that night talking late into the night. It was such a wonderful visit; he was my family come to visit. Earlier, calling my dad to let him know Philip had arrived, Philip proceeded to describe my apartment, my school, every class I was taking and the homework I was working on (because he made sure I did it) to my father. He told him not to worry that I was doing good and was safe. That is when I realized the two were in cahoots and that Philip had come on a mission to ease my father's worries. Philip had been my dad's foreman when my dad went on strike. The day of his visit Philip told me so much about conversations with my father throughout the years which remain priceless to me. My Dad spoke candidly to Philip and I came to see him in an entirely different light and understood many of the reasons he went on strike. It was Philip, by the way, who gave my father a permanent job, year-round at Mid-State Farms when no one else would and helped pull us out of a bad situation. He had so much compassion for our large family, and saved us from extreme hardship by what he did. /abby p.s. I always kept an eye on Philip and it seemed to me he was happy with you and that is all that mattered to me. Thank you for loving him and caring for him throughout the years.

**Deborah Vollmer, 12/17/04**

**RE: computer for Maria Rifo**

Folks,

I have fond memories of Maria Rifo. When I arrived at La Paz to work with the Legal Department, I knew very little Spanish. Several of us would go over to Maria's, and she would teach us Spanish. The classes were both helpful and fun--

Debbie Vollmer

**LeRoy Chatfield, 12/17/04 (1)**

**RE: ELLEN EGGERS WRITES. . .**

LeRoy Chatfield 1963-1973

Ellen Eggers writes: *"But by the time I left (1987) I really had this feeling that there was not a whole lot happening that was worth sticking around for. I don't know if that was the fault of the ALRB, politics, the Executive Board, Cesar, the quality of the staff . . . or a combination of all of those things."*

It seems to me that Ellen Eggers has introduced a new discussion variable here that deserves some serious attention. She is referring, she writes, to a several year period between 1980 to 1987. Because I was not present nor involved during that period, I cannot discount her comments, nor can I properly evaluate them.

Without going back and rereading all the essays relating to this period, I remember that the statewide microwave system was planned and built at some point in this period, I believe a radio station was purchased, and UFW programming had to be developed, there was a series of national and Canadian boycott activities during this time period, I remember reading about LaPaz training programs for para-legals, legal apprentices, and field office staff, there was always some level of activity relating to organizing, negotiations, and contract enforcement going on, I believe there was an ambitious donor outreach during these years, etc.

It is quite possible I am confused about some of the time periods of these endeavors, but others can straighten me out.

What I ask is to hear from other volunteers who worked with the UFW during this period, 1980 - 1987 to help the documentation project fairly assess and evaluate the importance of Ellen's comments.

**Artie Rodriguez, 12/17/04**

**RE: INVITATION FROM ARTIE RODRIGUEZ**

**Hold the dates for the UFW staff  
and supporter reunion plus the 40<sup>th</sup>  
anniversary of the Delano Grape Strike**

Dear friend:

The new year brings major events for the farm workers' movement, including the celebration next September of the 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Delano Grape Strike.

Delegates at the UFW's 17<sup>th</sup> Constitutional Convention last August in Fresno approved a resolution to observe the anniversary "with ceremonies and observations befitting this historic milestone."

**The UFW is planning for a reunion of former union staff and active supporters at La Paz on a Saturday in September 2004 to be followed the next day by a grand celebration marking the 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Delano Grape Strike to be held at the "Forty Acres" in Delano.**

We are asking anyone who is interested to please mark your calendar for one of the weekends in mid- or late-September. Please let us know as quickly as possible if you would like to attend . . . so we can email you further details as soon as they become available.

¡Si Se Puede!

**Arturo S. Rodriguez, President**

United Farm Workers of America, AFL-CIO

P.S. Remember to obtain further information by email about the UFW staff and supporter reunion and 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary events[.] \* \* \*

**Hugh "Hawkeye" Tague, 12/17/04**

**RE: UFW Reunion**

I have been granted permission from SHE WHO MUST BE OBEYED (SHE for short) to go to the reunion with the understanding that I wear a chastity belt and a muzzle.

Hope to see you there!

Hawkeye

**Gary Clements, 12/17/04**

**RE: ELLEN EGGERS WRITES . . .**

Well, I can contribute a portion of the information here.

First raised on stories from my older brother, Mike, who had contact with the union in 1968 during Cesar's fast, while he was then a seminarian from Camarillo, and from Rev. Juan Romero, who was the assistant pastor in my parish church in La Habra, Orange County. After a single leafletting event in 1969 in front of a Lucky store in La Habra, I was out of touch until becoming a boycott supporter in Los Angeles area, in 1973 - 1976, then joined staff for Prop 14, in Sept 1976 and seven years later, almost to the day, left from La Paz. The entire time on staff, I worked and lived with my partner, Maxine Lowy. My work areas were LA Boycott under Larry Tramutt (pre-Tramatolla days) et al., a 5 week stint in Coachella under Eliseo et al., in which my one year of Spanish did not quite cut it for organizing, back to LA for two months, then on to Chicago Boycott to rejoin Maxine, catching a wave to the Midwest barely days ahead of one of the first purges I had experience with, in which some friends of mine were drummed out of La Paz. In Chicago, under Guy Costello and Alice Thompson and great contacts with Olgha Sierra-Sandmon, etc. Training within months out further east in Boston, living in the Dorchester House, intensive training under Fred Ross, where again, I was found to not make it. I had trouble with Fred's current theory that if former active supporters did not live up to our urgent emergency standards, then we, the organizers had to "give it to them", which meant that we basically were free to heap

insults upon them and in my humble opinion, try to shame them into some shallow form of "active" participation. Anyone who knows me, knows that that is not my style. Ironically, after I returned to Chicago and helped organize supporters on the South Side into supporting the current boycott, Fred got wind that I had "broken through" my organizing inhibitions: it always amused me that much later from Mary Mecartney, that when she was being trained, Fred offered me up as an example to fledglings of how to break through and become a real activist organizer.

In Chicago, working out of Catholic Charities office at 1300 S. Wabash, (now a paint store down the block from a very upscale Jewel supermarket), we one day got an angry call from Church officials that there was a rumor that Cesar was going to the Phillipines to accept an award from dictator Ferdinand Marcos. We vehemently decried the rumors, only to sheepishly get confirmation from a call to La Paz that a two week stint with Cesar and son was imminent and we had to learn the art of spinning, big time: Oh, you see, it was just a nod to all the Filipino union members after so many years of recognition of members from Mexico, with frequent trips to Mexico. Hmm. Discussion of more pervasive influences from more right-wing elements of the Filipino community did not surface until later, at least for one living then in the Midwest. I seem to recall that later it was "explained" that Cesar had passively been duped or manipulated by these right-wing elements from the Filipino community for their own personal gain, which the union seemed to later decry. But others will have to fill in more details there.

Another call came months later, early 1978. Cesar himself calling to shut down the boycott office in Chicago and all others around the country: "ruthlessly pruning" was his phrase that I recall best, as he explained how the old way of doing union business no longer made sense. A reorganization was afoot: former boycott directors and staffers would contribute in part to the development of new ranch leadership, with intensive training methods applied to students and Board members alike, using Cesar's new-found icon: management expert, Peter Drucker. Drucker's work, *Management by Objectives* (MBO), became the new UFW Bible, at least for leadership, replacing Crosby's standards for organizing. Board members spent countless hours, poring over each page and chapter, day after day, and week after week. I got only fleeting glimpses of this activity, in my infrequent visits to the North Unit, but it appeared to be excruciating for most there, either because it was not field office work, or because they were just not used to so much organizational meeting to death. Maxine and I had arrived later than other boycott immigrants, because I had gotten sick in Chicago, so we both missed out on being chosen for new classes for the up and coming new leadership. We were assigned to work downstairs from Cesar in Word Processing, Maxine working with Maria Rifo and forgive me, but I forget her name, the person we affectionately referred to as the nun who was not Catholic. Someone else help me out with names, please. I was in charge of work processing a new 2 page Union newsletter, something like, Letter from the President, and I learned how to type and run a very antiquated version of a word processor in 1978, and a "printer" called Frankenstein which used chad-hanging paper tape and very toxic chemicals. I remember David Martinez, or maybe Kent Winterrowd, telling me not to worry about my red-rimmed eyes, that just sitting in front of an old-style video display terminal could not at all be deleterious to my health, or the government would not allow it to be used.

1978: this was the heyday of the Game, adopted from Synanon quasi-"therapy" session, and allegedly also used by Delancy Street. In La Paz, attendance then was mandated twice weekly: Wednesday evenings, and Saturday afternoons. That "tool" had very limited usefulness, at least as far as therapeutic values were concerned. Untrained folks, utilizing some crackpot form of psychotherapy, without the aid of any sort of umpire or facilitator, heaped far greater levels of psychic injury on the "gamed" person than anything I ever tried to do with supporters back East. Folks were tormented on occasion, so severely that they left the union: this was how some folks received their pink slips. Interestingly, years later, Irv Hershenbaum, at that time (1982) director of the New York Boycott, told me that Cesar had admitted to him that the only real purpose of the Game was to isolate and weed out certain undesirable personnel. In 1982, the Game was a distant memory.

Back in 1978, Game attendance was mandatory. But because of the liberal use of swearing, Sister Florence, the reserved nun formerly director of the Mayo Clinic, but later transplanted to La Paz

and volunteering as Director of Financial Management, refused to attend. In my opinion, she broke the back of the Game, because her refusal emboldened some others to stay away. She was more important as Director of Financial Management than as a compliant Game player. Attendance got more slack, and shrank to one day a week. In February 1979, when Rufino Contreras was assassinated, and the strike in Calexico mobilized, La Paz began to become far less populated. The Game eventually consisted of a single game in the North Unit, with a dozen folks sitting around in a circle. I remember gaming Cesar and the other Board members, (it was too small to segregate by levels of authority any more) because all they were doing was sitting around reminiscing about old Games, "oh remember the time that we gamed Babo about playing around too much .... oh yeah .... ha ha ha." Anyway, many resources were applied to the field offices once again.

Of course, there had been classes of training new leadership from the field offices, more sophisticated training of Ranch Committee members in several week intensive training sessions at La Paz in 1978. This was paid for out of federal monies garnered from the Carter administration. That was a huge turnabout in itself for the union, because in the past, Cesar had sworn off government monies. But this was bigger federal money and it was a new era. So several programs sprouted up, besides financing the installation and upkeep (?) of the statewide microwave telephone system. One of the programs was for training Ranch Committee members. I attended the graduation ceremony of the first class. Each proud graduate had several proud family members present for a ceremony in the North Unit, to be followed by a classy meal in the Community Kitchen. A slide show was created and presented, showing what the attendees had learned during their stay. Pat Bonner was one of the teachers, along with Rhian Miller and others. The slide show ended with three slides accompanied by the words: "Cesar no es la union, La Paz no es la union, Nosotros somos la union." The concluding section lasted no more than 20 seconds. The lights came up, applause followed and all walked or drove back down to the kitchen for the midday meal. After everyone had been served, and grace was said, I remember digging in to some very good cuisine. Then Dolores rose and began to speak. "who says that Cesar is not the union?" And it started from there. Withing five minutes, the dining room was empty, with most plates of food hardly touched. Pat Bonner and Rhian Miller were gone in a day or two and a sour aftertaste of that graduation remained.

By the early fall, 1979, the "new" "renewed" boycott picked up momentum. Maxine and I were back in Chicago, moving next to East Orange, New Jersey, Manhattan, White Plains, then on to Boston and by 1982, with the southern strategy, to cut off secondary markets for Bruce Church's Red Coach lettuce, several of us went to New Orleans, Mobile and Birmingham for three months. We cut off several major chains from Bruce Church. But after we left, it crept back.

By 1983, Maxine left the Union and relocated into New Orleans, and our "phased withdrawal" plan had me staying on for a while. I went to La Paz, and worked directly for Cesar on what I affectionately term, the "armchair" boycott. Richard Viguery, the bloke who raised direct mail to a new level of effectiveness for the conservative Right, was being studied intently by Cesar. Cesar was convinced that the new boycott (for the '80's) was better suited to be less confrontational, less in-your-face", and I think Richie Ross might have aided in this belief. Anyway, let the consumer make the decision at home BEFORE committing themselves by driving and parking and walking up to the grocer's door, only to then be asked to go elsewhere or plan for a different shopping list. The plan was to send a series of slick four-color brochures to homeowners near a store and use one a week for four weeks to get them in the boycotting mood.

At first, it was tested in the Oakland-Bay area by squadrons of La Paz staffers driving up on a Saturday to drop these brochure leaflets door-to-door in supportive neighborhoods around certain Lucky Supermarkets in Oakland.

Later, it got to be where we did demographic analysis of Lucky stores statewide with the most supportive census and voting demographics within a one-mile radius, and from this gleaned 25 supportive areas. Then I drove around all 25 and eyeballed them and detailed how many had a competitive comparable retail grocer within a few blocks, to provide an easy and thereby more realistic alternative for boycotters. Out of this 25, we sifted about 10 very vulnerable Lucky

Stores. Then a crack team of myself and a few other valient staffers sat in the parking lots of each of these stores for several days at a stretch and copied down the licence plate numbers of every car which shopped there. (You would not believe how many people shopped multiple times in just a short number of days!) In any event, in this pre-laptop (and pre-911) day, we transferred this precious data back at La Paz onto computer, and for a mere 25 cents per name, we got an up-today mailing address list of actual identified Lucky customers.

I soon left the union after this, mostly because I had already pre-determined my departure date. I left on good terms, and even had \$300 to my name. I learned later that union representatives had a private meeting, with the cooperation of UFCW leadership, with Lucky administrators and that they were shown the brochures and the mailing lists and Lucky cleaned off the Red Coach lettuce without a shot being fired. That lasted for a while.....

But Bruce Church did not capitulate until years later, and only then, when the elder passed away and his son took over the business and I guess business negotiations were a little less personal. Seven years I worked, and never won too many boycotts, with maybe the exception of Dole. The boycott staffs were never more than a shadow of what they were in the "glory days". That has kept me from contributing to this discussion somewhat because it seemed so heavily weighted to the early years.

The Red Coach boycott started in 1979 and ended 17 years later, in 1996. I learned patience in the UFW and the value of wearing out the opposition, one way or another, with weaker resources monetarily, but stronger resources in spirit, and perseverance.

I kept in touch with UFW folks for a while, but moved on to New Orleans, where I worked as an organizer with AFSCME for three years, then went back to college and eventually got a law degree. I represent death row inmates and have done little else for the past 12 years. There are many powerful things to say of memories from back then. I do not regret my time. I felt odd and uneasy when Max Avalos thanked me for helping out the Union so much for so long. I preferred the attitude of Josefina Flores, during Prop 14, when she burst out with indignation at the former Claretian seminary in Compton, where we were living and eating. We were having a Saturday evening rally, I think, and some forgettable local politico had just given a speech about how much he could help the union, just call on him, anytime. Josefina Flores left the kitchen, wielding a large spoon, and took front stage and center and dressed this idiot down, telling him in no uncertain terms that he had everything bass - ackwards: IT was HE who would be helped by the union, the power of its volunteers, and power of its spirit, and the power of its votes and the power of its money, and that he must learn this lesson if he wished to survive in the world of politics in Califas. Let there be no confusion: the UFW would help his miserable individual self, and not the other way around.

Whether we, the union, its staff, its members, its volunteers, could always live up to that ideal, was one thing. But it was an inspirational ideal for me and others nevertheless. Que viva la causa.

Gary Clements

### **Kathy Lynch Murguia, 12/18/04**

**RE: Ellen Eggers wrote**

Gary Clements wrote...

*"And it started from there. Withing five minutes, the dining room was empty, with most plates of food hardly touched. Pat Bonner and Rhian Miller were gone in a day or two and a sour aftertaste of that graduation remained."*

Did Cesar need to be defended so ardently? This was an ear (Dolores) that could twist things and who wanted to keep Cesar's attention. On the other hand Helen, who was bold and honest, kept Cesar balanced. She was grounded in the honesty of what she knew, and never went beyond that. Playing on Cesar's insecurities and allowing such, kept some folks alive and well, forced many to leave and assisted others in entering the circle. in those years. Publicly and privately I learned to be silent and at times afraid, and moved on from Cesar's movement. After 1980 until I left in 1983,



I enjoyed my family and I worked with Barbara Macri,,Ellen Eggers,Marcos Camacho, Chris Schneider, Ned Dumphy,Julie Arciniega and so many other great folks. I kept my nose in the volumes of ALRB appeal cases, writing etc. Ellen was a great legal mentor and like Helen was equally honest about what she knew. Kathy

**Theresa and Blase Bonpane, 12/18/04**

**RE: DOC PROJECT HOUSEKEEPING**

leroy, many thanks for gifting us all with this amazing project. warmest wishes, theresa and blase

**Barbara Macri-Ortiz, 12/19/04**

**RE: RESPONSE TO JACKIE DAVIS**

Marshall responding to Leroy wrote:

*"A different way to look at it is that those running the union wasted people, were careless with the precious gift of time, energy, talent and commitment they were given, and drove people out, often those that had the most to contribute, at great cost to the individuals and to the movement itself."*

Marshall, these words ring true. And you certainly would know as your posting pretty much sums up what would happen during those too frequent life or death campaigns we always seemed to be facing, including many that you ran. Two of your campaigns that come to mind are the Salinas Strike and the Lettuce Boycott. Let's face it, Leroy's perspective is probably fairly accurate. I think that one reason why the leadership may have been "careless with the precious gift of time, energy, talent and commitment they were given," was precisely due to the notion that there was always someone in the wings who could replace the worn out volunteer or farm worker when s/he self-destructed from exhaustion or frustration or was chased out for complaining or challenging the plan of the day. While I am way behind in reading the postings, it seems like most of the criticism in this regard has been heaped on Cesar. That is unfair. Granted, he pushed people very hard, but so did you and so did most other leaders in the movement. To a certain extent we all did - that's how we made things happen. It may not have been the best way to operate, but there was no HR department in those days, and heck, we managed to weather the storms and live on to fight another day.

I've learned in life that no matter what the assignment or endeavor, nothing is ever perfect and so we will find ourselves putting up with the bad in order to enjoy the good part of the experience; and we will continue on until someday we are too tired of putting up with the bad to allow ourselves to be recharged by the good. At that point we will exit, one way or the other, and we will begin to rationalize, seeking to place the blame for our discontent or failures on those who pushed us. What we refuse to realize is that had we not been pushed in the first place, we would have never rose to the occasion or experienced the good.

Personally, I think we are all better people precisely because Cesar touched our lives and because of the richness and intensity of our individual and group experiences in the union. Our perspectives may be different based on our individual experiences, but whether we care to admit it or not, we will forever be tied together in a way that behooves us to respect each other and preserve the good that we share.

Peace,

Barbara Macri-Ortiz (1969-1990)

**Marshall Ganz, 12/19/04**

**RE: RESPONSE TO JACKIE DAVIS**

Barbara,

Not surprisingly we have very different interpretations of what I've written.

One of the most valuable things that I had to learn to do after the very painful years of 1977 to 1981 was to gain some perspective on my experience in the UFW. Feeling I had just emerged

from a kind of religious order, uncertain of what had gone on, what I could have done differently, and where to find the hope, I reflected, I read, I talked with people, I began to make a new life, and I learned. Eventually I came to understand that the tragedy I had lived through was not unique, that it had happened in other movements, and that the personal pain I had experienced had been experienced by many others.

It was not about "pushing people", a problem that could be solved by an "HR department" and I haven't been clear if you understood me that way. Between 1962 and 1977 the UFW had built up enormous human "capital" -- skilled leaders, credibility with the public, extensive organizational and political relationships, people who had worked together for many years, knowledge of what to do and what not to do. But between 1977 and 1981, Cesar (and I say Cesar because he had the will to do it, the power to do it, and the need to do it) threw most of this away, leaving behind a totally loyal remnant that struggled on, a shadow of what had been.

That this happened is important to acknowledge if for no other reason than that we and others can learn from it.

One problem with the purges was that they allowed Cesar to interpret everything that went wrong in the union from a certain point on as the result of someone's "malignant" intent, precluding the opportunity to acknowledge mistakes, learn from them, fix them, and move on. At the same time, as many postings attest, many people were left (farm workers and volunteers) wondering "was it my fault?", "did I do something wrong?", "what's wrong with me?" -- the kind of questions that powerless people always ask in conditions of loss over which they have little control.

Odd as it may seem, this is not written to "criticize" Cesar, but, rather to clarify the role he came to play in the movement he led that contributed to that movement's decline. And Cesar, after all, was the one who chose to polarize the conflicts and tensions within the union into a "with me" or "against me" position. One reason I suggested reading Ofshe's Synanon study and Kramer's study of organizational paranoia (or the Biblical story of King Saul) was to bring some perspective to what was going on these years, what different people's roles were, and to find ways to take reflection beyond the realm of "blame", "criticism", "defense", and "justification" into one of "learning" and "growth." But trying to learn from this experience challenges us to try to see it as clearly as we can.

Cesar was as gifted a person as I've met, but he let himself (and others of us contributed -- or, at least, didn't resist in ways that made much difference) get caught up in a situation in which his "better angels" eventually lost out, a loss that turned out to be a loss for us all, but most especially for the farm workers whose lives he had dedicated his own to improve.

Marshall

### **Kathy Lynch Murguia, 12/19/04**

On Dec. 19, 2004 . . . [Marshall Ganz] wrote:

*"One problem with the purges was that they allowed Cesar to interpret everything that went wrong in the union from a certain point on as the result of someone's 'malignant' intent, precluding the opportunity to acknowledge mistakes, learn from them, fix them, and move on"*

Nicely said Marshall. You're right. I might add Cesar never accepted responsibility for his interpersonal behavior and its impact on others. He'd become angry, explosive. sometimes appeared guilty/ ashamed, crying etc. but he never examined (at least to my knowledge), things with a clarity that would allow an objective analysis and a shift in his perceptual distortions. . He never adjusted his perceptions, thoughts, feelings or behaviors. He was "stuck" and in a caca that spread to all. I once saw the agenda he had set up for his "marriage meeting" with Helen when she left him in 1977. He acknowledged nothing. Instead he was in denial and all his points were about what was going on with her. He couldn't see himself; He didn't have that observing part of himself (observing ego) that hopefully most of us develop that allows us to pay "attention" to the needs of others...Most of his interpersonal thoughts were projections of his own needs. Those became his "generalized other". He had minimal insight or awareness into his own compulsive, driven behavior. And the only thing we could do, or speaking for myself, was to watch. \* \* \* \*

Pain and struggle for something noble is one thing. Pain and struggle to meet someone's self-absorbed grandiosity is another. Am I too harsh? Please, if anyone has other information or perspectives, that show Cesar had moved to another level, put them out. I'd love to hear that I am wrong. Take care Marshall. Happy Hanukkah. (little late)

Kathy Murguia p.s. I hope nobody hates me for being honest.

**LeRoy Chatfield, 12/19/04 (1)**

**RE: ADDITIONAL RESPONSE TO JERRY KAY**

LeRoy Chatfield 1963-1973

ADDITONAL RESPONSE TO JERRY KAY POSTING

\* \* \* \*

In January 2005 I will put out a call for PHOTOGRAPHS to be included in the documentation project CD.

\* \* \* \*

**Jerry Kay, 12/19/04**

**RE: ADDITIONAL RESPONSE TO JERRY KAY**

Leroy,

\* \* \* \*

And Jeez, photos; I kept absolutely NO photos from all my years except a few from Florida. I have one of me when I worked in the fields in Salinas, but none at the hiring hall or of me with any other workers, organizers, Cesar or officers.

But I know that the members took lots of pictures and will try (for my own account as well) to see who and what I can dig up.

Funny you brought up photos today, the same day i began looking for any.

Jerry Kay

**Kate Colwell, 12/19/04**

**RE: coming to the end**

Barbara wrote:

*I've learned in life that no matter what the assignment or endeavor, nothing is ever perfect and so we will find ourselves putting up with the bad in order to enjoy the good part of the experience; and we will continue on until someday we are too tired of putting up with the bad to allow ourselves to be recharged by the good. At that point we will exit, one way or the other, and we will begin to rationalize, seeking to place the blame for our discontent or failures on those who pushed us. What we refuse to realize is that had we not been pushed in the first place, we would have never rose to the occasion or experienced the good.*

*Personally, I think we are all better people precisely because Cesar touched our lives and because of the richness and intensity of our individual and group experiences in the union. Our perspectives may be different based on our individual experiences, but whether we care to admit it or not, we will forever be tied together in a way that behooves us to respect each other and preserve the good that we share.*

*Peace,*

*Barbara Macri-Ortiz (1969-1990)*

Barb, Well said! That certainly has been my experience in life. We learn from the good and the bad; stress is hard and yet being stressed and pushed can create good things. And truly I feel

bonded to everyone who worked in the Union (Ok, weaker bonds to a few.....) and I'm endlessly grateful for those years of my life.

For me it has been very helpful to hear all the voices on this listserv (especially when things were worded without insults and acrimony) and to learn a lot about this very complex movement that we lived....

See you all in September

Kate Colwell  
LA, Delano, Sanger and Calexico 73-76

**LeRoy Chatfield, 12/19/04 (2)**

**RE: RESPONSE TO JERRY BROWN'S FUNDRAISING PROPOSAL**

LeRoy Chatfield 1963-1973

**RESPONSE TO JERRY BROWN'S FUNDRAISING PROPOSAL**

Let me say first that whether a person is born an organizer, or learns to become one, you never recover from it. Jerry Brown was super-organized in 1966 when I first met him, and now 38 years later, he is still suffering from this incurable malady.

\* \* \* \*

**Pat Bonner, 12/20/04**

**RE: Gary Clements' posting**

Hi to Gary Clements and all:

I saw my name on Gary's posting and need to make one clarification. I.e. regarding the following:

*"Within five minutes, the dining room was empty, with most plates of food hardly touched. Pat Bonner and Rhian Miller were gone in a day or two and a sour aftertaste of that graduation remained."*

I remember well that very unpleasant day in 1979. However, I was not one of those who was gone in a day or two. Rhian and Karen were the ones who had to leave. I had not worked on the slide show. The director of the program, whose name slips me now, also left, by his own decision, because, if I remember correctly, he felt responsible for not having reviewed the slide show beforehand. I continued with the education program and stayed on until September of 1980, when I left on good terms.

Pat Bonner

**Alberto Escalante, 12/20/04**

**RE: Barbara Macri-Ortiz**

To the ListServe,

The very first time I saw Barbara Macri, we were marching in Goleta, CA., during the Oxnard to Santa Maria stretch of the 1975 March to Sacramento. I was guarding the right flank and rear directly behind and to the right of Cesar. Suddenly, a diminutive woman wearing granny glasses and carrying a huge arm load of clip boards, note books, pens, pencils and various other writing equipment started to run towards us. It appeared as if she was surrounded by a powerful force field, because the crowds between her and Cesar just seemed to begin separating as if she was Moses crossing the Red Sea! Being a guard, all I knew was come Hell or High water nobody not even this 5 ft. human dynamo was going to get past me to the "Old Man". I braced myself and was about to wrap her up in my arms when Marc Grossman tells me "let her through she needs to talk to Cesar" What followed for the next mile or so was something between a backwards march, a ballet and an impromptu scheduling meeting and conference "ala Macri". If I live to be a hundred years old I'll never understand how such a tiny person could possibly do so much fantastic work.

Barbara Macri-Ortiz is absolutely one of the most dynamic individuals that I've ever met. If anyone had ever figured out some way to harness Cesar's and Barbara's energy they could've easily lit up the entire City of New York, if not more!

Alberto Escalante

**Doug Adair, 12/20/04 (1)**

**RE: Thanks and apologies**

In a message dated 12/19/04 . . . [Barbara Macri-Ortiz] writes:

*Personally, I think we are all better people precisely because Cesar touched our lives and because of the richness and intensity of our individual and group experiences in the union. Our perspectives may be different based on our individual experiences, but whether we care to admit it or not, we will forever be tied together in a way that behooves us to respect each other and preserve the good that we share.*

*Peace,*

*Barbara Macri-Ortiz (1969-1990)*

Dear Barbara, and all,

I have wanted to respond with thanks, to you, to Hope, to Jerry Kay's poem, to many of you who have so eloquently captured the positive in our experiences; and thanks to LeRoy and Kevin Brown for making this discussion possible. (And also thanks to those who have expressed the pain -- that's part of the story too).

Since the date harvest began in August, I've been pretty tied up (and thanks to all who ordered our dates; we'll resume shipments in January). And my mom passed away in September (and again, thanks to those who expressed condolences), excuses for not participating in the discussion. I do hope there is some way to continue the dialog. I'll try to send this to the new address, and see what happens.

By separate e-mail I'm including some reflections on Gilbert Padilla, my compadre and mentor, hope it captures some of the impact he had on my life. I may be putting words in his mouth, and he and others can refute my interpretation. The mention of my beloved sister, Maria Rifo, reminded me of a celebration of her life of service (her 80th birthday?). Gilbert and I went up for the event. In front of the nuns and priests and fellow organizers, Gilbert reminisced that he had been on the Board, had participated in firing her from the Union to which she had given so much -- apologized, regretted his acquiescence, accepted his responsibility... noted that this event was a major factor in his reappraisal of his relationship to the movement, his decision to leave La Paz. It takes a strong person to be so humble.

All best wishes for the holidays,

Viva la Causa,

Doug Adair, member, UFW, 1965-2004 (pensioner)

**Doug Adair, 12/20/04 (2)**

**RE: Unsung Hero, Gilbert Padilla**

Unsung hero, Gilbert Padilla, and the original vision of La Causa...

When I went to Tulare County to pick fruit in the summer of 1965, my mind was full of a mishmash of capitalist blather. As I got into picking fruit, began discovering the life of the campesino, of the crews and the camps and the barrios, I found a great deal that appealed to me, as well as the poverty level wages and working conditions. And I ran into an amazing group of people concerned with "farm labor problems," including Bard McAlester and David Burciaga of the Friends; David (and Suzanne) Havens of the Migrant Ministry (I got to know the Drakes later);

and Gilbert Padilla of the Farm Workers Association, who had a little office outside Porterville, and was organizing tenants in the labor camp I moved into.

As I spent time with Padilla, he kept expanding on the vision he had, and he "organized" me, "opened my eyes" to use Abby's phrase, to viewing the world from a new perspective. (As I later came to know Cesar Chavez a little better, I saw the core of their vision as much the same. You who spent time with Cesar, were organized by him, naturally call it "Cesar's vision," and he expressed it the best and most eloquently; and it was also the vision of Dolores, and of the newspaper, *El Malcriado*, and a spreading group of union members....). Keystone was the concept of respect for farm labor, of visualizing a society in which the one who planted the seeds and harvested the crops, who fed the people of the world, would take his (her) rightful place of respect equal with the lawyers and doctors and philosopher kings.

My mother's view of farm labor was that it was for people who could not do anything else. Jobs in which one had to sweat had less respect in her universe than jobs "of the mind," and farm labor was at the bottom of the list.

From the Bible to Aristotle to Marx, farm labor was to be performed by "natural slaves," peasants who needed to be led and ruled over by the high priests, the aristocracy or the dictatorship of the industrial workers, but never in charge of their own lives. Every government program in 1965 (and since), every accepted wisdom of a CSO conference, every worthy effort of a church to "help" farm workers assumed that to get these people out of poverty, you helped them get out of farm labor... training programs, education (so the children don't have to be farm workers!), you name it, anything to escape the degrading work of producing food...

As I later learned the history of the union, I came to believe that when Cesar and Gilbert left the CSO to found the Farm Workers Association (and Dolores joined them a few years later), they were rejecting the middle class, upwardly mobile CSO world view, rejecting its materialist and capitalist goals, and rejecting its leadership of "the Movement." In 1962, CSO offered them quite a bit of autonomy and a budget, but they were proposing something much more radical, proposing building the Movement around an independent, democratic farm workers' union, of, by, and for the farm workers, with a dues paying membership, not dependent on outside power or money.

In that summer of 1965, there was so much energy in the air, even as clueless and naive a person as I could sense something was about to happen. When a strike broke out in the grapes at the Martin Ranch near Earlimart, it was even more of an eye-opener for me. The strike was not planned or called by Cesar or Gilbert or the union; or by the macho men of Earlimart; but rather by the women of the crew. And the issue was not wages or insurance but rather lack of bathrooms -- respect, dignity, "Stop treating us like animals!"

As Hope noted in one of her postings, Cesar and Gilbert had already done a lot of the footwork by 1965, walking the barrios and camps, spreading the vision, the hope for change; and the workers came to them because they trusted them, bought into that idea. And they trusted them because they were NOT, not the government, not the Catholic Church, not some middle class politicians or the AFL union.

Padilla assumed "leadership" of that strike. His role was not to stand in the back of a pickup and give fiery speeches. Rather, it was, first and foremost, to listen to the workers, and to try to harness and guide this tremendous explosion of energy towards an achievable goal. The first question to be faced was one of violence. I later learned that there was a whole arsenal of guns, knives, chains, pipes, and whatever in the cars of the strikers, ready for action. Padilla had to convince the workers not to use them on the scabs and their cars. Many have pointed to Cesar's almost religious commitment to non-violence, his reading of Gandhi and the Bible. Gilbert seemed to me to take a more practical approach in his organizing, that if the growers had any excuse they would use their overwhelming power with the police and courts to attack and crush the workers. Non-violence was thus a defensive option to try to shield the workers from attack, not an end in itself, and not submitting non-violently to the injustices, as the Church was preaching.

The other idea I picked up from the Martin Ranch strike was that of the union staff (Padilla, Chavez, and Huerta, the entire union staff in 1965), the "leaders," as servants of the workers. They proposed that workers, that I and others, join together as brothers and sisters, and participate with them in building this new society. There was no proprietary ownership of the union, and I was accepted as a brother. Clearly, Cesar was "number one brother", but his reputedly stormy relationship with Dolores was summed up by Bill Esher, "Brothers don't fire Sisters." This was a family of brothers and sisters.

The AWOC AFL union went out on strike at ranches where their predominantly Filipino membership was strong, after their members pushed them into action. As the strike snowballed to other ranches, it was to the UFW that the workers responded. The "vision of the UFW" (read "of Padilla"; read "of Chavez"; read "of Huerta") was inspiring, was dazzling. Intellectually, the AFL union had little to offer, in comparison. And the vision of the UFW was soon enriched by people like Phillip Vera Cruz, Fred Abad, Rudy Reyes, and Manuel Vasquez, AWOC members who so radicalized the AFL union that its boss, Al Green, wanted to dump the whole project and abandon the grape strike, even before the end of 1965. The farm workers demanded the transformation of 102 Albany from a sleepy office and back water of dreams to the forefront of a potential peasant revolution. As our spokesman and leader, Cesar crafted the union's response, endorsing the workers' right to make their demands, pledging the union's support for those demands, but conditionally, that the workers accept a non-violent and anti-racist path. It was my understanding that that was the social compact between the workers and the union, ratified by the vote of September 16, 1965, and reaffirmed in the Plan of Delano in 1966. The idea of heaping all the praise (and blame) on Cesar came later...

I worked with Padilla in Delano, in Rio Grande City, Texas (1967), in the boycott in Philadelphia in 1970, where we went to reinforce Hope Lopez's soon victorious efforts; and finally in Coachella, when Padilla came down from La Paz to help the Freedman workers renegotiate our contracts in 1980. Padilla remained true to those ideals of 1965, the leader as servant to the workers; guiding the energies of his team, bringing out the best in the diversity of the staff under his direction. Padilla was not obsessed with "sacrificios" or guilt tripping to inspire his staff. He could use teasing and his wry humor, to support his analysis, a focus on the practical way to get the job done, and if it involved good food or a party or a more pleasant alternative, why not? The farm workers' poverty was not by choice, and our modest life styles were the best we could manage on the budget available. We were hoping to improve both. Padilla accepted and welcomed advice and criticism and seemed as comfortable dealing with politicians and prelates as with vatos locos and peasants of the fields.

I knew people who enjoyed working with Fred Ross, and Marshall and LeRoy, organizers who had reputations for really pushing their staff and accomplished amazing victories with that style. But I feel very lucky I had a chance to work so often with Padilla, a real joy and inspiration to work for him, with him. And there were others, too, under whom I served, Bill Esher, Jerry Cohen, Eliseo Medina, under whom I could enthusiastically put in my 10 or 12 hour work day without ever feeling I was being used, a cog, fodder to be chewed up and spit out. As an alternative way to build towards the life I wanted to live, to fulfill the dreams of La Causa, Padilla's vision and wisdom, and Cesar's, and Phillip's, and Eliseo's, are a daily and ongoing inspiration.

Viva la Causa,

Doug Adair, Pato's Dream Date Gardens, Thermal, Calif.  
Member, UFW, 1965-present (pensioner)

**Richard Cook, 12/20/04**

**RE: Doug Adair's and Other Contributions**

Doug,

Thanks for your cogent, sensitive, articulate and detailed reflections throughout this process of remembrance. I hope you keep writing.

And there have been so many others, Alberto, Kathy, Marshall, Abby, Ellen, Susan, Deborah, Graciela, Joaquin, Khati, LeRoy - too many more to mention - who have contributed so much and responded, often confessionally, with insight and engagement. And of course, many of the less frequent contributors (Tom Nagle, Virginia Nesmith, Gary Clements, Hub Segur, Terry, Margaret and Jeff come to mind) have added as much if not more than some of us parlanhines. Thanks to Doug and to all!

Show of hands, apart from this Project, how many of us have written or are writing a history, memoir, imaginative or fictional piece that covers some part of the life of the union or of life in the union? If you do not want to post this info to the Big List, I would like to hear from you personally. I am working on a memoir, and would like to know what is out there I have missed and what else I might look forward to.

To borrow from Sor Juana, la monja poeta Mexicana ilustre,

En este relato, los descuidos merecen cuidados.  
In this history, even the trifles deserve attention.

Richard Cook  
NFWM, 72-83 (La Paz, AZ, St. Louis, L.A., Florida, Salinas)

#### **Donna Haber Kornberg, 12/20/04**

Kathy –

Thank you for that posting. I am sure that it was very difficult for you to write.

How could any reasonable person hate anyone else for being honest? If anyone does, then it is that person who has a problem, not you.

Best,

Donna (Haber Kornberg)

#### **Ellen Eggers, 12/20/04**

**RE: *Unsung Hero, Gilbert Padilla***

Doug...you write so well. I am printing this posting and giving it to my children as part of a Christmas package. I am so moved by the details, the feeling and the analysis. They were born in the 80's and lived at La Paz. I think they will appreciate this history. Thank you for your contributions!

Ellen Eggers  
LA Boycott 72-75  
La Paz Legal 80-87

#### **Susan Drake, 12/20/04**

**RE: *memoirs***

Richard, I'm re-working specifics in my last UFW years, 1972-73. Glad to help you if I can with remembering what you're working on.

My memoir (published 1999)--if you can't find a copy, I can sell you one directly, Richard...or anyone else, for that matter. Title: Fields of Courage: Remembering Cesar Chavez & the People Whose Labor Feeds Us. I think I'm the first female staff member to publish about this movement. Starts with my meeting Cesar in 1962 and goes thru his death, including our feisty years when I was his secretary. It's honest and respectful...a lovingly critical look at the man from the point of view of a privileged Anglo meeting people who changed her outlook on life!

Susan (1962-73)

#### **Marshall Ganz, 12/20/04**



Kathy put her finger right on the problem that took all this beyond the realm of "someone making a few mistakes" and "gee, no body's perfect." Making mistakes is an essential part of the learning process, just like falling off a bike the first time you get on to ride. You simply can't learn to keep your balance without falling. So the problem is not making mistakes, the problem is the failure -- no, the resistance - to learning from them. (doesn't this sound familiar from the recent presidential campaign- a president who resists learning). And when you accept responsibility for a community, an organization, a movement, a nation, accountability has to go with it. Holding our selves accountable for leadership roles we accept is not "criticizing" or "bitterness" it is just how its supposed to work. Too bad it broke down in the UFW.

**Richard Ybarra, 12/20/04**

So in terms of lessons were any of them from the UFW taken or applied in your early 80's effort to take over the UDW who hired you as a consultant?

**Abby Flores Rivera, 12/20/04**

**RE: response to Jackie Davis**

Dear Kathy,

No, I can't hate you for being honest but I can take exception with you in comparing Cesar's personal life to his work life. Where we might have been able to observe Cesar working and to draw our own personal conclusions to what we believed he might have been doing or thinking, we cannot claim to know his private life with his wife no matter how close we considered ourselves to have been to him, to his family, or to Helen. Years of marriage has taught me that. This episode in their personal life is best left to them and their family who worked things out just fine irrespective of whatever agenda might have been drawn up. It's akin to my grocery shopping lists that I sometimes draw up then go to the store only to buy something entirely different having left my list at home. If anyone read my list, they would think that is what I bought, but no dice.

I never saw Cesar as seeing himself in a "self-absorbed" grandiose way either. I did see a lot of resentment from people though who couldn't make him budge and tended to justify not winning by painting Cesar in a bad light. What I saw in Cesar was a *brilliant negotiator* that nobody could knock down, walk over or fool. Unless I was his own private physician, I wouldn't want to venture into guessing whether he had "an observing ego" or whether he projected his "generalized other" anymore than I would do the same to anybody else who worked for the union during my time. Believe me, we were quite a few mismatched, strange individuals, the whole lot of us. I heard a lot of crap about a lot of people, too, especially those in leadership roles. Many believed there were a lot of egos flying. I took it all in with a grain of salt. I cut in half what I heard and then subtracted some more. Come to think of it, perhaps those outside the union see all of us in those clinical terms. I never saw myself stuck in "caca" either otherwise I would have cleared out of there, quickly. Cesar did fall "off" quit a few "bikes" and did learn lessons from those experiences...that is why he started the union to begin with... la misma de siempre/ always/ abby

**Jerry Brown, 12/20/04**

**RE: RESPONSE TO JERRY BROWN'S FUNDRAISING**

LeRoy,

Whether we were born with it, or learned it from the leaders of the union, the truth is that the farm workers movement drew something special out of all of us - that did indeed last a lifetime.

- Jerry

**Barbara Macri-Ortiz, 12/20/04 (1)**

**RE: Reply to Marshall**

Marshall wrote: *"Holding our selves accountable for leadership roles we accept is not 'criticizing' or 'bitterness' it is just how its supposed to work."*

Marshall,

With all due respect, the whole point of accountability is for the critique to occur at or within a reasonable proximity of the actions/ policies that are challenged, so the problems can hopefully be rectified. For example, the anti-war protests and debate of the 1960s took place while the war was going on, not 25 years later, because people felt strong enough about the subject matter to challenge the policy. The problem I have with all the criticism of Cesar now is that if no one in leadership positions in the Union at the time felt compelled to bring the problem front and center, and put their own opinions and concerns under the microscope for examination by all, maybe the problem was not as big as some make it out to be now. There are always two sides to the story. It is easy to cop out now and make Cesar the fall guy for all the perceived wrongs that occurred years ago, but then he can't enter the robust debate with his side of the story. That is NOT how it is supposed to work. Also, criticizing with bitterness in one's heart results in a very distorted view of history.

Barbara Macri-Ortiz

**Barbara Macri-Ortiz, 12/20/04 (2)**

**RE: RESPONSE TO JACKIE DAVIS**

Marshall,

I can appreciate what you are saying, but it just occurred to me that no one has really discussed one part of the equation that probably had a profound effect on the course of the union's history and also on how Cesar viewed some of the events that have been dissected on this list serve. What I am talking about is the internal union politics that always seemed to color many of the debates during those years. That was unfortunate because people took sides based on the personalities, rather than the issues, and I think this was not only very divisive, but it prevented us from really dealing with the genuine issues of the day. Also, people were not very honest about their views, having one view behind closed doors and another view in a meeting with Cesar.

I think that one of the serious issues of the day was the question of whether the union should continue with volunteers vs. paid staff. Unfortunately, the issue was never honestly aired out and discussed. Instead, Jerry pretty much separated his staff from the rest of the union, and people lined up either behind Jerry or behind Cesar on the issue, and the result was a standoff, and eventually the end of the Legal Department as we had known it. The same type of conflict was seen in the debate about the boycott. In both instances, positions quickly polarized, which prevented us from an open examination that might have produced a compromise and a solution that everyone could live with.

In retrospect, I think that internal politics mixed with egos held us back in a number of ways. For instance, when we failed at campaigns no one in the leadership ever really pushed for serious debriefing. Instead, we were just enlisted for the next campaign, without trying to figure out what we could have done differently in the last one. I was not in the top leadership and so I could be wrong but my impression was that such a debriefing process was too risky for those who had failed because it might put them in a different light with Cesar, and possibly change the political alignments within the union.

Your comment that "*Cesar threw most of this away [i.e. skilled leaders, credibility with the public, extensive organizational and political relationships, people who had worked together for many years, knowledge of what to do and what not to do], leaving behind a totally loyal remnant that struggled on, a shadow of what had been,*" puts the blame on Cesar for something that we all need to take some responsibility for, if indeed your interpretation of events is accurate [which I am not conceding, but realize there are differing opinions on this].

I don't think that Cesar threw anything away. He just did what he felt he had to do to protect the union. A good example I think is the situation we had with the paid reps, and because of the internal union politics the situation got out of control. Cesar was between a rock and a hard place because he had committed to allow the Ranch Committee Presidents to be named the paid union representatives at their ranches. But when the reps decided that their politics were more important

than administering the contracts, Cesar had to draw the line because the Union would be held legally responsible, if the reps didn't do their jobs. Cesar did not remove them from their elected positions as president, but only as the union representative for contract administration, collective bargaining. This action became a wedge because of the politics, and even today, it continues to be misinterpreted.

Now, having said this, I have to say [and I am sure you must know] that internal politics seems to be a reality in every organization, although it is may be more pervasive in labor unions. This is unfortunate, but it is life, so the politics in the union was probably normal and to be expected. What I think was different in our union was that we were all so invested, and so conflicted. Our pain was more acute because we were so close to one another. In a sense we were all family, so our struggles were too personal, and our differences were seen as a betrayal. Yes, we were a "religious order" of sorts, and so leaving the union was akin to losing our religion. I think that many of us who left the union actually went through a period of grieving because a part of us did die when we left -- we really did leave behind a big part of our identity [both as we saw ourselves and as others saw us]. It is not surprising that this list serve has unleashed such passionate feelings in so many of us. But it saddens me that so much of that passion is focused on dissecting Cesar. At the end of the day, is that really going to make us happier? We say that we want others to learn from our mistakes, and that is not a bad goal. However, how much of our experience is unique to the time in history, the nature of the movement, and the individuals? What lessons can really be taught, and at what cost?

A little something to chew on. Happy holidays!

Barbara Macri-Ortiz

**Marshall Ganz, 12/21/04 (1)**

**RE: Reply to Marshall**

Without venturing to know what is in your heart, Barbara, but also with due respect, a number of us did raise questions, criticize, and pose alternatives at the time, but, one by one, left after being attacked, or, in some cases, before being attacked, or were run out. At the same time many of us restrained ourselves far too long out of respect for Cesar, for the mission of the UFW, or because it was hard to believe that what was happening was as bad as it turned out to be. Some, like Chris Hartmire, served loyally to the end, but still got attacked when yet another thing went wrong for which Cesar needed a "fall guy" -- one of the last in a long line of "fall guys" of Cesar's that began with Joe Smith. The problem was never that Cesar didn't get "his say". It was that others did not. And that was one of the key problems. I find the argument that a man who chose a public leadership role, polarized the movement that he led so as to preclude any effective dissent, and, thereby, eventually led that movement into the ground should not be evaluated in terms of the leadership he provided to that movement to be incredible, but, sadly not surprising. That is the unquestioning kind of hero worship that served the UFW so poorly, and, ironically, perhaps Cesar most poorly of all.

**Marshall Ganz, 12/21/04 (2)**

**RE: RESPONSE TO JACKIE DAVIS**

Barbara,

And I appreciate what you are saying here, but where we disagree is as to Cesar's role in the internal politics that are part of the life of any organization, especially one that is suppose to be governed by elected leaders. Cesar argued against local unions because he wanted to avoid the "politics" they would bring. The alternative turned out to be a top down, centrally run operation in which it was impossible for anyone to develop a secure enough base of power to challenge the leadership, their programs, or their decisions. So instead a healthy, open, contentious politics that part of healthy democracy, what developed was a kind of "palace politics", opaque to most observers, unclear to the voting constituency, and dominated by one kind of maneuver or another - - but this was the alternative that Cesar pushed for, preferring it to the transparency of openly

contentious politics. One of the reasons that the paid reps were so fearful about going to the convention in 1981 to run their own candidates for the board was because there was no tradition of open debate, challenge, and accountability -- something far more like the PRI with which they were familiar than with a more open kind of democratic politics. And, as they soon found out, they would be dealt with just as the PRI dealt with its opposition for years - getting rid of them. I puzzled about what you mean about their politics interfering with their jobs -- they were elected leaders of Salinas Valley farm workers and it was their job to represent them, not only to the growers, but to the union leadership as well, as best they could. They concluded that mean electing some of their number to the board of the union. Cesar didn't agree. They were fired.

As to the polarization, it was Cesar who chose to polarize everything but turning things into black and white, with me or against me issues. That was how he did his politics. The legal department is an excellent case in point. Cesar forced people to choose sides on this one, avoiding any compromise or effort to try to work it out. The Board discussed it at two board meetings in the summer of 1978, with a week in between, finally taking a vote that went 5 to 4 for Cesar, after he had threatened to quit if he didn't get his way. As I think back, it's remarkable that Eilseo, Mack, Jessica, and I voted against his position anyway -- something I'm proud of having done. So not everyone feared telling Cesar what they thought. But, of course, from that point on, our days were numbered. I'm also puzzled by how much you use the passive voice in what you have written as if no one was responsible for what was happening. If people feared being honest with Cesar, why was that? If things got polarized, who was responsible for that? And as for debriefings, for example Prop 14, Cesar was the one who refused to do a debriefing. And what about after all the elections in 1975 and 1976. Within my organizing team we did lots of debriefing about why we won some and lost some which is how we eventually learned how to win more consistently, but why was there never any union wide debriefing, leading, in part, to the Giumarra debacle. Some of us wanted it very much to happen. Why was preparation for the 1979 vegetable contract negotiations postponed and postponed and postponed until we wound up almost forcing ourselves into a strike? Ann Smith and I were ready to go way in advance, but Cesar wasn't having any part of Ann Smith, and so on. Cesar constantly fought for the power he asserted in the union so when we get around to assessing what worked and what didn't. Cesar's leadership - and the kind of organizational structure he had created - played a very big part in it.

As for the value of trying to learn from the past, perhaps it's because of all the young people that I work with these days, but there is great value in trying to learn from our mistakes, and those of others, in hopes of doing better in the future. The great gift we have as human beings is our ability to reflect, to imagine, and to learn. Providing we learn with our hearts as well as our heads, its one of the reasons for being hopeful that we can do better. In any event, we must try.

**Barbara Macri-Ortiz, 12/21/04**

**RE: ELLEN EGGERS WRITES . . .**

Leroy,

I think your description of some of the things that were going on during this period is quite accurate. In fact, Ellen Eggers gets most of the credit for the revitalization and success of the Union's law apprenticeship program from 1981 - 1987. She was the supervising attorney who saw Marcos Camacho, Chris Schneider, Ned Dunphy and me through the program. Since we all passed the bar on our first attempt (Marcos and Chris in '86 and Ned and I in '87), Ellen's program had a 100% bar pass rate, a higher success rate than even Harvard Law! She deserves to be quite proud of her accomplishments and we apprentices are most appreciative that she made such a successful program possible for us.

Ellen taught us a lot and also did some great appellate work for the union. If Ellen is reading this, remember the case you won with the argument that the fireman's rule applied? I will never forget that case!

I have tremendous respect for Ellen and for her dedication and commitment to the farm workers for all those years. She weathered a lot of storms and served the Union to the best of her ability at a time when we usually found ourselves on the wrong side of the vs.

The 1980s were no picnic and it definitely was not an easy time to be a member of the Legal Department. After Dukemejian was elected governor in 1982, it was all downhill for the ALRB work. Dave Stirling was appointed General Counsel and soon thereafter, CL complaints became more common than CEs. Make whole cases were challenged until the appellate courts sucked every penny out of our original victories, companies painted their buses to relieve themselves of UFW certifications, and decertification petitions were treated with kid gloves by ALRB staff who catered to the new regime. It was not a pretty picture.

If the ALRB mess was not enough, the Legal Department and Ellen had to take on some very difficult civil cases during this period. We were hit with a number of lawsuits arising out of the 1979 vegetable strike in Calexico. Although we were able to dispose of most of the suits, the Maggio litigation hung around until 1985 when we ended up trying the case in front of a judge whose wife had been a strikebreaker at the very company that was suing us [Maggio]. The judge never disclosed the conflict but we eventually found out two months into the trial after we had waived a jury. Our writ challenging the judge's failure to disclose was denied by a Supreme Court that was under siege. To this day I believe that we lost the writ because Rose Bird and company were overly cautious, looking down the road to the election. But rejecting our writ didn't do the justices much good as they were booted out in the November elections. The bifurcated trial continued through 1987, after which we were hit with a \$1.7 million judgment, even after all the help we got from Hub Segur in our efforts to prove that Maggio made a ton of money in spite of the strike due to the outrageously high market prices paid during the huelga. The trial was exhausting and took a lot out of Ellen and all of us. Unfortunately, that experience, which included Ellen and I and our children living in close quarters together in Calexico for what seemed like an eternity, also took a toll on our friendship. Even the good cooking of Lala Escutia (a dear friend of La Causa who recently passed away), couldn't keep us and our children from getting in each other's hair, and I still am saddened that our friendship suffered because I was not able to do a better job of keeping the peace and everyone's spirits up.

Back in La Paz we also had to fight off a civil Rico case filed by Bruce Church in federal district court in Fresno, and a lawsuit in Arizona, alleging that the Red Coach boycott was illegal under that state's horrible farm worker labor law. Also, the paid rep case in federal court hung around for about six years, and nobody got any pleasure out of litigating that case.

So that's some of what Ellen had to deal with as a UFW lawyer during the period 1980 - 1987, not to mention the periodic flooding in the library, the late night trips to the Bakersfield annex to meet ALRB deadlines, and the evening visits from the ghosts who resided in the North Unit [actually these spirits of children who I guess were patients in the North Unit when it was the children's wing of the TB sanitarium were pretty friendly]. All things considered, it was probably not the best of times to be a union lawyer, but at least La Paz was a great place for our kids. And probably none of us will forget the time when Camilo slew the bear who came done from the mountains and surprised him in the auto shop, just outside our offices. That created quite a controversy.

I don't know how much or if any of the above had anything to do with the way Ellen was feeling at the time she left the Union. I just know that Ellen did a lot of hard work during a very hard time, and for that I was and will remain grateful for the service she gave the farm workers.

Viva Ellen,

Barbara Macri-Ortiz (1969-1990)

**Donna Haber Kornberg, 12/21/04**

**RE: response to Jackie Davis**

Perhaps, Abby, it is not a question of comparing Cesar's personal life to his work life, but more a question of aspects of Cesar's personality which influenced the union and which were reflected in both his personal and work lives?

I very much agree in principle that one's personal life is one's own business, and should not be the subject of enquiry by others, but I am sure that Kathy was/ is not a busybody in that sense, and did

not investigate Cesar's personal life any more than the aspects of it he displayed -- for her and for everybody else. Cesar himself was not too good at keeping work and personal lives separated, and it was my impression that he even wished to display aspects of his personal life which would benefit his organizing efforts, e.g. his family's lack of money and material goods.

Saludos,  
Donna Haber Kornberg

**Al Rojas, 12/21/04**

**RE: RESPONSE TO JACKIE DAVIS**

Marshall,

I like the comparison or definition you give, such as the PRI, as if the UFW didn't have a real relationship with the PRI, we must not forget about that, after all Cesar supported Carlos Salinas de Gotari for President in 1988 and as for all the rest of you who really know much more, espeacially those that guarded Cesar and knew at the time what was happening, I should know, maybe Barbara forgets or wants to forget that it was about Farm Workers electing Farm Workers to the Board of Directors, how can I forget how Conventions were run when one chose to run against Cesar's slate, even Marshall knows that, he was on Cesar's slate, Barbara has a short memory also, as to all the complaining she did, I can remember when she came to the Poplar Hiring hall with the "Union Seniority Card Campaign," complaining about everything and in her most colorful manner, I must say, until some farm workers came to me complaining "Oye que tiene esa cabrona hablando sin respeto enfrente de nosotros?", and confronting her with "hey watch your foul mouth and if you have some Bitching take it to Cesar!, all you do is nothing but complain since you came here," it seems that Barbara has some memory loss, Barbara, I like her now passive take, Barbara you must have taken a dramatic turn in personality, but if anybody knows you back then, as I sure did, yes there are many of you who to this day refuse to accept the truth and some of you that will go along with the vindictiveness and hate and contempt you all have to this very day , you see there are many of you who went along with Cesar and you are right, you(we) are responsible, so Marshall, (I am now talking to Barbara) Barbara, just remember how that first UFW Convention was organized and who were the movers in the behind the scenes, I for one believe that Barbara you attempt to deny Marshall's right to his thoughts and opinions, you see Barbara, there is need for some healing, just like the present make up of the Union, where you hear the statement coming from the professed non-violent leader, "Marshall Ganz will never enter La Paz ever!" , and I respond to the professed leader, "hey look Marshall gave part of his life to build this Union just remember that, who are you to carry on that vindictiveness and bitterness!", so you see Barbara there is hurt and bitterness, you see, there were some people that were emotionally damaged and we haven't heard everything yet from them or maybe never, I for one can tell you that and you know that and if you don't, then you are in denial, we all have our say in this, as well as you have but don't blind yourself with, "Not I," for all the bitterness, just remember Barbara try a little harder and if you want me to help you remember, then ask yourself why you felt the way you felt and went around telling everybody else, or at least those you chose to and not others, like me or certain people, I believe that the more we all continue to express our inner feelings ,we begin to expose ourselves and that might not be all that bad after all we were not all so innocent, you see, there is no question that we loved that man, Cesar, but I also knew that to disagree with him you paid the price and who didn't want to be in good light with Cesar all of us did, you did too!, and I chose at times to disagree with Cesar because I felt I was right and disagreed with him on numerous occasions. Peace.

**Marshall Ganz, 12/21/04 (3)**

**RE: RESPONSE TO JACKIE DAVIS**

Did Cesar support Salinas over Cardenas? I never knew that. Interesting.

**Hub Segur, 12/22/04**

**RE: 1972: The Times They Were A-Changing**

Hub Segur 1969-1973, 1987-1989

While a number of events in 1971 had major impact on how 1972 played out, the variety of occurrences during 1972 can be viewed as altering, at some substantive level, the union's strategic focus. This alteration can be seen as a more risk adverse positioning through the shift of resources into a defensive alignment. The result was a loss of offensive momentum. As a majority of union conflicts are sold to staff as "life threatening", the particular set of challenges in 1972 might be viewed as distancing the union from its primary goal of organizing farm workers and leaving the union vulnerable to the frontal assault launched by Teamsters and growers in the spring and summer of 1973. The resource shift in 1972 achieved a significant political break through and regenerated national attention, but it also undermined the momentum of its most powerful offensive weapon, the lettuce boycott.

The Preface: Mid-1971

The momentous signing of the grape contracts in 1970, immediately followed by massive worker support for the UFWOC in the central coast lettuce and vegetable industries, provided incentive for institutional agriculture to counter attack. Their weapon of choice was the cleverly drafted labor relations legislation that would essentially disenfranchise most farm workers while proclaiming "Peace to the Fields." The American Farm Bureau Federation took the lead in sponsoring state legislation in Kansas, Idaho and Oregon with Kansas and Idaho adopting such legislation by mid-1971. In California, Democratic Assemblyman Kenneth Cory sponsored the Cory Wood Bill AB 964 which had shades of Farm Bureau language. With Dolores working the Sacramento corridors and 5,000 farm workers and supporters gathered on the Capitol's steps, the bill died.

The Oregon Legislature, however, passed a bill based on the Farm Bureau model and sent it off to the governor for signature. Unfortunately for the Legislature, Cesar sent Jerry Cohen to the governor for a veto. The well organized Oregon boycotters teamed with Jerry on a threatened picket line around the state to discourage tourists, rallying boycotters in the Midwest, East and Canada to phone in a "No Oregon Lumber Enters Here" message, and supported some farm worker women who set up an altar and prayed at the entrance to the Capitol building. Gov. Tom McCall vetoed the bill, saying he "had never seen such pressure against a measure in 22 years as a state official."

Jerry arrived at Juan Flores' lawn party in Delano the evening of the veto and became so animated and engaged in telling the veto story, he poured the entire contents of two burritos on his shoes. But received a standing "O" from the crowd that had gathered around him. Meanwhile, the Farm Bureau was stimulating interest in their model legislation in Washington, New York and Florida. Later, Cesar was to tell Jacques Levy, "we were trying to keep them (Oregon) from setting a precedent. The only thing was, my heart wasn't in those fights. They slowed us down terribly."

The Setting: Winter Lettuce Deal

As the winter of 1972 came to a close, the lettuce boycott was building momentum. The city coordinators are on top of the game and information flow to the boycotters is on target, thanks in part to the cooperation with UFW contracted growers. Example: Alfredo Figueroa in Blythe was picking off the numbers of Santa Fe railroad cars containing lettuce from our target growers, particularly Norton and Palo Verde Farms. Alfredo would call Boycott Central in Calexico in the evening with the car numbers leaving Blythe that day. Marshall had located a sympathetic member of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks in Winslow Arizona who was willing to help. When Alfredo called in the car numbers, I would phone them over to Winslow. The following day, our Railway Clerk sends them through the computer to Topeka, Kansas and that night, he tells me when the car passed through Winslow, where it was last checked, its final destination and on what line it is traveling. Car SFRC 55706 was headed for Scranton PA with Norton lettuce. I alert Richie Ross in Philly who takes a guess and calls Jos Notarianni & Co in Scranton, telling them that the Norton car means nothing but trouble - leafleting, picket lines, etc. Jos Notarianni blinks. The next day we next find SFRC 55706 diverted to Hunts Point, New York, to Harry Klein. Just happens that the New York boycotters had been picketing H Klein in Hunts Point that

morning and had obtained a commitment from him not to handle the target growers. Richie passes on the diversion move to the New York staff who immediately phones up Harry Klein with the appropriate threats and insinuations about his commitment earlier that day. Klein's only comment was "May God strike me dead." One gets the picture of him looking under rugs, behind doors, not really believing it all.

#### The NLRB Campaign: Spring 1972

About the same time, word arrived that the Republican dominated National Labor Relations Board was reviewing the definition of a "commercial shed" so as to include the UFW under the NLRA which would prohibit secondary boycott activity. Nixon's newly appointed General Counsel was seeking an injunction on secondary activity pending the Board's review. A marvelous example of blatant political pandering as the California's spring lettuce season approaches. The union's analysis was: The NLRB's decision to curtail the union's boycotting was a political decision engineered by the Republican Party. The union response would be a pressure campaign on the Republican Party, in particular its National Chairman Senator Robert Dole of Kansas, to call off the NLRB.

The campaign lasted about two months before the Republicans capitulated. The opening flurry was a call for 250,000 letters to Dole with each boycott city and field office having to contribute their fare share. A national picket day of Republican headquarters throughout the country resonated across constituencies - hard hats in Boston, Eugene McCarthy in Chicago, fifty priests joined 400 pickets in Denver, major press coverage in Washington DC, Detroit Republicans invited the pickets in for tea, Al Rojas debated Republican leaders on TV in Pittsburgh, San Jose and San Diego each had over 300 pickets, in San Francisco Joan Baez read her telegram to Dole and Fresno had over 1500 farm workers demonstrating. The union pitch was that demonstrations took place in 150 cities. "Boycott Elephants." "Boycott Non-Union Republicans." Linda Legerette, in her sultry alter ego of "Linda Lu from Oklahoma", phoned Robbie Dole ("operator, you better make that Senator Dole"), got him on the line where he at least conceded he had received telegrams on the issue.

Endorsements of the union's position poured into La Paz every day. Press coverage in almost every city was supportive. Farm workers pickets were showing up everywhere Republican officials appear. Senator Tower of Texas was locked in an elevator with five farm worker pickets while descending six floors. The boycott offices were charged up and having a great time. Letter writing sessions for staff and guests were held after dinner at La Paz. The national letter count had reached 60,000 by mid-March. Dolores and Richard were holding press conferences in Washington, Jerry and Bill Carder were talking with the NLRB and the Department of Labor. By the second week in April, the NLRB had capitulated.

When Cesar made the announcement at a La Paz community meeting, he confessed to being a cynic when first considering the letter writing tactic. Now he used the NLRB strategy to illustrate his oft-repeated theme that the correctness of a decision is often determined by the campaign that follows it up. The decision here was to go after the Republican party on the basis that the party will discipline its members. "Making the right decision isn't the most important thing. Just aim to get in the area and by sheer effort, make it work." Didn't John Madden employ that same philosophy when he told his Oakland Raiders, "Don't worry that the mule is blind, just load up the wagon"? They went to the Super Bowl that year.

#### Santa Barbara Strategy Conference: April 1972

When Dolores and Richard returned from Washington, an evaluation meeting was held resulting with the decision to schedule a two-day strategy conference at St. Thomas Seminary in Santa Barbara. Boycott coordinators from 22 boycott cities around the country were flown in, joining Board members, field office personnel and key administrators. Cesar introduced his major concern shortly after the introductions: "Forget about the Teamsters. They're not a basic enemy. They can't be, they are workers. Our enemy is the Farm Bureau." And a few minutes later, "We can't run a lettuce boycott without taking them on. They won't leave us alone, they'll keep attacking us. What do we do, pull everyone off the boycott for another legislative campaign?"



And later he added, "To beat them, they would acknowledge the right of the union to exist." Jim Drake added, "We'll consolidate all the opposition in one pocket. Then we'll find out who is the strongest." Laughter broke out and Cesar commented, "Yeah, it's kind of scary." Cesar went on: "We were boycotting grapes but couldn't win because of the Defense Department. Same thing here. The issue is lettuce but we can't win because of the Farm Bureau. And the beauty of it is that it is true. And that helps." LeRoy chipped in, "We have gone on less." This time applause broke out. Sensing the group's hesitancy to focus on the Farm Bureau first, Cesar said, "Years from now everybody will write their own book and say, 'I didn't want to fight the Farm Bureau.'"

The discussion moved to making the lettuce boycott a national issue and then responding to the Farm Bureau. Cesar and Dolores pressed for attacking the Farm Bureau first. For hours the discussion went back and forth with all kind of creative ideas for both campaigns. Get every city selling Farm Bureau leaflets for a penny, "A Penny A Day Keeps the Farm Bureau Away." Or, a lettuce strike with folks going to jail. Jerry Cohen reminded everyone of Cesar's jail time during the 1970 lettuce strike and suggested boycott staff should do some time, "Marshall and Hub, The La Paz Two".

By 11 pm, fatigue had set in and no census had been reached. Another pause, then Cesar's voice rose, "This is the first time in the history of the union that we've been hung up on a decision. Give me a goddam decision, any decision!" Piqued. Silence. Richard Chavez commented, "We've given you a decision but it's not the decision you want." Cesar snapped back, "I respect you, I expect you to respect me". This time, an awkward pause, restlessness in the room, someone recalled a humorous strike story which was followed by a series of wisecracks. It was over and everyone headed off to bed. As the group reconvened on Sunday morning, the air had been cleared and we started laying out the Farm Bureau strategy.

Arizona - A Bill, A Fast, A Recall: Spring and Summer 1972

Bill Encinas bursts through the trailer door, "Where's Avelina and Bob?"

"Asleep."

"Where's their room? They've got to go to Arizona."

Peter Cohen and I were having a beer at the kitchen table of the trailer. It was 2:15 am, Sunday morning and Cesar decided to send the shock troops in a last ditch effort to stop the enactment of Farm Bureau legislation in Arizona. Within an hour, Bob and Avelina joined Richard, Dolores, Steve Jimenez, Marc Grossman and Andy Anzaldúa on their way to Arizona. The bill was passed and signed by the governor who ignored Cesar's request to present farm worker concerns. Cesar arrived in Arizona on Wednesday and a day later announced his Fast for Justice. Marshall, LeRoy and Jim Drake arrived on the following Sunday.

The campaign strategy included sending pledge cards to all cities asking people to support Cesar in his fast by pledging not to eat lettuce. By the middle of the week, a number of cities are staging vigils and masses in support of the fast. Within a few days, visits from George McGovern, Coretta King and Joan Baez along with hundreds of phone calls and telegrams of support from political, labor and religious leaders rushed in daily from every corner of the country. In a surprise to all of us still at La Paz, the New York Times printed an interview with LeRoy indicating the union might move its headquarters from Delano to Arizona "to build an effective farm workers union". I, for one, started packing.

The campaign to recall Arizona Governor Jack Williams, who signed the bill into law, was well under way before the conclusion of the 24-day fast on June 4. The heart of this campaign is wonderfully reported in Danny Ybarra's essay, "Arizona Recall Stories". Folks from the boycott cities, field offices and La Paz made up a dedicated Recall team of sixty petition circulators and deputy registrars. Jim Rutkowski documented the campaign and estimated the crew was putting in 2500 hours per week. While some 176,000 signatures were eventually collected with more than a sufficient amount verified, the Recall was stymied by the conservative political maneuvering of state officials. What did result was the first massive registration of Navajo, Mexican American

and rural mine workers in Arizona which has influenced the state's politics ever since. And, of course, the union emerged with three words that will be forever: Si Se Puede!

No on Proposition 22: Fall 1972

While the Arizona Recall campaign got under way, most of us still in La Paz were spending weekends walking precincts in Los Angeles for Art Torres' efforts to be a state assembly member. Art did not make it out of the June Primary but the rest of us were unknowingly in training for a major campaign - Proposition 22. Cesar had promised a month earlier that if this version of the Farm Bureau legislation qualified as an initiative for the California November ballot, he would bring in everyone from around the country to insure a "No" vote. By the end of June, word came down that the initiative had qualified.

People were called in from everywhere to staff the major California cities. Voter registration was a necessity and difficult. That was followed by door to door leafleting and, for the final two weeks, the "human billboard" operation. The latter turned out to be a great group activity. Thirty or forty people would line busy intersections and freeway on and off ramps holding up six-by-four foot "No on 22" signs. Working together, getting cars to respond and tractor trailers to sound their air horns. "No on 22" received more California votes than Nixon. Victory margin was sixteen points, 58 to 42 percent. A three day post mortem strategy conference at La Paz was attended by nearly 200 participants of the "22" campaign. There was a debriefing and a recruitment pitch to continue working with the union. The growers had spent \$750,000 while the union costs were \$199,000 including some \$85,000 in donations. Richard Chavez had been talking to support groups during the campaign and was telling them the union would match the growers at a dollar per man: For every dollar they spent, we would send out another worker.

Cesar later reflected on 1972 and the political skirmishes in Arizona and California and told Jacques Levy: "We used a lot of the boycott people. In fact, the lettuce boycott ceased to exist." But Cesar saw the effort in Arizona and the victory in California as critical: "It gave us a very strong encouragement about our right to exist. While fighting Proposition 22 did slow our organizing efforts, it settled the issue once and for all - that and the recall of the governor put the lid on, I think."

Shortly after the meeting of Proposition 22 participants, three key city coordinators left the union. Richard Trejo directed Philadelphia, Bill Masterson in Detroit, and Bill Paterson in Pittsburgh. The union had clearly strengthened its political position but the full cost of that effort has yet to be analyzed.

**Jerry Brown, 12/22/04**

**RE: 10 reasons to donate to the Farmworker Documentation Project**

Dear Friends – Brothers and Sisters,

I sent these to David Letterman to read on national TV on Xmas eve. But, just in case Dave doesn't read them, here are the 10 top reasons why you should pledge to donate, or raise, \$250 to be sent to LeRoy for the Farmworker Documentation Project. Remember the deadline for your pledge is Jan. 7, 2005.

# 10. If you don't, Dolores will come to your house and send you to New York City to boycott mushrooms.

# 9 (a) Out of appreciation for connecting with old friends from La Causa.

# 9 (b) Out of appreciation for the opportunity to vent at old enemies and tell people what you really thought of them.

# 8. For reminding us how young we once were and how much energy we had for the boycotts and campaigns.

# 7. To insure that history will remember Cesar Chavez, the farmworkers and volunteers – Viva la Causa en la historia!

# 6. To make sure that the wonderful essays that you all wrote will be published and reach a large audience.

# 5. To lighten LeRoy's work load and out of gratitude for his bringing us all back together again through the Documentation Project.

# 4. Out of thanks that you are no longer living in voluntary poverty on \$5 a week.

# 3. To tell your kids that you didn't buy that violent video game they wanted for Xmas, but made a donation to the farmworker project in their name.

# 2. To educate your friends and neighbors about the need to support the farmworkers today, as you raise \$10 each from 25 of them to reach the \$250 goal.

And now for – drum roll:

# 1. Admit it folks, where else can you get this kind of therapy and catharsis – for free!

Merry Xmas to all,

Jerry Brown

**LeRoy Chatfield, 12/22/04**

**RE: HUB SEGUR'S THOUGHTFUL POSTING**

LeRoy Chatfield 1963-1973

I just had the opportunity to read Hub Segur's thoughtful posting about the UFW political activity 1971 -1972. It certainly gives me a lot to think about, and I plan to do so.

The first thought that came to mind when I finished reading Hub's posting was that life - or in this case, a movement - is a series of trade-offs, and regardless of whether the UFW veered one way, when perhaps it should have gone another - or the reverse - there are always trade-offs that result, and the movement is forced to live with those results. If the results are negative, life goes on, and one has to make the best of it under the new circumstances.

Much of what happened in 1971-1972 was not dictated by the UFW but was in response to the dictates of agribusiness. But it is certainly fair to ask whether the UFW response/defense was measured and appropriate, and it is certainly fair to analyze the negative effects our response might have had on maintaining the boycott, contract enforcement, organizing in the fields, and preserving the sanity and stability of volunteers.

I do not intend this posting to be a RESPONSE to Hub's commentary. Rather these are some initial thoughts that come to mind as I begin to think about the implications of what he has written.

I very much appreciate Hub's understated style, including a touch of humor now and again.

LeRoy (Chatfield)

**Susan Drake, 12/22/04**

**RE: Jean Maunder**

Does anyone know how to contact Jean Maunder? I'd like to be in touch with her. Her stepmother is a friend, and I just learned today that Jean worked in our clinics at the border. If any of you know Jean, her father's health is very tenuous at this point; she's with him in Port Charles, wherever that is.

Susan Drake (1962-1973)

**Humberto Gomez, 12/22/04**

**RE: From Humberto M. Gomez**

Dear LeRoy and All Participants:

I have not participated very much or read all postings. However, it was very nice to see postings from previous and present UFW Volunteers that I did have the privilege to work with and share good and bad times while working with the Union.

Several questions have arisen on some of the postings regarding if the UFW did improve the lives of farm workers and their families. Please let me testify to that, and to explain why I will always be grateful to the UFW and all volunteers participating or not in the project.

As a farm worker myself, I felt the changes and big improvements not only on the economic sector .75 cents per hour minimum, wage (mid sixties) to \$1.25 per hour late sixties and early seventies UFW contract (Robert Farms) \$1.90 per hour and a piece rate system where any farm worker will make no less than \$75.00 dollars per day plus the introduction of breaks (10 minutes) pension fund and the controversial but necessary citizen Participation Day (CPD).

On social power, working five (5) days per week and making more money, we were able to expand more time with our families, get involved in church, school and community activities.

On political power, I give all credit to Cesar and the UFW movement. For the first time in the history of my county Fresno in 1970 a Mexican American was running to be elected as county supervisor Cruz Bustamante Sr. the father of our present Lieutenant Governor Cruz Bustamante. Even though Cruz lost the campaign, his historical challenge to the political system was the initial spark that started the fire and encouragement for other Mexican American to run for office such as Al Villa Fresno City Council Member (I believe first Mexican American) Armando Rodriguez, Fresno County Supervisor (First) and later on Superior Court Judge.

Such fire was extended to all cities and counties in the Central San Joaquin Valley. Salinas Valley, Ventura and Los Angeles Counties and eventually all over the state where Latinos started to run as candidates for all kinds of political offices, Latinos taking control or participating as board members for school boards and restructuring the educational system for our kids, students such as Lea Ybarra, Grace Solis, Maria Zapata, Liz and Gloria Hernandez demanding Chicano Latino studies within the California University System.

Health Care yes, for the first time farm workers were able to get medical care not only for themselves but also for their families due to medical plan coverage (RFK) Union clinics, community Health Clinics were burned such as United Health Centers, Clinicas Del Pueblo in different areas of the state.

I personally feel that the biggest gain that Cesar and the UFW Movement gave to the Farm workers was the lost of fear to demand "Dignity and Respect" as workers and human beings for the first time my sister and aunt will be able to use a portable toilet to do their necessities and the circle of women to cover them while going to the restroom became history for the first time, portable drinking water (sometimes with ice) and individual cups, no more water from the dirty and discarded Pepsi can to drink water, plus the improvement on working conditions under contract or by laws sponsored by the UFW including but not limited breaks, pesticides banned and controlled use of it, increase on wages, benefits, grievance and Arbitration and many other benefits that provided "Dignity and Respect" for all farm workers.

Therefore, as a farm worker, I want to thank from the bottom of my heart to all the volunteers listed on the project or unlisted, for the positive changes and improvements that thanks to their sacrifice the Farm workers and their families including myself are enjoying.

Even though I agree and disagree with some of the participant listings, my love, respect and admiration will always be with all the UFW Volunteers, specially the ones that pushed me to become 100% involved in the Union such as Hope Lopez, Pablo Espinoza and Gilbert Padilla co-founder of the Union, mi compadre and a very good person to work with.

For me it was a privilege to work with the best including but not limited to Marshall Ganz, one of the best strategist that I have met Frank Ortiz, Richard Chavez, Eliseo Medina, Jessica Govea, Manuel Chavez, Dolores Huerta, Pablo Espinoza, Hope Lopez, Oscar Mondragon, Arturo Mendoza, David Martinez, Ben Maddock and Gilbert Padilla all of them with their own special style to ask and to do the job.

As final comment, I enjoyed the listings that I was able to read such as the ones from Albert Escalante Mr. Leaflet (the best) and Mr. Malcriado Doug "Pato el datilero" which I have not seen since the Henry Moreno Campaign in Coachella.

Merry Christmas for all and Happy Prosperous New Year 2005.

Remember, as volunteers we did our job we made history and we shall be proud. We all were touched by Cesar. He was not perfect, nor a saint he never claimed that, we all knew that.

But he was a hell of a good Organizer and human being that touched us all and convinced us that we didn't have to love each other as long as we learned to work together, and we did it.

Humberto M. Gomez

### **Scott Templeton, 12/22/04**

#### **RE: Humberto Gomez's Expression of Gratitude**

Humberto Gomez wrote that he thanked all of the volunteers who helped make positive changes.

In my essay I wrote the following about Humberto at Cesar's funeral:

*Humberto Gomez did the most memorable thing. He personally thanked me and other "gabachos" for our help. He said something to the effect that he and other farm workers or people with farmworker backgrounds were profoundly moved and motivated to see us join la causa. Humberto's expression of gratitude helped to heal my wounds and honored my minor, yet personally costly, contribution to the movement.*

[I should have added in the paragraph that my experience with the union is one that I treasure and am proud of, even if it was personally costly.]

So Humberto, thank you for your kind and healing words. I wish I could give you a big hug and then a UFW, Si-Se-Puede, We're-Going-to-Kick-Some-Ass handshake. It is one thing to struggle for ideals, such as justice. But, the struggle becomes meaningful in a different way and sustainable when there are relationships involved.

Mila Thomas, a close friend, former UFW staffer, and now a leader with SEIU, once told me 'It's all about relationships'. Those words have come to mean more and more to me as I grow older.

There were so many things that I wanted to include in my essay but did not for lack of time.

I have so much respect and admiration for Chris Hartmire. He is a bigger hero for me than Cesar. He was booted out of the union shortly before I went to the Philippines to do field work for my dissertation. In my idle moments in the villages where I worked, I kept thinking about his huge sacrifice and how he was betrayed by those he loved and to whom he had given so much of his life. I would get profoundly sad thinking about it. I still do.

One approach to organizing that I observed some in the union taking was what I'll call the instrumental, or behavioral, or extrinsic motivational approach. The organizer doesn't enter into a serious relationship with the person. Rather the organizer sees the person as someone who can be manipulated with the right amount of exaggerated urgency and guilt-tripping, just as a behaviorist sees behavior as a function of rewards and punishments. In this approach, the organizer can stretch the truth or lie to convince the person to do what he wants her to do. The organizer 'crunches' the person rather than appeals to her sense of justice. The organizer is afraid that the person needs to hear the story in black and white, in sound bites, rather than any nuance. The truth isn't bad enough, we have to embellish it. It's all about marketing, something Cesar and the union pursued in the mid-80s. (I've got paper copies of numerous Como Siempre spots.)

The approach that I preferred was what I'll call the relational, social cognitional, or intrinsic-motivational approach. Of course, the organizer needs to convey urgency but not a false, inflated sense of urgency because you're going to want the person to be involved for the long term. You want the person to trust you to give them accurate information, to believe in your integrity. Part of what is wrong with the whole system is that it's built on lies. If we want to change the system, we

have to tell the truth, we can't lie. Don't bullshit. Give the straight scoop. The ends don't justify the means. The organizer appeals to the person's sense of justice and responsibility and isn't afraid of the truth.

In the organizing I did, I tried to use the second approach more than the first. But I also had the sense that others had success with the first approach. Of course, George Bush had success with the first approach too.

One reason why shutting down the boycotts was a negative was that relationships had been built that were broken. Supporters got tired of one-night stands, I suspect.

I don't know if I'm adding anything new to the discussion. My apologies if I'm not.

Merry Christmas, Belated Happy Hanukkah, Happy New Year.

All of these discussions have rekindled a desire to join a picket line and go shut down a grocery store on a Sat. afternoon. Didn't it feel great when a parking lot was empty?

Scott Templeton (Jan. 1980 – Feb. 1981, summer 1982, Jan. 1985 – Aug. 1985)  
Clemson, South Carolina

P.S. Is the Jerry Brown who's been writing from Florida International University the former Governor or a different Jerry Brown? Does anyone know what became of John Brown, who had a close affinity with the workers and, I believe, organized a successful strike in Morgan Hill at Steakmate (?) or some kind of mushroom plant.

### **Sam Trickey, 12/23/04 (1)**

#### **RE: hesitant remarks**

Good morning –

With considerable hesitation, I make this post. I was not a UFW volunteer, but rather was and am a deeply involved supporter. Leroy has been kind enough to include me on the list. I have learned much from it and been delighted to see the names of people whom I've not heard of for very long times. It is an immense gift and for that alone Leroy is owed many thanks.

I've been hesitant because my trajectory was not that of the UFW volunteer. Nevertheless, I am perhaps as intimately involved over a long period as any non-staffer could have been. At multiple points in UFW history I was heavily involved in one or another campaign. Beginning in 1966 with the Texas watermelon strike, my involvement has been with faith communities and organizing them to live up to their professed positions in real terms via boycotts and other campaigns. So I have been part of National Farm Worker Ministry since it began. That involvement continues today, as I end 4 years as NFWM Board President, one of the highest honors of my life.

One other credential: I think I am the only person - other than Cesar himself - ever to have been attacked by name in a multi-page article in the Florida Farm Bureau Federation magazine for supporting farm worker organizing. (Aside: professionally I am Professor of Physics and Chemistry Univ. of Florida. I am also Vice President of the Faculty Union here.)

For months I have read this list variously in wonder, bemusement, and puzzlement but almost always in appreciation. Stand back and look. It is a remarkable story. It has not ended.

In that spirit, here are comments, responses, and observations, with respect for everyone and animus to no one.

\* Basic Vision

The basic vision of UFW, of Cesar, Philip, Gil, Dolores, and the other founders, DOES work. There are UFW contracts in California, Washington, Florida, Texas. There are FLOC contracts in Ohio, Michigan, Illinois and, most amazingly, in North Carolina, as of a few weeks ago. There is the Service Center (with affordable housing) and there is Radio Campesina, etc. There is organizing that is leading to contracts. There are political successes. The fact that the contracts

cover a modest fraction of the total number of workers is a sign of how hard the problem is. It is not novel to understand Christ's remark that "the poor will always be with you" as being a commentary on how enticing it is for some to exploit others - and farm labor remains one of the most intractable examples.

\* Movement vs. Union

There has been a lot of discussion on this issue. It may not be framed as nicely as possible but the underlying issue is whether the farm worker struggle was - and is - about making major changes in the existing social and political order or about constructing a new order. Put another way, is the movement FROM the current situation TO a set of practical objectives or is the more important reality the movement itself? This is the utilitarian vs. utopian question and an important way to look at the internal tensions in the UFW. I think Cesar tried to have it both ways at times and never really resolved the matter in his own mind.

Because of the disparity between utopian and utilitarian views, the depth of bitterness and animosity sometimes expressed on this list is no surprise but it is a sorrow.

Like many other explicitly Christian supporters, I was and am deeply skeptical of the utopian view. Theologically it is idolatry, the practical consequence of which is that it inevitably is a deeply disappointing failure. (Good theology has good practical consequences.) This is precisely what happens, in my view, in all radical movements, secular or religious. Clear-eyed realism includes dealing with the fundamental brokenness of human relations, our demonstrated inability to do things perfectly, and the inevitability that selfishness, fear, greed, etc. will be interwoven in the very best of efforts. Utopianism claims to have a way around that. It doesn't.

Equally importantly, in all my conversations with ordinary farm workers, almost has anyone expressed a desire for a sweeping social movement, the utopian dream. Almost always what is expressed is a desire for a life that some radicals might dismiss as bourgeois - medical care for family, a decent house, a reliable car, respect and safety in the work place, etc.

So I have always articulated the utilitarian view. Organizing and collective bargaining is demonstrably the most effective way for workers to achieve practical results. Boycotts and related campaigns are power sharing. With professional credentials as a scientist, this viewpoint also is rhetorically valuable. I start with the facts - the dismal conditions of most farm workers - and argue that rationality and conscience (faith) coincide. The Biblical prophets do it better, but it is the same approach.

More about utopianism under Management, below.

\* Changing Social and Political Realities

One of the striking aspects of the list discussion is the relative lack of detailed consideration of how different the political climate was in 1964 - 70 or so from what it was by say 1975 - 80. We went from powerful public consensus on the moral imperative of civil rights and the moral failure of the Vietnam War to the "silent majority" whining of Spiro Agnew, the extreme conservatism articulated by Barry Goldwater, and the self-centered supply-side mythology of Ronald Reagan and company. Even if UFW leadership had made perfect choices in the 70s, there was no way to continue benefiting from the tide of social change in the 60s. In this context, it is no wonder that Cesar at times seemed to be frustrated and to act as if he felt that he had lost his touch.

\* Florida

I am surprised and a little disappointed at the relative lack of mention of the struggles in Florida. Jerry Kay's contributions are a counterexample; thanks Jerry! I may have missed others. (I've filed all the incoming email but only read about 60% of it.) One of the things that Cesar and UFW had to come to terms with was how different Florida is from California. Right-to-work, undergoing an awkward transition from an isolated, segregated, rural, low-population state to a modern urban state, reactionary non-Mexican Hispanics, etc. all made this state very different from California. (I'm also not convinced that many Californians understand how oddly self-referential California

can seem.) It was never clear to me that Cesar and much of the rest of UFW leadership ever entirely learned the lesson about how different

Florida was - and is.

\* Personalities, Management styles, Purges, the Game, and Burn-out

Cesar was never personally harsh or demanding to me. In fact, he was remarkably respectful. I cherish the fact that he told me, unsolicited, that he respected my staying in academe rather than leaving and joining NFWM or UFW staff and that he valued the existence of serious supporters such as I in various walks of life. I spent a week in Coachella when the Teamsters came in. Chris Hartmire brought me out. Cesar raised no objections when I said I had to go back to Florida to teach, only thanked me for coming. He and I argued, sometimes fiercely. I held - and hold - the view that servanthood ministry does not mean that I park my brain at the door. On several occasions, when UFW was doing something I didn't think was right, I told him so. (Two examples: I thought the heavy emphasis direct mail was a mistake and that the pesticide campaign was over-interpreting the evidence.) His response always was the highest form of respect - he took the arguments seriously and he told me the reasoning for what was being done. He took time out to talk with me when I showed up in La Paz unannounced. He stayed in my house and made very few requests, none that would be considered a demand.

I have a somewhat less favorable view of Fred Ross than many on the list. Clearly he was a marvelously gifted organizer as well as a fascinating personality. We shared the back seat of a car from Oakland to La Paz one time. I wish I had tape recorded his running commentary sparked by passing one town after another. But to me he was a bit narrow. Unlike Cesar, he was openly scornful of my sense of calling. "When", he once asked me, "are you going to give up that science nonsense and come do something real?" He insisted on using EXACTLY the same methods in Florida as in California, even arguing to me that the worker committees had to be called "Ranch Committees". Citrus in Florida doesn't know anything about "ranches". When Dianna Lyons, I, and Fred were talking about some law (right-to-work maybe?) Fred said, "Well, we'll just put it on the ballot and change it." But ballot initiatives in Florida are a lot harder to do even today than they were in California (I lived in California off and on during 1973-76) and back then they were extremely hard and rare in Florida. And he insisted that we in NFWM must use the house-meeting formula, even though I had long since found out that I could be far more persuasive with potential supporters by being more flexible, less formulaic.

Given that Cesar showed me such respect, purges and using "the Game" never made any sense to me. "The Game" by construction seems to be a form of humiliation and control, thus completely at odds with the best of what Cesar and UFW and the farm worker movement stood for. Same for purges. Some of the discussion on the list has helped me to better understanding of what happened. But I'm still left with the unsettled sense that neither technique was authentic when measured by UFW's values. In a manner of speaking, National Farm Worker Ministry was purged too. But we recognized a broader commitment to farm worker organizing and played a significant role in the Campbell boycott that brought FLOC its first contracts.

Part of the origins of burning out staff are easy enough to understand. Cesar's own energy and fierce commitment, plus the almost desperate need to cope with multiple simultaneous challenges led to directly to working chronically in a crisis mode. But if the poor are always with us, that means we must nurture and support human resources, not burn people out. That's the practical side. The theological side says that farm workers aren't "labor" or "hands" but people - and so are UFW staff, whether volunteers or not.

Having to cope with chronic multiple crises combined with multiple successes (contracts) and opportunities (Texas, Florida for example) also explains a big part of Cesar's trying one management technique after another. For a man who had not the privilege of substantial formal education nor the luxury of time to read on management and leadership, it is remarkable that he did as well as he did - and a testimony to the many gifted volunteers who made major contributions. There are at least two down sides. To this day UFW seems at times to have a certain kind of organizational attention deficit. There is enough darting from one thing to another



to make me worry sometimes. It can have hard consequences - like the loss of supporters over the failure to open clinics here in Florida.

Also it is easy to become fascinated with one management scheme or another. In his overload, I think Cesar more than once got too fascinated with a particular scheme. Airport newsstands are full of books on miracle management and leadership methods. When I went into University computer and network administration I read several leadership books. Most of the "airport books" are appealing because they are oversimplified and promise big results with little effort. The fundamentals of good management are boring - communications, reliability, integrity, consistency combined with flexibility, etc. Delegation is a biggie of good leadership. As far as I can tell Cesar didn't delegate well. Again, no surprise - how many people have the vision and courage he and a few other founders did? And how do you delegate that?

If you have read this far, you are very patient indeed. Let me bend your patience only a little more. I commend to you Virginia Nesmith's posting from a few days ago. She said well some of the things I have wanted to say.

Thanks again to all of you. Being a participant in the farm worker struggle literally changed my life - for the better. I hope to have helped the workers as well.

Feliz Navidad, Paz y Justicia, Sam

Samuel B. Trickey

**Barbara Macri-Ortiz, 12/23/04**

**RE: hesitant remarks**

Sam,

Thank you for the thoughtful posting. You need not be so hesitant. Some of us may at times lose sight of the forest for the trees. Your perspective is appreciated. It reminds us that the forest is breathtaking.

Peace and Happy holidays to all,

Barbara Macri-Ortiz

**Sandy Nathan, 12/23/04 (1)**

**RE: THE BOYCOTT & THE ALRA 1975**

This is a response in part to LeRoy's summary of the UFW's stages of life (email of November 20), as well as a very belated response to the comments of both Barbara Macri (dated July 6) and Larry Tramutola (dated July 5). Actually, most of what follows was written months ago, and left in the "Drafts" box. I decided to dust it off, edit much of it out, and then send the rest, in view of LeRoy's "stages of life" email and Jeff Sweetland's excellent summary and analysis of the mid-70s ALRA days (email of Dec. 5.). I think that his piece focuses directly on the question of "whatever happened to the UFW," and it dovetails with this stuff I had done earlier. So, here's my two cents worth.

For purposes of disclosure, I was a full-time member of the legal department from January, 1973 until some time in the middle of 1979. I think I stopped doing any legal work for the union by the middle of 1980. (I had been hired in Jan. 1973 by LeRoy and Jerry Cohen initially to work on the Safeway legal attack in LA. Not long afterwards I was sent off to Coachella, never to return to LA.)

Barbara had written about the importance of the boycott and how bad things allegedly got under, and because of, the ALRA starting in the 80's. Others have also touched on these points. Larry wrote about the organizational chaos (purges and other dysfunctional behavior) which befell the Union after the ALRA era began in 1975. Obviously, others have written about this as well. The period described by Larry was the same period of time roughly encompassed by LeRoy's "reformation" period, although I am not sure it was so much a reformation as a conflagration. As

I noted, Jeff Sweetland's review of the ALRA activity underscores the one historical issue not mentioned and which I think is worth adding to the mix.

I found Larry's and Barbara's comments interesting together (posted a day apart and not intended to respond to one another) because their comments focus why the UFW's demise in the late 70's/early 80's -- the very moment in time that the Union should have been triumphant -- was so painful for so many. These discussions also suggest why so much bitterness has been expressed on this listserv. And for those who are angry about the criticism of Cesar that has emerged on these pages, they should understand that the sense of loss experienced by many people during this particular time period was enormous. If they hadn't cared so much about building a farmworkers union owned by the workers (as opposed to the Founder or a select group of individuals), the pain wouldn't still be so apparent. That this failure occurred when the union was on the brink of great success only made it that much harder to accept. What happened to the union affected people in a negative way with the same force that all of the positive stuff affected those of you who feel so compelled to defend Cesar's memory and legacy no matter what he did. (I think Marshall's comments in an email dated Dec. 19 capture quite well the dynamics of the loss experienced by people as a result of Cesar's actions in the late '70s.)

Barbara wrote critically about the ALRA, almost as if somehow the law was responsible for the UFW's undoing. In my view, nothing could be further from the truth. With all due respect to Barbara, whose contributions to the Union and others has been long and fruitful, blaming the ALRA for any of the Union's undoing misses the point of the role that the ALRA was supposed to play in the development of the Union. It's something like blaming the ocean for the sinking of the Titanic.

It was well-known and well-understood by the leadership of the Union in 1975 that the passage of the ALRA was only going to provide a window of opportunity to build the Union. (And if they didn't know and understand that, they weren't paying attention.) It was not going to magically convert the Union from an organization "fighting for its life" into a powerful force. The fact is that while the grape boycott had been hugely successful the first time around, it was also clear that the lettuce boycott was not ever going to bring the vegetable industry to its knees. The Safeway boycott, while effective in getting Safeway's attention (and perhaps even contributing to the passage of the ALRA), was also never going to bring the growers into the fold. Then, while those two boycotts were struggling to achieve results, the Union suffered a nearly mortal wound in the 1973 Teamster-Grower disaster in the grapes. The grape strike had failed to regain the grape contracts and had to be given a quiet death. The AFL-CIO money (\$1.5 million) for the strike was exhausted as well. Simply put, we couldn't "win" that strike. Things could hardly have been gloomier in the Tehachapis. (In fact, if I recall correctly, that was precisely the time at which LeRoy took his leave, no doubt exhausted and fully aware that things were going to get a helluva' lot worse before they got better. I realize that LeRoy may speak for himself on this point, but that is the way it looked to many of us.) Thus, as the summer of 1973 came to a close, and all but two of the grape contracts were lost, the Union was literally hitting the road to wage a number of simultaneous boycotts.

By the spring of 1974, we had even lost the Larson grape contract in Coachella, one of the last two grape contracts. The Gallo boycott was nice and kept people busy; the boycott apparatus was strong; but organizing farmworkers into the Union was not a priority. There was very little infrastructure set up to do so. A change in the farm labor laws probably represented the Union's last, best chance for meaningful survival. (Certainly the boycott apparatus could have continued indefinitely as a fund-raising organization, and as the arm of the "movement," but it could not organize farmworkers.) The rap against farm labor legislation, by the way, was that it would turn the "union" or the "movement" into a business union; that the sense of the cause would be lost. Ironically, the apparent effort to save the "cause" at the expense of the "union" in the late '70's may have resulted in the loss of everything, including the "cause," the "movement," and the "union."

In any event, while the boycott remained a great organizing tool (and no doubt accomplished many of the things that have been mentioned in this project), the task of organizing farmworkers was getting more difficult. With the departure of Ronald Reagan as governor in 1974 (and who

knew that it would really take 30 more years for the sun to set on that SOB), and the dawn of the Gov. Jerry Brown era, it made sense to look for legislative solutions to turn things around. At that point it seemed like we really had nothing else to lose and everything to gain. (I believe that a good faith pursuit of legislation had also been a condition of the \$1.5 million dollar grant from the AFL-CIO for the 1973 grape strike, not that that was necessarily driving the Union.)

But again here is what was known about the legislative solution: **even if it could be achieved, it was only going to give the Union a window of opportunity to survive and grow into a viable force before it (the ALRA) would suffer the same fate as the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA), which eventually became more of a hindrance than a help to the labor movement.** But just as the NLRA didn't kill the larger labor movement, the ALRA couldn't have killed the UFW. But the UFW would have had the same (or even better) opportunity than the industrial unions in the '30s had to become strong before the NLRA was undermined by all the right wing political forces. That window would probably be open for the two terms of Jerry Brown, if that. But having 5-6-7-8 years in which to gain a foothold and become a strong, permanent force in the national farm labor picture was far more than the Union could have hoped for otherwise by the winter of 1975. Nobody thought that the ALRA was going to be a complete solution to all of our problems. Rather, as Scott Washburn described so well, it was just to be another tool to accomplish the goal of organizing farmworkers. And it was, and would have been, a damn good tool had the Union used it to its potential, instead of committing institutional suicide in those years in which the ALRA window was open.

I remember Jerry Cohen telling a story of how he ran into a grower lawyer (I think it was Don Dressler from the Western Growers Association) at an airport sometime around 1973-74. Dressler, a pompous sort who loved to gloat anyway, told Jerry that the UFW would be nothing more than an interesting footnote in labor history when all was said and done. After the ALRA was passed and literally hundreds of elections had been held, and the Union was seemingly about to write chapters (not footnotes) in the labor history books (see Sweetland email), we laughed (and gloated) about Dressler's comment.

Then came the events of 1976. In early '76, the initial funding ran out for the ALRB. When the Democrats, who controlled the Legislature, opted to not fund the ALRB (in order to protect the Valley Democrat legislators), the Union started gathering the signatures for what would become Prop 14. Initially the signature gathering seemed like a strategy to pressure the legislature to re-fund the ALRB. And that part of the strategy worked. It all came to a head in June 1976 when the Speaker of the House, Leo McCarthy, offered to fund the ALRB if Cesar would drop the initiative. While the decision to go forward with Prop 14 -- and refuse McCarthy's deal to resurrect the ALRB in June 1976 -- may not have been **THE** key mistake of that period, it was pretty damn important and hard to imagine a worse one. At the time, I am confident that most of the leadership knew the decision to go forward was a bad mistake and in retrospect, it came to look even worse than bad.

But it is probably also true that the pieces were already in place at the very top for the union to self-destruct. In other words, we were probably on a course to destroy ourselves whether or not the Prop 14 crusade (Eliseo's descriptive term) went forward. But the awful decision-making process in effect at that time -- which resulted in the decision to go forward -- would only be magnified in the years to come. Maybe LeRoy is right that Cesar chose this misstep because he was thinking "movement" not "union." Who knows? We do know, however, that the decision to go forward with Prop 14 was an unmitigated disaster for the Union as a union. (It was also disastrous for Leo McCarthy and his wing of Democrats as it turned out. And it galvanized the growers into a political force that would change California politics and help usher in the Deukmejian era and that style of politics.)

In any event, instead of consolidating our gains and using the down time to rest and plan, the Union wasted that time (between the closure of the ALRB in Feb. 1976 and June 1976). Then the Union launched the Prop 14 debacle and caused the ALRB to be shut down until some time in early 1977 I believe. So a whole year of precious time was lost while the internal self-destruction went forward. The growers must have marveled at our stupidity and their good fortune.

And yet, even after losing Prop 14, and even after wasting that year, we got the call from the Teamster lawyers about their desire to get out of the fields. (You will recall that many of the fights in the fields throughout the early '70s were between and among the UFW, the Teamsters, and the growers. So, getting the Teamsters out of the fields had the potential to be a tremendous boost to the Union.) I believe the call came from the Teamsters within days after the Prop. 14 election in Nov. 1976. Thus, even with all that had happened, the Teamsters were ready to leave, and within a few months, they did leave. As a result, when the ALRB re-opened in 1977, we again still had a golden opportunity to build the Union. Perhaps as LeRoy says, Cesar was tired and hurt from the Prop 14 humiliation, but most of the rest of us were merely bruised and still ready to fight and consolidate gains. We could have easily risen from the ashes of the Prop 14 loss and done just fine, if the leadership had been able to get focused. Indeed, most of us were just waiting to get Prop 14 out of the way so that we could get on with the real work of building a union. And no doubt those farmworkers who had waited so long were probably ready too.

But this is where the smoldering chaos (which Larry alluded to in his July email) erupted and destroyed the last, best chance to create a strong union. Instead of using all that down time and the departure of the Teamsters to consolidate, plan, build, learn, etc., the Union plunged into the self-destructive path from which it would never recover. Instead of using the ALRA in the years from 1977 through the end of Jerry Brown's second term (1982) to build the UFW into a force, the Union floundered. (I realize that some good things still went on in those years, such as in the vegetable industry, but the seeds of destruction had been planted and by the end of the "reformation" period the "cultural revolution" would be pretty much completed.)

So the window closed, and the opportunity was lost. And, while it is true that the law would have gotten things bogged down, as Barbara describes, that is really beside the point. What is crucial is that the Union could have made more than enough gains during those years to build a solid foundation, organize farmworkers, become financially more stable, and remain way ahead of the game. Instead, we got trapped in other games. That great opportunity was lost.

So, to sum up, I think it is misguided to blame the law for the Union's woes. And it takes studied, utter blindness to ignore how the internal chaos of that (reformation?) period destroyed the Union for all intent and purposes. Simply put, and regardless of the reasons or any good intentions, it was a failure of leadership at a crucial time.

While all of the stories and gains described thus far in this project are an important part of the larger Union story, to me this failure during LeRoy's "reformation" period is still one of the most important in the Union's history.

And in looking for the wherefores and whys, it is pointless to look elsewhere. The UFW didn't die on the vine because of Ronald Reagan or George Deukmejian or David Stirling or the Teamsters or the growers or the ALRB or the Democrats or the "stupid" voters in California, or any other of the myriad external forces some have sought to blame, loathsome though all of those may have been. Instead, the answer, as our dear Brutus would say, "lay not in the stars, but in all of us" who were there, beginning (and perhaps ending) at the very top.

Highlighting this particular failure is not to diminish the remarkable things achieved by Cesar, by the Union, by the "movement," and by all of the UFW staff, (including all the fabulous food and meals -- none better than you could get at Robert Garcia's house), as described by many of the contributors to these pages. No question that all those successes were real and lasting. Nobody can deny that Cesar had been a brilliant and gifted leader, nor does any of this erase the tangible and intangible changes made in the lives of people and in the landscape of this country. Those advances are immeasurable, as the testimony of so many writing have confirmed. Nor can it be denied that the UFW was a training ground and a testing ground and a spawning ground for so many who would do such good work in so many places for so many people for the rest of their lives.

Still, in thinking of those days from the mid-1970's into the early '80s, it is hard not to be haunted by the fact that Dressler was right. And, perhaps much of the bitterness that has been expressed in

this project just reflects the fact that for many of us, thinking about that time reminds us that the saddest words of mice and men really are, "what might have been."

Sandy Nathan

(The longest decade of my life was the month I spent at La Paz in the summer of 1973)

P.S. As an aside, comparing Doug Adair's email of Dec. 20 describing the excitement at the dawn of the Union's existence in 1965 with Ellen Eggers' grim description in 1987 (email of Dec. 15) is a stark reminder of how far afield the Union went in pursuit of its dreams; and the extent to which it lost its way. As another aside, to those of you who ask why raise criticisms and things "negative," I suggest you ask LeRoy. He is the one who started this project. I'm not really sure why he initiated this thing, but he didn't ask only for paeans to Cesar. He asked people to document their stories. So, they did it. Some chose to remember the many good times and accomplishments, others opted to tell another story that occurred. With respect to Cesar's role in the life of the union and the lives of the participants in the union, Winthrop Segur probably put it best: Cesar was Cesar. Nothing that any of us say by way of opinion really means much at this point. There is far and away enough of a factual record so that Cesar's life and the Union's history speak for themselves. Historians and those who are interested will draw their own conclusions from that record no matter how much we try to write and re-write history. And, as critics and apologists, we may as well be the blue states and the red states, and never the twain shall meet.

30

### **Sam Trickey, 12/23/04 (2)**

**RE: ack when we I learn to spell LeRoy; also a correction**

Dear documentation project list participants –

I did it again. It is LeRoy NOT Leroy. My apologies to LeRoy. I know better but don't type better.

In the 4th paragraph of the section "Movement vs. Union" of my "hesitant remarks" sent this morning, a key "never" was omitted in the second line. Please forgive the error. The paragraph should have read -

"Equally importantly, in all my conversations with ordinary farm workers, almost never has anyone expressed a desire for a sweeping social movement, the utopian dream. Almost always what is expressed is a desire for a life that some radicals might dismiss as bourgeois - medical care for family, a decent house, a reliable car, respect and safety in the work place, etc."

peace, Sam

### **Jerry Brown, 12/23/04**

**RE: What do the farmworkers want?**

Dear Sam,

I recall a time during the Delano table grape strike when the union was supporting a program of building low-cost housing for farmworkers in Earlymart, with the support of Bill Kircher and the AFL-CIO. Earlymart is a small grape-growing town about 20 minutes outside of Delano, where Juanita and I moved after Delano got to be "too busy" for us in the late 1960s.

Some of the "utopian" anglo volunteers protested that this housing project was "too middle-class" and not what they had joined the movement to fight for. Cesar asked them in astonishment, "Just what do you think the farmworkers want?" and wondered aloud if these volunteers were really there to "serve" the farmworkers or if they had another agenda.

However, reflecting back on Cesar's talks / sermons about "servanthood" and about how "to be a man is to suffer for others," more and more, as this discussion unfolds, I see that the union (as I experienced it) was also a movement and to some degree (as someone recently wrote) a quasi-religious order.

So, the paradox is that for some it was a union, and for others a movement, and for others both. As an organizer and myth-maker, Cesar, through his charisma (state of grace), at that time, was able to keep both visions alive.

Similar to your observation, all of the farmworkers I knew in the Delano area were delighted with the housing program, which offered their families the chance to put down roots and stay in one place – which working under a Schenley or other wine grape union contract gave them the opportunity to do, instead of having to live as migrants.

By the way, does anyone know what ever happened to the housing projects in Earlymart and (I think also) Richgrove? Did they get off the ground? Do they still exist today?

- Jerry Brown

### **LeRoy Chatfield, 12/23/04**

#### **RE: YES, SPEAKING FOR MYSELF**

LeRoy Chatfield 1963-1973

Sandy Nathan wrote:

*"(In fact, if I recall correctly, that was precisely the time at which LeRoy took his leave, no doubt exhausted and fully aware that things were going to get a helluva' lot worse before they got better. I realize that LeRoy may speak for himself on this point, but that is the way it looked to many of us.)"*

In his thoughtful and well-written posting, Sandy Nathan speculates about the reasons for my leaving the UFW in August 1973, and suggests that I might clarify the situation, which I do now.

In August of 1973, I was not prescient enough to know that "things were going to get a helluva' lot worse." If my friends and colleagues attributed this reasoning to me, I did not know of it.

No, my reasons were more prosaic and personal. First, my four children were at the age of beginning school, and Bonnie and I wanted them to have a stable elementary school environment; second, my mother had been widowed a few years earlier, and I felt the need to be more available. Third, I broke my pick on the Safeway boycott. Fourth, I did not want to serve on the new executive board, which would be elected at the upcoming UFW convention because I had no stomach for the internal politics of the union, and I was unwilling to make such a long-term commitment.

I write this clarification only as an historical footnote, and because Sandy raised it. I do not mean to give my leaving, or my reasons for leaving, any particular significance in the sweep of the movement.

### **Alberto Escalante, 12/23/04**

#### **RE: From Humberto M. Gomez**

Humberto,

Que gusto me dio cuando empese leer tu ensayo. Nos dejiste como era en los tiempos de antes. Pero, que triste que muchos de los mismo condiciones han regresado y los (pinche) Rancheros poderosos todavia siguen haciendo case lo mismo perro ahora es peor porque todo que se nesesito comprar ahorra es mucho mas caro. Incluyendo los gastos para mantener un carro. Antes, uno podia ir todo la semana en menos de \$20 de gasolina, ahorra te cobran mas que \$40 cada vez que llenas el tanque con gasolina! Al mismo tiempo los sueldos seguian como si estan congelados. Se ve como todo esta caendose para atras, los sueldos, las condiciones, todo que luchamos y sufrimos tantos anos para cambiar por el bueno, con unos hasta perdiendo la vida en la lucha para mejorar la vida de el Campesino. Pero, no nos vamos a rajar. Ya que uno ha visto al otro lado, diciendo ya que uno ha ganado un sueldo bueno y ha tenido aseguranza medico cubriendo su familia, creas que lo va dejar ir tan facil? No way, Jose! Como nos dijo el Senor "Nadien puede parar el trabajador que ya sabe que hay un mejor manera de vivir. Uno que ya a conosido una vida

mejor, no lo va dejar ir tan facil!" Fue bueno ler lo que escribirtes. Y cuando vi a tu nombre pense "OH, Yeah! Humberto, Hmmm, el vato que se "llevo" me V-W "Conejo" que me dio Artie Mendoza! No pero en verdad Humberto tu deveras eres un Hombre de la gente. Te escuchban, porque si notaba que hablablas la neta. Tu hicistes muchisimo bien alla en tu area. Todavia sigues ayudando o trabajando para la Union? Tal vez no vemos alla en Delano o La Paz en Septiembre de 2005. Aye caraye, Chato en donde se han ido todo los anos desde el tiempo cuando usamos pantalones cortitos? Cuidate, Chato.

Como Siempre Tu Amigo

Alberto (Escalante de Volante)

**Nancy Grimley Carleton, 12/23/04 (1)**

**RE: Prop. 14 Decision making**

Sandy Nathan wrote:

*Then came the events of 1976. In early '76, the initial funding ran out for the ALRB. When the Democrats, who controlled the Legislature, opted to not fund the ALRB (in order to protect the Valley Democrat legislators), the Union started gathering the signatures for what would become Prop 14. Initially the signature gathering seemed like a strategy to pressure the legislature to re-fund the ALRB. And that part of the strategy worked. It all came to a head in June 1976 when the Speaker of the House, Leo McCarthy, offered to fund the ALRB if Cesar would drop the initiative. While the decision to go forward with Prop 14 -- and refuse McCarthy's deal to resurrect the ALRB in June 1976 -- may not have been **THE** key mistake of that period, it was pretty damn important and hard to imagine a worse one. At the time, I am confident that most of the leadership knew the decision to go forward was a bad mistake and in retrospect, it came to look even worse than bad.*

Sandy, I very much appreciated your lengthy post examining the effects of the ALRA and the aftermath on what happened with the union.

What I still haven't seen anyone address is why the union leadership held off on full-fledged campaigning for Prop. 14 until the very end of August (really, post-Labor Day in terms of campaigning in full gear). For those of us on the ground (the so-called "foot soldiers," not the leadership), this delay was confusing and near inexplicable -- I imagine especially so for those who had been recruited specifically to work on the campaign but then found themselves being assigned to seemingly peripheral tasks. Yes, we were mobilizing during the summer, but without clarity about what we were mobilizing *for*.

Was the decision to proceed with Prop. 14 truly reached in June (hard to imagine, since we didn't spend our time that summer as if this were the case) or later in the summer? Was the leadership ambivalent about going through with the campaign? Waiting to see what else might develop in Sacramento before committing 100% to the effort? Overconfident about our capacity to pull off a victory in a mere two months given the relative ease with which we gathered the signatures (in record time) to put the initiative on the ballot? Willing to accept defeat at the polls as a possible outcome of the election so long as it put added pressure on the Legislature (i.e., seeing either outcome, win or lose, as a "win" in some sense)?

Given the margin of defeat and the greater financial resources of the growers, it may be that Prop. 14 would have lost even if we'd been campaigning hard over the summer, but I've always wondered. When a grassroots campaign is up against a big-money campaign, time to lay the groundwork can overcome the financial disparity. Of course, when some folks raised this issue at the debriefing held in La Paz after Prop. 14's defeat, we were met with an angry Cesar making his appearance through a window and telling us we were only servants of the farmworkers and didn't have the right to question the leadership's decisions.

If there's anyone out there who had a leadership role that summer (of 1976) or knows something about what the discussions were, I'd appreciate hearing about what went into the decision to delay

active campaigning for Prop. 14. Given the significance of the defeat on what came after, it seems relevant to a full history of this period.

Nancy Carleton

Boycott staff 1975-1976

(San Jose, with two months in the San Fernando Valley during the summer of 1976)

**Richard Ybarra, 12/23/04**

**RE: Prop. 14 Decision making**

Nancy those are good questions...though I was gone and helped all I could in San Diego I would like to share a thought or two on your question...

During that era and even beyond the corporate campaign community enjoyed certain strategic and financial advantages, some obvious and some not, especially to people who believed and acted as we all did at that time.

They did, knew and understood polling and all around public opinion research (just as years later their future kin discovered Willie Horton, Boston Harbor, gay marriage, etc.) In 1976 they discovered the public's perception on the sacredness of PRIVATE PROPERTY - which I believe was Prop 14's Achilles heel.

When I saw the newspaper ads that showed La Paz's "private property u keep out" sign along with their mantra and message "PROTECT PRIVATE PROPERTY" I felt the steepness of the slope increase in the grower's favor....14 years later the grassroots Big Oil Campaign ran into a similar fate....and two Massachusetts residents did so on a national scale....

Peace

Richard

**Nancy Grimley Carleton, 12/23/04 (2)**

**RE: Prop. 14 Decision making**

Richard Ybarra wrote:

*Nancy those are good questions...though I was gone and helped all I could in San Diego I would like to share a thought or two on your question...*

*During that era and even beyond the corporate campaign community enjoyed certain strategic and financial advantages, some obvious and some not, especially to people who believed and acted as we all did at that time.*

*They did, knew and understood polling and all around public opinion research (just as years later their future kin discovered Willie Horton, Boston Harbor, gay marriage, etc.) In 1976 they discovered the public's perception on the sacredness of PRIVATE PROPERTY - which I believe was Prop 14's Achilles heel.*

*When I saw the newspaper ads that showed La Paz's "private property u keep out" sign along with their mantra and message "PROTECT PRIVATE PROPERTY" I felt the steepness of the slope increase in the grower's favor....14 years later the grassroots Big Oil Campaign ran into a similar fate....and two Massachusetts residents did so on a national scale....*

Thanks for responding, Richard. Yes, I remember the private property theme and the scare tactic television ads implying that if Prop. 14 passed, the next thing you know union representatives would be demanding entry to people's private homes to organize their babysitters! These ads were everywhere on the airwaves, and they were hard to counteract even if we had the advantage on the ground. You point out, quite correctly, that the growers had the resources to develop an effective advertising strategy that preyed on people's fears, as many campaigns have done since to devastating effect.

Nancy Carleton



Boycott staff 1975-1976  
(San Jose, with two months in the San Fernando Valley during the summer of 1976)

**Sandy Nathan, 12/23/04 (2)**

**RE: Prop. 14 Decision making**

In answer to your question, although I was not in a leadership position, I do recall that during that summer one of the other things going on was Jerry Brown's campaign for the Presidency. In addition, Cesar gave a nominating speech for Brown at the Democratic National Convention, which I believe was in July/August in New York. So, people were busy with Brown and the focus was elsewhere until the convention was done. I believe we even had some folks involved with the convention. I'm sure Marshall will recall that. I also believe there was a good deal of ambivalence about actually going forward with Prop 14, even though the die had been cast in June. Finally, I may be wrong about this, but I believe there was even a UFW convention late that summer, and that obviously would have taken time.

But regardless of the work we might have done during the summer, I think Richard Ybarra is right in saying that once the growers began their "Private Property" campaign -- which sadly was predictable -- we didn't have a snowball's chance in hell. Prop 14 was an attempt to put the ALRA, including the "frightening" access rule, into the State Constitution. In real terms this meant that UFW organizers' access to grower property would be a constitutional right. In even "more real" terms this meant that brown people would be entitled to go on white people's property. In California in 1976 that was a tough sell. (One of the big questions in writing Prop 14 was whether to include the access rule in the initiative. We did and we paid for it.)

In the summer of 1976 Cesar and the Union were probably at the summit of his and its power. Unfortunately, time refused to stand still.

**Alberto Escalante, 12/23/04**

**RE: Why was the Organizing Team Disbanded.**

To all,

Question: Can anyone give me one good reason why the UFW disbanded and eventually did away with the Organizing Department? And why they decided to piecemeal it out "You go to the Boston Boycott, You go to Contract Administration, You run the San Benito region, You go to El Taller Grafico, etc. etc., etc! Essentially turning what was once a crack team of smart, dedicated, loyal & extremely resourceful Farm Worker Organizers into bean counters and pencil pushers. People whose entire focus had been to enter into a designated area (farming or ranching community). And by using contacts and information they developed with the help of some "friendly" workers from inside (Submarines) these were workers who had been anxiously waiting until it was the right time for them to start gathering and submitting their showing of interest petition or their UFW authorization cards. Meanwhile, this core group of inside workers would continue to meet with the UFW organizers providing them with the names of farm workers who had indicated that they wanted us to start doing some home visits. Even though the UFW organizer would cautiously park a block away or so from the farm workers house he was visiting, sometimes a foreman or "un barbero" would recognize us or the UFW car and hurry off to give the Big Boss the information betraying the farm worker who we were visiting. And even though this was/is against the law to use this privileged type of information against the farm worker or the person who consented to the home visit, still the boss and his goons would keep trying to intimidate the workers by telling them they'd be fired, or worse, if they kept talking with the UFW people about wanting a union contract. Sometimes there'd be Organizers (like yours truly) who would get accosted or shoved around a little, sometimes we'd even get beat up by company thugs who then tried to scare the workers into believing that the Company REALLY meant business! Sometimes this would interfere with the election process and it ended up in the courts where the ALRB would go out and investigate all of the incidents on file! Yet the workers were absolute in their resolve that eventually they would have a union shop where they worked. Until then the case would go to the Union Legal Department until all of the ULP's and other issues were resolved. But until then the UFW's

Organizers would seek out another Company, Ranch or Farm and decide when was the peak harvest period. And so the process of organizing the workers into "Chavistas" would begin all over again. It was exciting work, and every day was interestingly diverse. Meanwhile the farm workers were beginning to develop an awareness and a heightened sense of Pride & Dignity, in themselves and in their occupation. And each year more farm workers would get together with the UFW and each year more Ranches and Farms would get signed up and the union would file for an election with the ALRB. Eventually, according to Cesar he wanted a worker to be able to keep accruing his or her seniority all year round. When work stopped at one ranch, the worker would go to another ranch where his seniority would begin to accumulate as soon as his employment had been confirmed. And even though he would only be doing seasonal work if he kept going to work at places where there were UFW contracts his Pension & seniority would increase at a rapid rate. And so, that and a million other reasons are why I would like to know WHAT or WHO was behind the eventual dissolution and demise of what had once been a crack group of organizers unlike any other who'd ever worked in the lush verdant fields, orchards & vineyards of California. And California was just going to be the start. Early in 1976 after a 3 day/night speaking tour of Southern California to explain what we were calling the Farm Worker Initiative (Prop. 14, although at this juncture it wasn't even a Proposition yet!) and we were all very tired and I was just sort of "Zoning Out" when out of the blue Cesar turned and asked me what I would say to best describe what a "Farm Worker" was. I thought about it and sort of "Hmm-Haww'd" and scratched my head, finally I said "Uhhh, a Farm Worker is someone who works with the earth?" And Cesar sorta looked back at us and smiled wide enough so that I could see that space in between his teeth that I always thought made him look just like an innocent child and says "Yeah! We can probably even organize and sign up the all of the Lumberjacks and coal miners and the Landscapers and the Gardeners!" And then somebody laughed and said that he wanted to run "The Beverly Hills Organizing Campaign" because that's where a lot of Landscapers & Gardeners worked. And their employers were all a bunch of rich white Liberals who would fight over who would provide their workers with the very best contract. And I said that the Patrones would all make sure that every worker signed a contract as a precursor of being hired "Nobody but UFW Gardeners would work in all L. A.!" And we all laughed as the blue Plymouth station wagon wended its way through the Ortega Highway on its way back to La Paz, little did I know that it would be that little silly conversation that would eventually lead to the end of Organizing as we knew it. From then on there would be no more Commando-like groups of UFW organizers, survivalists, ne'er do wells and quite possibly excellent candidates for The French Foreign Legion. We no longer would be completely self contained organizers who needed very little in the way of creature comforts. We were used to satisfying our carnal need within our own little group because we knew that any outside relationships were doomed by the very nature of our need to sever all ties with the "outside world." But by 1978 that era would be all over. Killed by its own efficiency, we'd won too many elections and made too many people aware of what one little group of zealots could accomplish. We'd been studied by Sociologists, courted by Labor experts, used as proof that unless we were stopped we'd usurp the leadership of the Union and give it all away to the workers! Oh My God! What did those Crazy Organizers think they were doing anyhow? By 1976-77 we were very close to being full on Revolutionaries. And the Revolution we related to MOST was a cross between Agrarian Reform/Liberation Theology and the workers taking over not just the means of production, but the distribution of capital as well! Plus, Organizing every damn Landscaper and Gardener in Bel-Air, Brentwood, Beverly Hills and Pico Rivera! Until someone decided to throw in the towel that is. A Gigantic car wreck on Hwy 99 called the "Giumarra Election Fiasco of 1977" (We should have stayed in the row crops at least another year or two).

Alberto Escalante 2004  
(A what is that?)

### **Marshall Ganz, 12/23/04**

#### **RE: Prop. 14 Decision making**

As I recall, when the ALRB was shut down, we had just completed a very successful run of elections in the Imperial Valley, winning 30 out of 32 or something like that, culminating with Bruce Church. Our response to the shut down was to qualify a "farm worker initiative" for the

ballot in record time. We had just decided to form an organizing department and a number of our Imperial Valley crew had adjourned to La Paz to plan the research, recruiting, training, strategizing, etc. that it would take. Instead, and quite enthusiastically, we turned into a signature gathering machine.

In the meantime, Jerry Brown announced he was going to run for President. He asked for our help, initially Gilbert helping out in Maryland, where Nancy Pelosi's family had deep roots, and Jerry helping out up in Oregon. After qualifying the initiative we had quite a machine put together, were discussing whether to go forward with the initiative or not,, but also saw the presidential campaign as a unique opportunity to gain allies at the national level comparable to those we had at the state level. I was sent up to Oregon to lead a write-in effort, took a team of organizers, which included a bunch of ALRB people who were on lay off at the time. We then were sent to Rhode Island where we did a 72 hour write-in and then to New Jersey. We did well in New Jersey, but the night of that primary, the 'party leaders' converged on Jimmy Carter as the nominee, so that was the end of that.

All this was during the spring and early summer, when we weren't too saddened to miss having to face the Teamsters and the growers in Coachella Valley grape elections. Around this time, as I recall, Jerry Brown and LeRoy flew down to La Paz and met with the Board, urging us not to go through with the ballot initiative. Brown had been doing well in the polls, the presidential run hadn't really hurt him, but had real concerns that the initiative would encourage a right wing turnout, making it harder to win California for Carter. Brown did say, however, that if we decided to go ahead, he would do whatever he could to help -- which he did. There was a great deal of ambivalence on the Board about going though with it, but there was also a lot of cockiness based on how well we had done, first, in Imperial Valley, second, in qualifying the ballot initiative, and, third, in our performance in the presidential primaries. And, after all, we had won Prop 22, just 4 years before. I don't remember the precise timing, but, other than doing the research, targeting, etc. we didn't think we had to do too much before Labor Day, and also saw an opportunity to mobilize support at the Democratic Convention in New York, where Brown had asked Cesar to nominate him. We made quite a bit of hay there, including a big fund raiser in the old McAplin Hotel, the last day of its existence, to which everyone came. Right after the Convention, I had been asked to spend a week with Juan Yzaguire, leader of an independent Puerto Rican farm workers association whom we were considering affiliating, visiting farm worker areas in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Connecticut, and New York.

I think I cut the trip short to get back in time for a meeting about going forward with Prop 14, but I'm not certain of the timing. Our biggest error in Prop 14 I think was our naïveté about statewide campaigns, media campaigns, and ballot initiatives in particular - a case in which the only meaning 12, 13, or 14 has to the voters is the meaning it is defined to have, a task accomplished far more effectively on the scale involved with television and mail, than the kind of grassroots work at which we were very good -- and which was very effective at qualifying the initiative for the ballot, winning smaller, more focused elections, such as the primaries, etc. We had no real understanding of how a media campaign worked, and although we were offered help, especially from people who had been associated with Tom Hayden's campaign for the Senate, we were suspicious of the help we were being offered (while all this was happening the purges had already begun at La Paz, with Joe Smith, and with Nick Jones to follow soon; Cesar had already begun to be preoccupied with "assholes", creating an atmosphere in which anyone might be one. We got going in a blaze of activity, opened operations all over the state, and, until voter registration closed, concentrated on an effort to register 100,000 voters that I recall we did very well with (one reason was the money we got from the Democrats that we could use for Prop 14), but we couldn't get our media campaign together, and, once the growers' ads hit, you could almost feel a shift in the mood in the parking lots, reports of the volunteers, etc. No doubt we could have run a more effective grassroots effort, done more organizing and less bumper stickering, started sooner, etc., but I think the only thing we could have done to win would have been to launch a very smart television campaign defining the meaning of prop 14 before the growers could do it, and figuring out how to define it in such a way that we could have inoculated against the private property charge. As it became clearer that we were in trouble, like the people up a famous creek without a paddle, especially with our media campaign, we turned to Brown (who had been raising money for

us) to do an ad, which he agreed to do if we would pull all other ads and rely on him as spokesman. He was at the peak of his popularity at the time, he committed to raise more money, and we agreed. Unfortunately, i think it would up having the opposite effect, starting Brown's decline in the polls, rather than raising us.

In any event, the end came soon, in early November, and I'll never forget the way Tom Bradley spoke in South Central LA to all of us who were in mourning there about being strong enough to lose, to admit it, and to come back and fight another day. We took couple of days off, went up to La Paz, where there was to be an evaluation (which I was certainly nervous about, having been responsible for coordinating the campaign, but which I fully expected would happen), but, just as an evaluation was to begin, Cesar climbed in through the window of the North Unit and called it to a halt. Our organizing team had done an evaluation of the Imperial Valley campaign, of the primaries, and expected to do this one too, but Cesar had other plans. We all went out to Kern River Park where Fred Ross and I had been assigned to interview all the Prop 14 staff to decide who could become an organizer, who could go to a field office, who could serve at La Paz, and who was no longer welcome. We were told to be on the look out for "assholes", especially people who were thought to be part of Nick Jones's boycott conspiracy. Ironically, I believe it was at this same day at the park where Roberto Garcia, Pablo Espinoza, Humberto Gonzales, Bobby De La Cruz, and other field office directors began to put Cesar on the spot, albeit very respectfully, about salaries. We had managed to postpone the reopening of the ALRB until after the election under a new General Counsel, Harry Delizonna (sp?), so a few days later, our organizing team was on its way back to Imperial Valley for Round II, at the same time hoping to build expand on the contracts that were being signed with Salinas Valley growers - which we did.

We likely would have been better off not having run this campaign than having run it, but, so much in the way a movement like this one unfolds is contingent, one never can know. It is also true that Cesar in particular seemed to take losing very hard. It was as if it had been the first time he seriously misjudged the public. They've got the money, we've got the people, he used to say. But, all of a sudden, they got the people too. But far greater than any strategic damage that was done by losing Prop 14 was the extent to which it contributed to the growing sickness within the union which had nothing to do with Prop 14 at all. From my perspective, the purges that began, the paranoia, and all the rest were many times more serious in crippling the union than making a wrong call on Prop 14. A healthy and vital organization can recover from most mistakes because that, in part, is what it means to have a resilient organization -- one that can handle loss, learn from it, and move forward. We had been that kind of organization when we responded to the Teamster suddenly signing a contract with Perelli Minetti in 1966, with losing the Giumarra strike in 1967, with the Teamsters signing 200 contracts in Salinas the night we settled with the grape growers, with the Republicans trying to outlaw the secondary boycott, etc. As the purges wore on, however, we lost more and more of our leadership, our organizational capacity, and our creativity. Unlike a strategic error, this damage to the capacity of the organization itself could never be recouped.

Marshall

**Abby Flores Rivera, 12/24/04**

**RE: What do the farmworkers want?**

Jerry: Yes, they did in both towns. In Richgrove one whole block of the northeast end of town became inhabited by most of the Schenley Ranch Committee members. Many homes were built throughout the small town as well. Cesar was right! That is exactly what farm workers wanted. A house to call their own. /abby

**Jerry Kay, 12/24/04**

**RE: Cesar's fasts**

This is late and out of the blue. But the last few days I have been wondering what effects Cesar's several long and debilitating fasts may have ultimately had on his strength and psyche. He talks about them a lot with Jacques Levy and other places and speaks of his clarity, etc. I was never near him during one, and the closest I came was after the fast in Arizona, some months later. But

those of you who were--and I don't expect you to give medical info-- but did you note any great changes after one; what other effects could have come from them?

Jerry Kay (69-75)

**Terry Carruthers (Vasquez) Scott, 12/24/04**

**RE: Cesar's fasts**

I've also wondered about possible negative effects on his liver from all the home-grown comfrey tea that Cesar used to drink...

Terry (Vasquez) Scott  
1973-1988

**Doug Adair, 12/25/04**

**RE: DAILY FUNDRAISING & HOUSEKEEPING REPORTS**

Dear LeRoy and Bonnie,

Best wishes for a Joyous Christmas and year to come. I really appreciate all you've done to launch this project.

Viva la Causa,

Doug Adair, El Malcriado

**Tom Dalzell, 12/26/04**

**RE: Was Prop 14 the End of the Line?**

LeRoy sees Proposition 14 as the single turning point in the arc of the UFW. In retrospect, yes, Proposition 14 was a mistake, and not just a small mistake but a colossal mistake in the form of hubristic over-reach. I am not convinced that it was more than that, though. We had been guilty of hubris before (shunning advice from other unions as we set up the hiring halls in 1970) and we had made mistakes before (badly misplaying our hand in the 1973 negotiations with the grape growers). Was Proposition 14 a fatal mistake from which we could not have recovered? I think not. In early 1977 we had a successful organizing drive in the asparagus in Imperial Valley and a few months later we had the Teamsters out of the fields and five years of the best labor law in the US and a Board appointed by Jerry Brown in front of us to consolidate. It seems to me that it was with success, not failure, that we fell from grace.

Thanks to the postings on this list, I have come to a new belief about what went wrong. There are at least two sides to most stories, but not to all stories. I look at some of the key events in the late 1970s and can't see another side to many:

- The public humiliations of the Monday Night Massacre at La Paz in April 1977
- The public humiliations of the Delano purges in the summer of 1977
- Cesar's alliance with Synanon and use of the Synanon Game over the opposition of the NEB (except Dolores) and top leadership
- Cesar's immersion in Silva Mind Control
- Cesar's embrace of the military dictatorship of Ferdinand Marcos in direct defiance of convention resolutions
- Cesar's belief that he had the ability to heal
- The firing, eviction and public humiliation of Maria Rifo
- The firing, eviction and public humiliation of Chris Hartmire

These actions were irrational, antithetical to all that we had stood for, and in most cases were simply organizationally sanctioned interpersonal brutality. I can't help but see them as evidence of

more than hubris or error or internal union politics. I can only see them as evidence that something was deeply, deeply wrong. I don't know what it was, but I doubt that it was simply a complete loss of confidence in Cesar due to the events of 1973 and 1976. It seems that a shadow fell over him. I don't know what that shadow was, but the choices that he made suggest that it personal and frightening.

With Cesar's unquestionably brilliant leadership we built a powerful Union. When the shadow fell over him in 1976, all that we had built began to slip away, and a few years later it was effectively gone, well before Deukmejian took office in 1983. It didn't have to happen that way. How sad.

Tom Dalzell

**Kathy Lynch Murguia, 12/26/04**

**RE: Was Prop 14 the End of the Line?**

Good job .....k

**Doug Adair, 12/26/04**

**RE: A Malcriado, guilty of idolatry?**

In a message dated 12/23/04 . . . [Sam Trickey] writes:

*Like many other explicitly Christian supporters, I was and am deeply skeptical of the utopian view. Theologically it is idolatry, the practical consequence of which is that it inevitably is a deeply disappointing failure. (Good theology has good practical consequences.) This is precisely what happens, in my view, in all radical movements, secular or religious. Clear-eyed realism includes dealing with the fundamental brokenness of human relations, our demonstrated inability to do things perfectly, and the inevitability that selfishness, fear, greed, etc. will be interwoven in the very best of efforts. Utopianism claims to have a way around that. It doesn't.*

*(Equally importantly, in all my conversations with ordinary farm workers, almost never has anyone expressed a desire for a sweeping social movement, the utopian dream. Almost always what is expressed is a desire for a life that some radicals might dismiss as bourgeois - medical care for family, a decent house, a reliable car, respect and safety in the work place, etc.)*

*peace, Sam*

Hey, Sam, interesting comments but I'll take some exceptions.... Medical care, decent house, reliable transportation, respect and safety.... sounds pretty utopian to me! If you had been in Delano in the 1960's, oh what dreams you would have heard...

In 1965, the "utilitarian" unionism of Al Green and the AFL-CIO was that the job of the union was to win an extra nickel or dime for the worker, who could then go to the friendly local banker and get the home loan, and then go to the friendly local real estate agent and buy an affordable house.... what's wrong with this picture?

And the Churches' "farm labor programs" typically provided "cookies and milk" for the kids in a day care, so BOTH parents could work at the miserable wages offered...

But in 1965 we were dreaming of opting out of that system. David Burciaga and Bard McAlester of the Friends, out on the West Side, and Jim Drake and Phil Farnum with the Migrant Ministry in Goshen were pushing "self Help Housing" (like Jimmy Carter's Habitat today), where workers came together to build their own homes. The outside church or foundation or whatever would help with coordination, organizing, paperwork, permits, but the workers themselves made the decisions, did the work. Later the government also promoted these programs, and many still exist. The Union was not a direct participant in these programs but urged members to take advantage of them. These programs were geared to the local, permanent residents, who could buy a plot of land, (so less practical for the single guys and migrants), but as Abby says, every family dreamed of owning their own home. The Schenley workers were transforming Richgrove within 5 years of signing their first contract.

Of course, the UFW directly sponsored communal housing, too, both at the 40 Acres and La Paz. And the Village at the 40 Acres, a retirement community connected to and within walking distance of the clinic -- the workers democratically running the enterprise, setting rules, making decisions -- sounds utopian to me! Where else in the country, before or after, have such utopian dreams been made reality?

Medical Care? Go out and give your extra nickel to some rapacious insurance company and buy into the local medical delivery system? We dreamed of setting up our own insurance company (Thank you, LeRoy!) and our own system of clinics..... I would argue that the capitalist health system in this country was and is broken, and for a dozen years, our little tiny union was building an alternative...

A reliable car? The gas station at the 40 acres was right up there with the Clinic and Retirement Village as a priority. The dream was that it would be a co-op, that would buy parts and engines at a discount, offer a set of tools and equipment that workers could check out, a place where they could work on their own cars, where mechanics could give classes on auto repair.... It never quite got off the ground, but we were dreaming dreams...

Invest your extra nickel at the local Bank of America? The BofA had been sponsoring strike-breaking and agribusiness consolidation for half a century, were incestuously entwined with DiGiorgio Corporation in ferocious anti-union strike breaking.... The Farm Workers Credit Union was our hope of opting out of that banking system.

And telling a worker he will have respect and dignity working for an agribusiness corporation....? Farm workers today accept the agribusiness system because no one is offering an alternative. In 1965, Luis Valdez and Phillip Vera Cruz and Tony Orendain and Epifanio Camacho and hundreds of other farm workers were arguing, "It doesn't have to be this way." I saw Padilla and Chavez as open to these ideas, that the movement would move in the direction the workers took it, though their responsibility was to focus on the here and now, what could be accomplished for immediate benefits. It was an incremental approach (starting with the Credit Union, even before the strike), but with a long term vision. We would get the best deal we could from these agribusinesses, but that didn't mean we accepted the system as eternal. In 1972, I worked for Tenneco Farming Company, a 5,000 acre spread near Ducor, with local headquarters in Bakersfield, corporate headquarters in Houston, 2,000,000 acres in Australia, hundreds of thousands of dollars in farm subsidies, politicians in a dozen states and countries at their beck and call.... The corporate decision makers were quite happy to abuse the workers, abuse the vines and land (and consumers) with chemicals, and chew up and spit out the workers like used equipment. When they got a chance, they smashed the union, and ripped up the contract. Even under the contract, they gave us the absolute minimum they could get away with...

You are absolutely right about 1965 being a different world from the present. The world of the WTO and NAFTA and ever larger multi-nationals and agribusiness giants is everywhere triumphant. There were plenty of farm workers in 1965 who had a living memory of the Mexican Revolution, of Emiliano Zapata -- "The land, like the water and the air, belongs to the people...", of Lazaro Cardenas distributing land to the peasants... (Now, with "pollution credits" and water deals, even the air and water is being privatized). President Kennedy was giving lip service to "land reform" in Latin America and the Philippines, and many of us were also asking, "Why not in California?" Visit most farmers' markets today, and you will meet family farmers who love working the land, producing quality (and often organic) food. The "Slow Food" movement celebrates the individual farmer, a food production system not geared to McDonalds and Safeway... That "radical" idea is still out there, but definitely on the defensive, relegated to a "niche" of the world economy...

Maybe the real idolatry is the professed Christian, "clear eyed realist" who endorses an agribusiness system that is so totally based on selfishness and greed. I'm proud there were people dreaming utopian dreams, and "clear eyed realists" like Padilla and Chavez who were mobilizing and organizing us so we could begin moving, one step at a time, towards some of those ("utopian") goals.

Doug Adair  
El Malcriado, 1965-1970  
Tenneco Farming Co. (1971-73), David Freedman Co. (1977-89) under UFW contracts...

**Patty Park (Proctor), 12/26/04**

As we come to the end of this process I would like to reflect on a farmworker leader Jessica Govea. We all get slowly recruited, or I did to join the staff but my first staff job was to work with Jessica at La Paz in the Service Centre in 1972, shortly after I arrived Jessica was sent I think to run a primary in LA for Torres.

When she was part of the Canadian boycott staff Jessica was the voice of the union at almost every labour convention that was ever held anywhere in the country. She brought them to their feet with her speeches and probably made more grown men cry than anyone. But she always did with from a point of view of inclusion. How our struggles were the same, how the values we were fighting for were the same. She always helped everyone understand again in a visceral way why we called each other brothers and sisters. She built relationships and commitment. She reenergised people and they help out in amazing ways.

I also remember that her father was a founding member of CSO in Bakersfield and that the Govea family worked side by side with Cesar in building the NFWA . In Canada she worked in Toronto and then went to head up the boycott in Montreal Quebec in the mid to late 60's. It was a time when many progressive Quebecois were striving to bring about independence for Quebec and a unilingual French speaking Quebec was critical to their agenda. They were as focused on the liberation of Quebec from Canada as we were on the liberation of farmworkers from the growers. They wanted an independent Quebec, we wanted an independent union. The president of the Montreal Labour Council was a Marcell....., a firebrand and high profile separatist leader and head of the CNN the Quebec union that was the rival of the international unions in Quebec. There is a story about Jessica speaking at the Labour Council, starting out in English challenged by xxxxxxx that she was not speaking French she quietly explained that her first language was Spanish just as French was the first language of most of the people in the room. She had something very important to talk to them about -- the struggle of farmworkers to a union of their choice -- and she knew that many people also understood English so she chose to speak English so she could tell her story about the needs of farmworkers to have a union to gain justice and fair working conditions, just the way they had organized their unions for these ends. The room went silent, she spoke, they listened and of course applause at the end. Montreal became one of the most successful boycott cities in North America and certainly made a difference in the Canadian contribution..

So when people talk about the leadership that was lost in the late '70's I think about Jessica and the Govea family. Founders of the movement and union.

**Susan Drake, 12/26/04**

**RE: Jessica Govea**

AMEN, Patty. And that woman could sing in a way that scooped up our deepest emotions and laid them out to face honestly. You may not know that Jessica has battled cancer for several years. Anyone with a current update? I believe she's still living in NJ.

Susan Drake (1962-73)

**Jeff Sweetland, 12/26/04**

**RE: Was Prop 14 the End of the Line?**

Tom - Many, perhaps most of us on this listserv are unfamiliar with the particulars of "some of the key events in the late 1970s" that you list in your post from this morning. I am speaking especially of the first two items and the last two items, the four examples that you cite of "public humiliation." Without more information, it is a little hard for us to evaluate how these items



support your basic premise. The four items in the middle of your list have been fairly well fleshed out over the course of this conversation.

Jeff Sweetland

**Alberto Escalante, 12/26/04**

**RE: Was Prop 14 the End of the Line?**

Hi Tom,

I considered myself both privileged and humbled to have been able to assist in the first 3 years of the UFW Organizing Campaign under the ARLA and Proposition 14 (experience). In late 1974 rumors were flying about an NRLA type of law being churned out of Sacramento that would enable California's farm workers to enjoy many of the same rights as those craft and trade workers who'd organized during the 1930's under the National Labor Relations Act. But Farm Workers had been excluded from consideration or coverage by the NLRA and now with the specter of a NLRA type of Act being hashed out in the legislature up in Sacramento. The buzz was on that it was going to be a Hot, Hot Summer in the fields, orchards and vineyards of California beginning with a Statewide March from the border in San Isidro, CA. to the Capital in Sacramento down to the UFW National Convention in Fresno. Spreading the word of this "New" Farm Worker Law to every farming & agricultural community in California.

And after being trained by Fred Ross I was cast in the guise of a Farm Worker organizer in order for me to experience first hand some of the most incredible moments during those wildly tumultuous years of 1975-1978! I can only say that for me at least, it was a wonderful period. And an exciting era full of sweeping Historic change and I feel greatly honored to have been allowed to be a witness first hand to a period in time that for many may well prove to be at the pivotal point in some of the most radical moments of our lifetime. Recently while I was looking back at those years, I started to recite the Rap that I used in those years, it was a rather "Pie in the Sky" sounding spiel that went: "Recently, the State of California signed into effect a law that now gives you the right to openly discuss whether or not you want to have a union represent you here at your place of employment. You now have the right to openly wear and display proof of your preference for or against the United Farm Worker or the Teamsters or for No-Union at all. You can wear buttons or put bumper stickers on your car. You have the right to have or read their leaflets or any other materials. If you want, you can even talk to a UFW or Teamster representative or organizer before work, during your lunch break or after you leave work. And the owner or any of their agents can't threaten or coerce or intimidate you, or in anyway deny you of any of your legal rights under this new law." Believe me it took a while before the workers realized that something substantial was taking place. And although their suspicions were aroused shortly after the law went into effect, and the matter of our being allowed complete access was challenged and the Access clause of the ALRA was suspended, then reenacted again... Going back and forth (like some whacky tennis match). And every time the sheriff or other law enforcement people would come and haul the union organizers off to jail. It really cast a definite "Chilling Effect" over the entire electoral process. Imagine trying to explain to the workers the laws finer points, its edicts and the so-called protections of the "new" Farm Worker law. And while you're trying to tell the farm workers to not worry about being fired or even think anything negative or about the fact that they've just seen a UFW organizer being hauled off to jail for trespassing? T'weren't easy, McGee! But, thanks to the final ruling that finally guaranteed us that access periods were indeed legal and necessary. Allowing access to the workers even though they were on private property (1/2 hr before work, all during their lunch break and after work) was necessary because often it was the only time we could see them. Yes, a real need existed for legal access to the workers under certain guidelines, of course. But to me it was the Granting of Access that made real organizing possible. It finally set the stage for the "Great Imperial Valley Turkey Shoot" AKA The UFW Imperial Valley Organizing Campaign of 1975. We were a prime example of the "Right Time/Right Place" Phenomenon. And it really scared the damn coveralls off of most of the owners of ranches, farms and farm land in California and Arizona. Although Arizona's laws were altogether different than those here in California, still because of the way some companies like Bud Antle, Bruce Church, Interharvest and a few other Mega-Growers operated, the border

between California, Arizona and in some cases Mexico was only a blur as were the laws governing Organizing and Unions. With Arizona's anti-Union Right to Work laws being the biggest obstacle in the path of any plans to organize Arizona's farm workers. And so, it appears to me as if all of the "Big Boys" of the California Farm Bureau got together and realized they had to put the kibosh on the ALRB to stop any further damage to the fiefdoms of California's rich landowner elite. Thus, the blockage of funds to halt any further activities and protections by the ALRA/ALRB stopped the UFW from winning anymore elections. With the Farm Bureau accusing the ALRB of being biased in favor of the UFW. Was the ALRB Biased? Were they in fact acting in concert with the UFW? You were there Tom, you tell me. I'd rather just say that the Board was there to protect the interests of the Farm Workers, and apply the law as objectively as possible. Its staff included people who had once been UFW volunteers, but that's only the nature of the beast. You couldn't find people who were any more knowledgeable with the problems of California's Farm Workers than ex-UFW volunteers. So of course they would obviously score well on any employment applications or interviews to work for the ALRB. But the ALRB people that I met were only interested in whether or not the farm workers were receiving complete and just application of the law. More than that I won't say. Although we were told by the Union leadership that the organizers & ALRB people were not to fraternize or be seen hanging out together. Which was almost impossible since we were always doing the same things together. But just the fact that the growers and the Farm Bureau and the Grower-controlled legislature could just stop the ALRB cold whenever it wanted to signaled the need for a law that had a much more permanent basis something that would really protect the rights supposedly guaranteed under the ALRB but were at best always just one controversy away from not being funded! I believe that's why Cesar tried to get the ALRA written into the State constitution and out of the reach of the Growers and their "Hired Hands". It's too bad we got eaten alive with the whole private property smokescreen, but we showed the growers that we weren't ever going to run and hide from them ever again. But I also agree that we should have stayed in row crops after we regrouped again. I learned within a couple of hours after starting organizing the Vineyards again in Coachella that some of those grape workers really hated the Union. And some had more than enough reason to be PO'ed at the Union and the Union Leadership. It was then that the skeletons started to rattle and fall out of the closets of every grape growing area we'd ever been in. And it got pretty ugly, too! Not the way we were treated by the Lechugeros! Now they really wanted us to organize everywhere they went. But for some reason Cesar felt he had to go back into the vineyards and make some sort of restitution or so whatever....As a result the whole Organizing machine crashed and burned.

And that was the real Travesty of that whole episode, not Losing Prop 14 (IMHO).

Alberto Escalante 2004

**Mary Quinn Kambic, 12/26/04**

**RE: Cesar's fasts**

I met Cesar only twice and was not active in California as most of you have been. However, a few years ago I met a physician at Johns Hopkins, Thomas O'Toole, who said his (O'Toole's) father had been a union leader and friends with Cesar, and commented that Cesar had been in "advanced renal failure" because of the fasts. He told me this after I mentioned that when Al Rojas visited Pittsburgh a few years ago during an SEIU convention, he met with former boycott volunteers. Al told us that later in his life, Cesar was sick and that one time, Cesar introduced himself to Al, not remembering who he was. Al shared with the volunteers that this was very sad.

Mary Quinn Kambic  
Pittsburgh Boycott

**Doug Adair, 12/27/04**

**RE: Eugene Nelson and Texas**

In a message dated 11/22/04 . . . [Kathy Murguia] writes:

\* \* \* \*

*LeRoy is looking for someone who knew Gene Nelson. I was around him, but never felt I knew him. Could you lend some info on this? Hope you are well. I stay in touch with Mark Day. Take Kathy Murguia*

Dear LeRoy, Kathy

We had a number of visits from Eugene Nelson in the '80's and '90's, last address in Hawaii, where his daughter, Tamara lived (married, a nurse)...But my last mail to him was returned, c. 1998?

Eugene had known Tony Orendain and Dolores Huerta before 1965, and had helped write/translate Tony's autobiography of his early years as an ILLEGAL ALIEN, in a beautiful and powerful book, (ups, I can't find it, who did I lend it to? Bardacke?), several others about Wobblies, and was visiting in Delano when the strike started. He was a picket captain, then assigned to the Schenley boycott in Houston, and then left the staff (turned down an assignment to go to Chicago under Bob Solodow, I think, thought he had seniority), and went down to the Rio Grande Valley, invited out to Rio Grande City, where a couple of locals, a used car salesman and an insurance salesman (?) thought they might attach their dreams to the union, called a rally, and promoted a strike in the melons in June of 1966..... Eugene gave a fiery speech, and a thousand workers were on strike, and called Delano for help.... no preparation, no prior organizing, no money, the leadership in Delano horrified... Texas a right to work state with labor laws written by folks that regretted the change in labor relations imposed by the Yankees in 1865.... La Casita Farms, the major grower, was right on the river, could bring crews across the border by boat (or wading) without ever going on public property.... a hopeless situation....

But it could be argued that no place in the U.S. needed a union more than the Rio Grande Valley, and the labor stream that started there greatly affected the California scene (and Wisconsin and Ohio and the Mid west)...

Eugene promoted a march from the Rio Grande Valley to Austin, and a priest and a protestant minister promoted themselves as spiritual leaders of the movement, collecting money and fighting among themselves for the spoils and jostling to be at the front of the march, and who was wearing a bigger crucifix. Gov. Connelly's refusal to meet with the marchers, and his senatorial candidates' confrontation with the marchers outside Austin, led to a Latino rebellion against the Democrats, and is credited with electing the first Republican ever (John Tower) to a statewide office.

Tony Orendain and then Gil Padilla were sent to try to bring some kind of order and organization to the operation (with Bill Chandler the administrative assistant to both) and I went down in 1967 to open a Texas edition of El Malcriado. Mass arrests by the Texas Rangers in June of 1967 led to the court case (Medrano et al vs. A. Y. Alee and the Texas Rangers) that overturned the entire Texas labor code (I was arrested for Criminal Syndicalism, helped me avoid Viet Nam).

Hurricane Beulah wiped out most of what was left of the union. Tony went back down (where he still has a radio station and where his family settled), and the union has an office, but I don't think we ever got any contracts. The UFW was recently in the news for supporting ("organizing") church secretaries at some Catholic Church. I gather there is a good service center program.

Eugene was criticized as a romantic, for getting sucked into a wildcat with no hope of winning, of distracting from the main and unfinished struggle in Delano and California. But his involving the union in Texas set off a wild fire of organizing among Latinos, and contributed to an upheaval in Texas politics, labor relations, a rejuvenation of the Texas labor movement, pressure on the Catholic Church to respond to Latino concerns (Bishop Flores, the first Latino Bishop, followed soon after in San Antonio)...

The folks in Florida have complained that the Californians had a problem with understanding and relating to the different set of conditions on the East Coast, and Texans complained about the same thing. The argument in Delano was that we needed to build a real foundation in California first, that that is where we had put in years of organizing, even before 1965. Many folks in Texas wanted to see their fund raising and boycott activities helping deal with the local problems, after the melon strike put the issue before the public, while folks in California viewed it as a "no win" situation, we couldn't walk away from it, but it would be a "quagmire", to use a word current in

1967. In the debates in People's Cafe in Delano, there were heavy revs promoting strikes and wildcats everywhere, a la Che Guevara, "one, two, many Delanos!", put the issue on the table before the American public, no matter if the strikes lost.... the counter argument being that the people sticking their necks out, going to jail, losing their jobs and income for an immediate negative impact on their families, were going to feel burned, used, "chewed up and spit out," to use a phrase, and were going to be negative the next time we asked for help. The history of unions starting strikes and then walking away, during the 1940's and 1950's, had given unions a bad name. (In fact, many of the negative votes in the grape industry that Alberto refers to (1977) were folks from Texas, for whom the hiring hall and seniority and back dues all seemed designed to favor the local permanent residents, the Californios)...

Padilla went down to Rio Grande City in early 1967, with hopes of generating publicity, focusing attention on the problems, going through the motions of a strike, but building a foundation for an intense (and brief) boycott (La Casita, the target, was connected to Hardin Farms, the Salinas lettuce grower, and sold most of its crop in Chicago). The only railroad trestle going into Rio Grande City had been burned, that winter (when I arrived in Texas, Bill Chandler welcomed me and told me never to ask about the trestle, and I never did), so the growers and state mobilized to protect the trains. The mass picketing planned for the first week of the harvest had picket lines in Mission, Harlingen, three or four towns where the train would pass through. The growers/state/Rangers/RR had one of those cars that can drive on the tracks as well as the road, and apparently had a mounted machine gun pointing out the back. I can imagine one kid throwing a rock, and the Rangers gunning down the whole picket line ("they were only Mexicans!"). Shortly before the train arrived in Mission, the Rangers waded into the crowd and arrested Padilla, Chandler, me, about a dozen people, including Pancho Medrano, the Regional Director of the UAW. After we arrived in jail in Edinburg, Pancho used his dime to call Walter Reuther, and before the night was over, the jailers have received calls from all over the country, senators, labor leaders, maybe even a prelate or two... tremendous publicity, but the melons got picked and sold...

Padilla also mobilized Texans to pressure Washington, and first the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, and then the Senate Committee on Farm Labor came to Rio Grande City, focusing national attention on the problems. And at one point, he organized independent union members in Mexico (an independent brick layers union among them), and they picketed the International Bridge in Roma, while we picketed on the American side, trying to draw attention the "day workers," who lived in Mexico, but had permits to cross the river and work for the day and then go home. Gov. Connelly apparently personally called the governor of Tamaulipas or Nuevo Leon urging the Mexican police to take off the gloves and get tough, and there were echoes in Washington about the border. With almost no budget, Padilla (and Tony too) really made a significant impact. I think Cesar and Larry were right to focus on the work in progress in California, but I also credit them with putting enough resources into Texas so we can look back with pride as to what we did accomplish there...

Viva la Causa

Doug Adair, Texas edition, El Malcriado, 1967

**Graciela Martinez (Herron), 12/27/04 (1)**

**RE: A Malcriado, guilty of idolatry?**

By Jove, Doug - you took the thoughts right outta my mind and put them down in writing! I knew from the first day I met you that you were special somehow. I also believe you are amongst the few in this listserv that see things the way they really were, and are more willing to give credit where credit is really due. The union was not made by one but by many, and I have been blessed to have known and been a student of people you mention here, like my ex-boss whose job I now have, Bard McAllister, and Howard Washburn and the others, the people in Goshen - that's where I knew Jim Drake, when he'd come around the Farm Labor office, David Burciaga, Gil Padilla. These were the people I knew, working as Bard's assistant, when the Goshen group began building, and we took a big part in giving life to Self Help Enterprises (SHE). Over 5,000 individual homes built to date, giving so much to so many people. Renewed hope for a better

future for their families. This organization, built by so many hardworking people is still going, 35 years later. We're into multi-family housing, always searching for ways to help make dreams of owning a home real for farm workers. I say "we" because I am honored to be the president of the Board of SHE.

We did a wonderful job, all of us. We went riding on a wave that is still carrying us into the future. Those years helped shape me into the person I am today. I cherish them, and all of you who were there during this special time of my life. I will remember you as long as the Wonderful Power keeps me able. Bless you and your family. I hope to be "seeing" you through the new listserv. Thank you, LeRoy, for putting us back in touch. I treasure this and needed to let you know how much you have impacted my life. And for the rest of us "oldsters" – whether "good" or "bad", we went through an experience in our lifetime that served a lot of families and continues to serve. Life's road is not always smooth, but even if we fell, we were there to help push each other up to keep on going, and here we are. Blessed be all of you.

**Graciela Martinez (Herron), 12/27/04 (2)**

I remember Jessica. Didn't she marry Gil Flores, who works at the CRLA office in Delano? What wonderful things you write about her. I hope she somehow gets to see what you wrote about her. Sometimes we don't know how we impact other people's lives. Thanks for sharing with us.

**Susan Drake, 12/27/04 (1)**

**RE: amending Doug's Texas email**

Doug forgot to mention that Jim Drake was arrested outside the (I guess it was Edinburgh) jail, praying for Gilbert who was locked up inside! I suppose Jim could have been praying in his basso profundo voice, but I doubt that. Just his presence seems to have been sufficient reason for a Ranger to round him up. :-)

Susan Drake (1962-73)

**Alberto Escalante, 12/27/04 (1)**

**RE: Eugene Nelson and Texas**

To all my Brothers and Sisters,

When Kathy Murguia wrote to ask if he knew the whereabouts of the elusive Eugene Nelson, Doug Adair wrote out a nifty Bio on the man. By doing so Doug once again colored in between the lines of history providing us with a more complete look at a person who had only been a by-line, or the name of somebody whose UFW participation was up until then somewhat sketchy and vague. But, after Doug Adair's wonderfully enlightening story which reads as is if you're there alongside of Eugene Nelson, I now feel like I know him a little better. In fact, my curiosity was so peaked by Doug's writing that I punched in a "Google" search for myself by simply typing in the words: "Eugene Nelson labor organizer and writer". What it disclosed was a veritable wealth of Labor and Civil Rights history. An exciting pageantry that includes the Wobblies, Religion, Texas and the UFW, all interwoven into a rich tapestry of Labor History that is connected with a common thread by the name of Eugene Nelson. I wholeheartedly suggest that anyone who's interested in learning more about Eugene Nelson make a similar search and read about the exciting history of the realm of organized Labor before there were many of the legal protections that we now take for granted, but were set in place to insure and safeguard our Civil and Human rights as workers. But things can change, and just because we have them now, who knows what the future holds for labor, given the complete lack of concern for the needs of the working class by the Bush administration.

Les Deseo a Todos un Prospero y Feliz Ano Nuevo.....

Alberto Escalante 2004 (almost 2005)

**Richard Steven Street, 12/27/04**

**RE: Eugene Nelson**

Folks:

I have several pages on Eugene Nelson in the second half of the two-volume study of the photographers and photography of California farmworkers. The first volume [Photographing Farmworkers in California 1850 - Present (Stanford Univ. Press, 2004)] stressed the imagery. But the second half [forthcoming] is 750 pages of text about the photographers, quite a story, and it turns out Nelson had plenty of experiences photographing at Delano, and goes into some detail about having his camera stuffed down his throat, getting some good pics, taking them to the Delano photo shop, and then having the clerk tell him they were ruined in processing. It's a story that recapitulates a similar experience that a Salinas Index Tribune photo had photographing the 1936 lettuce packer's strike, as well as other photographers. I interviewed Nelson and corresponded with him in the late 1970s, when he was living in Forestville. I believe he was working on a memoir then. I did not know of his move to Hawaii. He should be interviewed, if he is still living, and his archive placed somewhere. I group him with John Kouns, Jon Lewis, George Ballis, Paul Fusco, and Ernest Lowe as the most intrepid of the early movement photographers 1960-1966, but there were many others, such as Sam Kushner, Harvey Richards, Ted Streshinsky, Emmon Clarke etc. only just now being appreciated. Cesar used to pack a Nikon. Did anyone ever figure out what happened to his pics? I've never seen one attributed to him.

Richard Steven Street

**Scott Templeton, 12/27/04**

**RE: Philip Vera Cruz, Early Signs of Paranoia, and Eugene Nelson**

Dear Fellow Staffers,

Forgive me if I bring up an issue that has already been discussed. I have not been part of the discussion for long. However, here goes.

In biography entitled "Philip Vera Cruz: A Personal History of Filipino Immigrants and the Farmworkers Movement" by Craig Sharlin and Lilia Villanueva (1992), Philip Vera Cruz discusses on pgs. 109-115 his resigning from the Executive Board and how the rest of the board members and close observers--Kent Winterrowd, Chris, Eliseo, Jerry Cohen, and Marc Grossman--ganged up on him to sign some kind of statement that nothing said in the board meeting would ever be made public and that he must turn over all of his union-related papers to the union. According to Vera Cruz and his author-transcribers, the board was worried that he would write some memoirs that would be critical of the union and Cesar's leadership. Most, if not all, of those who ganged up on Philip eventually were also deemed untrustworthy and ousted by Cesar.

My fiancée once remarked that I and others in the UFW acted as if we were part of a cult. I vehemently denied that there was any similarity. But, in retrospect, there was at least a grain of truth to her remark. I can remember giving the official UFW (i.e. Cesar's) interpretation of Cesar's trip to the Philippines. I vaguely recall telling someone that Marshall had left because of a power struggle with Cesar, that he wanted to become the de facto leader of the union. In retrospect, I was probably mouthing the Party (i.e. Cesar's) line. I was usually 'on message' when I worked for the union.

I don't tend to be a historian. Nonetheless, my impression is that contributions of Filipino farmworkers to the UFW have been downplayed even if they were proportionately less than those of Mexican or Mexican-American farmworkers.

Group behavior and mass psychology can be scary things. The Republican party operatives demonstrated the power of everyone being 'on-message'. It might have been important that the union had a united front to deal with its enemies and the press, especially in the early years. However, at what point does a united front become a gag order for expression of dissent even in private?

I have a copy of Eugene Nelson's Huelga: The First Hundred Days of the Great Delano Grape Strike. Is this a common book?

Happy New Year

Scott Templeton

Jan. 1980 – Feb. 1981 (LA Boycott), summer 1982 (Salinas and Watsonville), and first half of 1985

**Susan Drake, 12/27/04 (2)**

**RE: Philip Vera Cruz, Early Signs of Paranoia, and Eugene Nelson**

Historian/author Paul Henggeler (now deceased) found Board meeting tapes at Wayne State that he believed revealed more than Cesar ever intended to go public. Too bad if it's true that they hurt Philip as Scott says the Board did when it was Cesar himself (intentionally or unintentionally) spilling confidential comments.

Susan Drake (1962-73)

**Alberto Escalante, 12/27/04 (2)**

**RE: Philip Vera Cruz, Early Signs of Paranoia, and Eugene Nelson**

In a message dated 12/27/2004 . . . [Scott Templeton] writes:

*Philip Vera Cruz discusses on pgs. 109-115 his resigning from the Executive Board and how the rest of the board members and close observers --Kent Winterrowd, Chris, Eliseo, Jerry Cohen, and Marc Grossman --ganged up on him to sign some kind of statement that nothing said in the board meeting would ever be made public and that he must turn over all of his union-related papers to the union. According to Vera Cruz and his author-transcribers, the board was worried that he would write some memoirs that would be critical of the union and Cesar's leadership. Most, if not all, of those who ganged up on Philip eventually were also deemed untrustworthy and ousted by Cesar.*

To all,

Unfortunately, Mark Sharwood and I both became, unknowingly, and unfortunately witnesses to that whole horrible event. I yield any further comments, of that tragic and vicious attack on a true hero, Phillip Vera Cruz, to my worthy partner Mark Sharwood the day that we worked typing and copying off all of the discussions that took place leading to the Resolution that they used to dismiss Phillip...

A truly sad and shameful day in UFW history

Alberto Escalante 2004

**Ken Schroeder, 12/27/04**

**RE: values and actions**

Before this conversation ends I want to jump in. It's been great to hear from so many of you. We did some amazing things together.

I'd like to address the issue of how we related to each other as volunteers, especially as to how consistent we were in our values and in our actions. The farm workers' movement worked to win justice through non-violent action. We fought against the idea that workers were mere implements of production. We worked to empower people to overcome fear and to speak the truth. I believe we often fell short in how we lived these values within the union.

When we worked without regard for our health and when we neglected family, we were not non-violent with ourselves. When volunteers were unfairly fired or pushed out without explanation and when we watched that happen to others without speaking up, we were not non-violent with each other.

In boycott house meetings I recall talking about how farm workers were fired without cause and about how workers were afraid to talk about working conditions for fear of losing their jobs.

Within the union, volunteers were often treated as expendable and replaceable. Many volunteers, especially in the late 70's and early 80's, were reluctant to openly discuss issues for fear of being labeled disloyal or fired.

I'm glad to see these issues being discussed, because we need to learn from our experience and we need to pass on what we have learned. There's so much to do and we have so much to offer.

On a personal note, I have been living in Modesto and working for Migrant Education teaching English to elementary school students. I'm divorced and my 19-year-old, Daniel, is in college. I've been active with our local peace group and have recently gotten involved in faith-based community organizing with PICO.

In the little time remaining, I'd really like to hear from others who have not yet joined the discussion. Where are you and what are you doing?

Peace to all,

Ken Schroeder 1974-1989 Connecticut, Montreal, Toronto, Delano, Lamont, Coachella, Livingston, La Paz, Stockton, Napa

#### **Theresa and Blase Bonpane, 12/28/04**

##### **RE: Jessica Govea**

i was so moved by your words about jessica govea and her battle with cancer. blase and i worked under her supervision in approx. 1971 in l.a. she was a powerhouse. tho we were neophytes in organizing, i can't tell you how much i learned from her, marshall, and leroy. theresa and blase bonpane.

#### **Humberto Gomez, 12/28/04 (1)**

Dear LeRoy and Participants:

Pato (El Malcriado), glad to see that you and Debbie did remember my name. I hope to be in Imperial Valley in mid January or February, I will stop to see you and Debbie.

To brother Escalante, no I don't work with the UFW since 1989. I am working as Director of Organizing with the Southern California District Council of Laborers' (LIUNA). Sorry about taking your VW I only applied my seniority, by the way, don't blame my compa Artie, I used my Mexican key to start the car.

To my sister Abby (Peleonera) and Jorge, mis respetos y saludos. Espero verlos en Septiembre.

#### **Humberto Gomez, 12/28/04 (2)**

Dear LeRoy and All Participants:

LeRoy, \* \* \* \* Thank you for all your good work. I hope that some day you will put another project together, where we will be able to thank and recognize all those farm workers families such as the Amescuas in Salinas Valley, Sra Serrano in Coachella, Dona Lupe in Blythe, Los Rojas and Gonzalez and many more in the San Joaquin Valley, Felix El Cubano in Napa and many more Farm workers families that are all over the states of California and Arizona opened their hearts and home to all of us and made our jobs more easy, by not worrying about where to stay and what to eat.

The project was very good but we where talking only about us the staff volunteers. Remember we were getting paid \$5.00 \$10.00 dollars per week plus \$3.00 per day for hotel and food when traveling not much but we were getting paid. Equally we need to recognize all families and volunteers from all over the county and Canada that same as the Farm workers opened their hearts, homes and wallets to enhance the Farm worker cause. I can tell you that without the support of volunteers such as Cruz Bustamente Sr., Hector Abeytia, and our tortilla connection in Fresno, we will not have been able to have those good conventions and provide food and room for all delegates and strikers, at no cost to the Union.



Best wishes for all during 2005. See you in September

SI SE PUEDE

Humberto M. Gomez

**Alberto Escalante, 12/28/04 (1)**

*RE: Jessica Govea*

To J,

Many was the long and dark Imperial Valley night that Sister Jessica Govea would stay and translate text after text of leaflet after leaflet using her own precious sleep time to stay and help me. I will always the memory of her smile, my, didn't Jessica have the best & brightest smile in the entire UFW! And her voice, nothing less than a Seraph could even come close to her rendition of "Cu, cu, ru cu-cu Pal-o-ma!" Or any other song she sang.. She once told me her favorite song was the a cappella version of the civil rights song "Freedom." Jessica I hope you can read these words "I love you my Sister and may God protect you, mi amiga tan guapa y valiente!"

Que Dios te Bendige,

Alberto Escalante 2004

(ps Are you the Blase Bonpane who wrote so eloquently of "Liberation Theology" and the works of certain Revolutionary Priests who were working in South and Central America? If so I really was enlightened by its message. Thanks.. AE)

**Julie Kerksick, 12/28/04**

*RE: reactions to the listserv*

Dear Fellow Travelers,

Here are some thoughts as we come to the end of the listserv--somewhat random but also responses to many over-arching themes touched upon over the past months. In some ways, they are simply a re-hash of my essay, but in my head and heart, they are magnified by the experience of listening to all of you who have participated in the listserv over the past year. I did not serve long enough or in a senior enough position to contribute to much of what has been said on specific campaigns or decisions, but there are lots of topics that connected with my experience and the impact of the UFW on my life since then.

\*On the One Hand, On the Other Hand....\*

I came into the UFW wanting to make a real difference in the lives of farmworkers, dazzled by the prospect of large-scale social change, and inspired by the opportunity to put my faith into action. I left the UFW believing that we had made a difference, and grateful for the incredible opportunities to work on something that was important, and taught me so much. But I also left with less assurance that the UFW would reach its full potential. Because the same people that made it possible to achieve the impossible, weren't always able to take it to the next stage. Though I was less dazzled by the promise of large-scale social change, I was still deeply committed to working long-term for change, and grateful for the experience which taught me that the impossible is (somewhat) possible. I was not cynical, and left with the understanding that whatever I did, I should undertake it with clear purpose, strong analysis, good strategy, hard work, accountability--and humility.

The UFW was where I learned that there was something called organizing that had the potential to really make a difference in people's lives; it showed me ways to accomplish this; it helped me grow and develop professionally and personally--but it also modeled some of the worst aspects of organizing as well. It was hard for me to accept some of the things I saw. We were expected to work without time off or without regard to needs that changed over time (the ability to work for the stipend, for example). Individuals were told what to do, with little ability to influence the

decisions that affected them. Guilt was a weapon that was wielded a little too often to keep us from pushing too hard when we questioned a decision or strategy.

Still, I was always aware that I was there by choice, and that the stakes were not the same for me as they were for farmworkers. In that regard, I always felt that I was privileged to be part of it, and enormously thankful for all the help and mentoring I received from the boycott and field office staff with whom I worked.

My husband and co-worker, John Gardner, and I left in March 1977. We did not experience the effects of the loss of Proposition 14 or the Game or the purges. But I felt then, and I feel now, that terrible things were said and done in the name of justice for farmworkers. The UFW is not unique in this regard. It is, if anything, like every other movement and social change effort that I've known or studied. Creating real change that leads to greater equality, opportunity and security for all of us is never neat, easy, or uniformly accomplished. That is especially true when one is committed to working for change within democratic structures. When I forget this, I am doomed to suffer yet another broken heart. (There have been many in the past thirty years.)

But acknowledging that certainty of imperfection is not the same as accepting it without a fight. That's what I hear from so many of you on this listserve. Thank you.

\*On the Boycott:\*

What a revelation it was to discover that individuals in St. Louis, Missouri, could have a positive impact on the lives of farmworkers 2,000 miles away, by choosing not to buy something--and then letting the growers know it. I was, and remain, in awe of the brilliance and power of the boycott when it is done effectively. Being part of the grape/Gallo/lettuce boycotts changed my life--in large part, because I believe it changed the power equation between farmworkers and growers. On the other hand, I couldn't see the sense of continuing boycotts when they are more symbolic than real. So I've been selective in which ones I support over the years.

\*On Fred Ross, Sr and Learning Organizing:\*

I learned a lot from Fred, though it took me a long time to acknowledge his clay feet. I am not sure I understand them yet.....but I learned so much that I still apply to my work today. I think the house meeting model is great. I have used the "pindown" countless times to move from talk to action--or lived to regret it if I failed to use it. I have seen the legitimacy of the issue approach to organizing, and how one can do it with integrity. I have learned about leadership development, and how hard recruitment is, but how much a relatively small number of people can accomplish if they are organized, focused and disciplined.

I loved the fact that the UFW brought together people directly affected by an issue and people who were concerned on their behalf. Alone, farmworkers could not wield sufficient power to force the growers to change working conditions, wages or benefits. But combining the concerned consumers with the farmworkers willing to organize, we could wield enough power to affect growers. That powerful lesson has stayed with me in every thing I've done in the past thirty years. The New Hope Project (where I work) and its predecessor organization, Congress For a Working America, use[d] this model to good effect.

I (hopefully) brought something to the farmworkers with my time, commitment, education and energy. I learned many things from them in return. This is still true today in how I approach my work with unemployed and under-employed workers. Individuals may be poor, or lack power, but people are not stupid about recognizing whether someone is working with them out of mutual respect. Some of the farmworkers I met had much more experience in organizing than I had, and it was obvious that I was their student. But even the many farmworkers I met who were looking to me for direction or help were teaching me as they helped me understand their world views, their families, their cultures and their work.

\*On Balancing Work and Family:\*

Richard and Barbara Cook were married and had three children when they recruited me to work for the UFW--first as a volunteer while I was a student at St. Louis University (1970 to 1973), and

later as a volunteer in a staff role (starting in 1974). I thought a lot about how they managed to do the work for the long haul, and still be parents. I don't know how they or their children evaluate the ways they combined their work and family life, but it was an inspiration to me.

John and I have three sons, ages 23, 20 and 14. We've not done it perfectly, but I feel our children have both helped us stay committed and engaged in our work, and also been the centering force away from the work, to remind us that saving the world starts at home.

I can think of dozens of individuals and couples who taught me by example about how to take care of myself and friends and family while also trying to work hard for a better world. Thanks to each of you.

\*On Crosby Milne:\*

John and I met Crosby in 1976 when we were working in Coachella. Crosby was intrigued by our interest in applying some of the organizing techniques we had learned from the UFW/Fred Ross, and using them at some future time in an organizing effort on behalf of low income workers in large urban areas. We eventually did this, though it didn't go exactly according to the original plan (though we've had some success in getting the Earned Income Credit expanded, promoting subsidized transitional jobs, as well as dramatically expanding health insurance and child care for low income working families in Wisconsin).

Crosby offered his time at no cost to us between 1978 and 1985 to help us create a mission statement for what became Congress For a Working America and that lives on today in The New Hope Project's mission, "to create pathways so that those who can work can get out of poverty through work." Crosby taught us about Management by Objective, using Specific, Attainable, and Measurable Objectives to detail our organizing plan. Most importantly, he used his management training to remind us and articulate the connections between and among our Beliefs, Values and Goals. This has been hugely important in figuring out how to find allies that might not usually work together. Crosby also hammered into us the difference between basic and facilitating goals, and the importance of keeping them straight. For example, creating an organization to pursue our mission is a facilitating goal. It's an important one, but shouldn't be confused with being the same as the mission. Too many times, people focus too much energy on keeping an organizational structure going, even if no effective work on the mission is taking place. I have used his work over and over again, and believe it has helped me do better work as a result.

\*On Cesar:\*

Cesar was not a Saint to me, but he was a larger-than-life organizer who accomplished things as a leader that had never been done before. I had limited personal contact with him, but in those encounters I knew that he was special, and yet I also saw that he was human and had limitations.

Cesar is one of my greatest inspirations. I try not to romanticize him, but to understand and appreciate all the ways that he used his gifts. That requires me to also recognize when those gifts were not enough for what was needed, and what we can do to carry on the work he shared with us, in whatever form it now takes.

It seems inevitable that we want our leaders to be heroes without human frailties. I have seen this again and again, and no matter how great the leader, how pure the motivation, it seems that the end result always includes some excess of pride on the part of the leader, which leads to bad judgments which leads to failure at some level. So the question for me is not whether the leader has made errors in judgment, because I believe it is inevitable and impossible to completely prevent. It is what do we do when we recognize it? How do we help others interpret it? Cope with it? It seems that it's in this area that some healing has taken place, but that much is still needed.

Can you tell that I am the Queen of Nuance, Process, and Let's Keep Trying???

I do still believe that it's worth trying, though I confess that this past year has been particularly challenging for me in professional, political and personal terms. I end 2004 with a sense of

renewed commitment, even as I'm not sure where the funding will come to do the work, or whether any of it can be an effective counter-weight to our President and our country's hubris.

This listserv has helped me, disturbed me, agitated me, encouraged me, depressed me, inspired me. I guess you'd call it a success, huh?

Finally--

\*On Living In a Trailer with Hawkeye and Three Other Volunteers, 1975-76:\*

For those who don't know me (most of you), you might not know how much I like to laugh, and "hearing" Hawkeye's voice again through his e-mails has brought lots of laughs.

Of all the culture shocks to my system in those years, none can compare with the shock of learning to live in that trailer. And that's acknowledging that John and I had a bedroom that gave us privacy, in contrast to Hawkeye sleeping on the living room couch. The work was incredible, with Eliseo pulling stuff out of us that we didn't know we had to give.

One image from that time: stumbling into the trailer at 11:00 p.m., and watching the guys make dinner by warming tortillas on the stove, and then putting peanut butter on them. At the time, I thought it was totally gross. Now it seems like a good nutritional choice.....

If you've hung in through this, thanks for all the provocative conversations and thoughtful comments.

Peace to you and yours and our world,

Julie Kerksick

St. Louis, New York City, Coachella, St. Louis (1974 to 1977)

#### **Alberto Escalante, 12/28/04 (2)**

**RE: A Retraction.....**

On 12/27/2004 [Scott Templeton] wrote about what "*Philip Vera Cruz discusses on pgs. 109-115 about his resigning from the Executive Board*" re: Marc Grossman

To the list members,

On 12/27/2004 I quoted a paragraph sent in by [Scott Templeton] that listed Marc Grossman as having taken part in the duress of Phillip Vera Cruz that led to Phillip's eventual resignation. **I was wrong** in doing so w/o rechecking my sources before simply submitting what I'd read as being completely true & accurate, when it wasn't. I feel that I must make it clear that **Marc Grossman had Nothing to do with that episode**. I now realize that what I'd done was wrong. And I now pray that I've redressed this matter adequately. I'm truly sorry if I besmirched my honorable colleague's good name by not going into my journal and rereading about the event before I simply cut and pasted a quoted passage that wasn't accurate. So rather than let this wrong continue I felt that I must correct the record by saying that **Marc Grossman was not a party to the event reported earlier**.

Alberto Escalante 2004

#### **Louise Anlyan Harris, 12/28/04**

**RE: Jessica Govea**

I am not sure what part of this story to tell, as I cannot ask Jessica which part she would like told at the moment, but she is definitely still fighting hard for the rights of many and especially for herself at the moment as she is battling cancer. She lives in West Orange, New Jersey with her wonderful husband, Ken Thorbourne.

Louise Anlyan Harris

Boycott, late 70's - Oakland, L.A. and Detroit (*very* briefly on the last two)

#### **Marshall Ganz, 12/28/04**

**RE: Jessica Govea**

Jessica is very sick now, continuing her 11th year of struggle with cancer, during which she has kept bouncing back, continuing to work as a labor educator at Cornell, and married to Ken Thorbourn, an organizer turned journalist. Jessica grew up with CSO. Her parents, Margaret and Juan, were co-founders of the Bakersfield CSO chapter in the 1950s. Juan was president of his local union of the Transport Workers, having worked for the Santa Fe since he came as a bracero from a town in the state of Mexico to work on the railroad during World War II. He was also chair of the local Comision Honorifica Mexicana, an association established in cooperation with the Mexican consulate to assist immigrants. Jessica's mother, Margaret, was born here, her parents having immigrated from San Julian, Jalisco, and grew up working in the fields around Arvin, Bakersfield, and Porterville. Jessica was born in Porterville, but she, her brother, Juan, and her sisters, Catalina and Margaret, grew up in Bakersfield, a barrio known as the "Little Okie", a spot that had "welcomed" dust bowl migrants in the 1930s. When her parents became active in CSO, she became active in "Junior CSO" and at 12 she won a CSO speech contest on the plight of farm workers. After graduating from Bakersfield High School in 1964, where she had excelled in public speaking, she continued at Bakersfield Junior College, where she was active in support of the civil rights movement (I met Jessica at a meeting LeRoy, who was then still Brother Gilbert, Vice-Principal of Garces High School, and I organized in the fall of 1964 to start a Bakersfield chapter of Friends of SNCC, which actually existed for a couple of years). When the strike got going, she found herself at the center of a controversy over support for the union at Bakersfield College. She began volunteering at the Bakersfield office of the NFWA in November 1965, helping me get it set up on Cottonwood Road, also in the Little Okie. Sometime after the March to Sacramento, she came to work full time for the union, starting work for LeRoy in the service center in 1966. In 1967, she worked for Jerry for a while when he came to work for the union, and then became much more involved in organizing. After a campaign we worked on together in Bakersfield in the late spring of 1968, we were sent to Toronto, along with Fr. Mark Day, to organize the Canadian grape boycott. In December she moved to Montreal, where she became responsible for the boycott, while I remained in Toronto. After leading successful boycotts in Montreal, and in Toronto, where she took over when I came back to California in February of 1970. She then returned to California, initially to work with Fred Ross, Jr., on the Santa Maria lettuce strike as I recall. After the strikes were suspended we were both given the responsibility for the lettuce boycott, which we coordinated from Salinas, then Imperial Valley, and then, La Paz. Jessica was then assigned to manage Art Torres campaign for the Assembly, against Alex Garcia, in 1972 - a hard fought campaign that set Art up for winning the seat two years later with virtually no opposition. She then was assigned to work with LeRoy on the Safeway boycott out of Los Angeles. When the grape boycott resumed in August, after we had lost most of the grape contract, we both returned to Toronto, along with a team of some 18 others, including Miguel Contreras, Paul and Barbara Carrillo, Ophelia and Henry Diaz and their daughters, Lupe Gamboa and others. Again, when I returned to work on the ALRB elections in May of 1970 [*sic*, 1975], Jessica remained to lead the boycott work there well into the fall. She then joined me in leading the organizing team (along with Bob Lawson, Artie Rodriguez, Jim Drake, and others) for the Imperial Valley campaign of 1975-76. After Prop 14 we had a variety of assignments, and in August of 1977, Jessica was elected to the National Board. That year she did a remarkable job working with a committee of ranch committee leaders to extend medical plan coverage to families in Mexicali, San Luis RC, and Tijuana, opened offices in those cities, and established supervisory committees to oversee the plan. She then headed the organizing program for a time, but by the summer of 1978, however, we wound up back in LA, where Jessica ran the East LA campaign for Jerry Brown (along with Miguel, Richard Polanco, and others). After that campaign, despite both being on the losing side of the legal department fight, in negotiations with Cesar, we agreed to continue working with the union, but with the understanding we would live in Bakersfield, not La Paz. We had also planned to get married, but postponed the wedding to try to help out with the mess that had been made of the lettuce negotiations in what turned into the 1979 Lettuce Strike. After Salinas contracts were won, we returned to Imperial Valley, as Jessica assumed the responsibility for making good on the medical plan benefits that had been won in the strike, a project she accomplished by the summer of 1980. That fall, however, we came to the conclusion

we could no longer continue working for the union, met with Cesar in January 1981 to inform him of our decision, but delayed our official departure until April or May (he sent us on a visit to Israel in response to requests from the labor movement and, perhaps, to reward us for our years of service). Sadly, after we had left, Jessica was attacked right along with the rest of us, and in one particularly ugly episode, the UFW tried to get her former sister-in-law, Lydia Villarreal (now a judge in Salinas), fired from her job at CRLA, where she had hired Sabino Lopez, one of the former "paid reps" Cesar and Dolores had fired from their jobs. Jessica moved to Alhambra in 1984, worked on a variety of campaigns, did training, consulting, organizing and eventually married Ken, moved to New Jersey, and continues to make a valuable contribution to the labor movement as faculty of the Cornell Labor Education Program, training union leaders in the kind of leadership she had come to exemplify.

**Scott Templeton, 12/28/04 (1)**

**RE: A Retraction**

Dear Alberto and Fellow Ex-Staffers,

The matter of who did or didn't attend the board meeting at which Philip Vera Cruz brings up a set of matters that has troubled me about this whole 'documentation' process. How well will the historian or historians check the facts? How will different perceptions of the same event be presented? Most importantly, do we, who have done our best to recollect things that happened more than twenty or thirty years ago, have any editorial control over what gets written? What if the historian needs to paraphrase what we've written and paraphrases it incorrectly in our opinion? If we are mentioned in a story, do we get a chance to say to her or them 'You didn't capture what I meant or you've distorted what I meant? To what extent, if any, do we keep these documents out of the hands of those who would deliberately misconstrue information to demonize the farmworker movement, unions, or liberals? Rush Limbaugh would have a field day with this information.

About who attended the meeting, I can imagine numerous reasons for the discrepancy between what's written in the book--pg. 111 explicitly mentions Marc Grossman and quotes him too--and Alberto's notes. In case I wasn't clear, Vera Cruz and his transcribers discuss this meeting as just before the 1977 convention and the same meeting that Gilbert Padilla said he wanted to resign but was convinced not to resign.

I too don't want to present as truthful information that turns out to be false. Alberto, we haven't met, but thanks for your concern about accuracy. I share the concern.

Scott

**Scott Templeton, 12/28/04 (2)**

**RE: Miscellaneous Matters**

Dear Ex-Staffers,

I think that I sounded unnecessarily concerned in raising the question about who gets access to our email exchanges and what they might do with them. But I would like to think that the historians who deal with this material will have a passion for accuracy and put the negative things that happened in the larger context of the positive and often unprecedented things that also happened.

I liked Humberto's reminders about the contributions of farmworkers themselves and supporters. Let us not forget them.

Scott

**Mary Quinn Kambic, 12/28/04**

**RE: historical accuracy**

In response to the concerns about the accuracy of what ends up in the documentation project, aren't all recollections subjective? We are all involved in what historians would call "retrospective

self-construction." We are each telling our stories through our own particular "lenses", to use another buzzword, and biases. But this is good; let the critics and reviewers and academics and plain citizens interpret what we say. If the facts are incorrect, let someone call attention to the fact, and if we disagree with what someone says about our motivations or actions, let's step up to the plate and duke it out. I am sure that anytime we do research on events we've been involved in, we will hardly recognize ourselves. How many people who supported the boycotts can sort out whether they worked in the grape or lettuce boycotts? Or both? How often have friends assured us that they remember being at events and being "very active" when we are wondering where the heck all of them were?

And even now, when peace people and non-violent practitioners cite historical models for non-violent action, rarely (at least here on the East Coast) do they mention Cesar Chavez and the farmworkers. It is my personal mission to add the name of our movement whenever the discussion comes around to American heroes of non-violence. The same thing will happen to Cesar that has happened to Martin Luther King Jr. Do young people know anything other than he had a dream? I can't believe he would recognize himself if he came back for his celebrations. His story is being lost already.

However, what we are doing with the farmworker movement is telling our collective stories, and that's wonderful! We are not alone, because those of us who were involved in the anti-war and resistance movements around the time of the boycotts, are re-examining these movements also. Those stories are conflicted and painful, for sure, just like ours. Other people are writing stories of SNCC and union movements which will be our stories too. One thing the documentation project has done for me is remind me that I am in the "beloved community" that the civil rights movement talked about. That will never die for me!

Mary Quinn Kambic

Pittsburgh Boycott (1968-1975 boycott volunteer) Yes, grapes and lettuce, I do remember!

**Alberto Escalante, 12/28/04 (3)**

**RE: Jessica Govea**

In Marshall's moving tribute to Jessica Govea Thorbourn he made one tiny little mistake. He wrote:

*Again, when I returned to work on the ALRB elections in May of 1970, Jessica remained to lead the boycott work there well into the fall. She then joined me in leading the organizing team (along with Bob Purcell, Artie Rodriguez, Artie Mendoza, Fred Ross jr. Paul and Barbara Carillo, Vivian & Jim Drake, Alberto Escalante and others) for the Imperial Valley campaign....*

He wanted me to go ahead and correct the date to **May of 1975**. She rejoined him down in the them Imperial Valley, where she's still highly revered to this day....

Jessica remains a legend to many people

Alberto Escalante 2004

Still proud to be editing for him after almost 30 yrs!

**Donna Haber Kornberg, 12/28/04**

**RE: THE BOYCOTT & THE ALRA 1975**

I have now (at long last; sorry it took so long) read your extremely interesting email, covering facts and times during which I was not present, having been sacked in 1968. It is, I agree, one of the saddest things to consider what might have been. Hindsight does make things appear clearer, especially as we now know the outcome of the events of the 1970s. Could it not also give an overly optimistic idea of what might have been done differently at the time, when in fact it might not have been possible, given the contemporary knowledge and circumstances? I have no idea, not having been there, but I find that it is sometimes the case, that we beat ourselves up too much for not having done things differently, when it would have been improbable to do so at the time.

I do not, however, think it is adequate to sum up as "Cesar is (was) Cesar." The Cesar I knew in 1966/67 was not the Cesar described by people who worked with him in the 70s. The earlier Cesar was charming, fun, lively, amusing, mischievous, open to discussing ideas, NOT very pious, and not at all self-important nor prone to put himself on a different plane to the rest of us. As far as I knew, he sacked nobody until our small group in 1968, when he started making alliances with Gov. (Pat) Brown and the AFL-CIO. He did not even strike me as autocratic; as I remember, people pitched in wherever they seemed to be needed with very little direction from Cesar.

I think that if we and others are to learn lessons from the UFW experience which will be helpful in future organizing, it is essential to try to understand why Cesar changed: what influenced him, what factors inside him and outside of him brought about the changes that were ultimately so destructive. Surely it cannot be the case that this kind of progression of a leader, and derivatively of 'his' movement, is inevitable for all movements?

Donna Haber Kornberg

**Doug Adair, 12/29/04**

**RE: charming, fun, lively, amusing, mischievous**

In a message dated 12/28/04 . . . [Donna Haber Kornberg] writes:

*The Cesar I knew in 1966/67 was not the Cesar described by people who worked with him in the 70s. The earlier Cesar was charming, fun, lively, amusing, mischievous, open to discussing ideas, NOT very pious, and not at all self-important nor prone to put himself on a different plane to the rest of us. As far as I knew, he sacked nobody until our small group in 1968, when he started making alliances with Gov. (Pat) Brown and the AFL-CIO. He did not even strike me as autocratic; as I remember, people pitched in wherever they seemed to be needed with very little direction from Cesar.*

Dear Donna,

That is certainly the Cesar Chavez I remember from that period, even when making deals (hopefully the best deals we could get) with the AFL and Gov. Brown (in 1966). Looking back, I see the fast of 1968 as having an unhealthy impact on him psychologically, as well as physically. When he informed the staff of his decision to go to the 40 Acres and fast, he described it as a very personal journey, and asked that we continue our work, and NOT follow him. But the nightly masses were orchestrated so that people were literally worshipping at his feet. And he emerged from the fast physically frail, receiving visitors from his bed. For months, access was controlled by Marion Moses and LeRoy, limited to a few minutes, hushed voices, and our issues, personal or departmental, seemed pretty puny to bother him with. I think the fast had tremendous positive impacts, but it also had a down side.

Viva la Causa,

Doug Adair, El Malcriado, 1965-1970

**Kathy Lynch Murguia, 12/29/04**

**RE: reactions to the listserve**

Julie, I enjoyed reading your post. I lived at La Paz from 1970-1983. I liked how you structured and discussed the areas dealing with our lives... What a balancing act! I know I have sounded strident at times on the listserve...but the closeness and chaos of that implosive five years (1975-1980) took its toll. Today I work in forensic mental health which means I work with folks who have been adjudicated not guilty for reasons of insanity for serious felonies.

\* \* \* \*

This is my perspective.

I was untrained in the 1970's as I witnessed Cesar struggling with the priorities of his movement. Cesar in his attempts to come up with the perfect plan and perfect answer that would encompass a



response to the struggles of the farmworkers. I was not in a leadership role, but I heard stories and witnessed events. From my work, I know that perfection can become a dangerous goal. What keeps us grounded is the conflict with each other and working it out. But we have to trust each other. Between 1978 and 1983 when I left I had limited personal time with Cesar, and when I had that opportunity I didn't know what to say and was afraid to ask what I needed to know. It was by far, the most painful time of my life. I listened to a lot of folks in their confusion which was supposed to come to the game format. The game didn't work. Personally, I feel I let some folks down when I didn't speak up. This is mine to deal with. Today, I have a pretty big mouth at times, but try to take responsibility for what I do and say and most importantly, the impact of my personality on others.

I am hopeful for the future of the UFW. When I retire I'd even like to volunteer. I don't think I'd make it, but maybe somewhere. This has been a good process and an interesting year..

I wish you well with your family and your future and your work with New Hope Project.

En solidaridad.... Kathy Murguia

### **Sam Trickey, 12/29/04 (1)**

#### **RE: response to Doug Adair**

Good morning –

Doug Adair served ably in the Texas arena and wrote well about it in his Dec. 27 posting that started with Eugene Nelson - thank you! That strike was part of what got me involved. The other part was an undocumented (as far as I know) wildcat strike in cherries in Wautoma Wisconsin in the summer of 1965 that got my first Father-in-law, Rev. Jose A. Hernandez, fired from a local Migrant Ministry.

Doug also served UFW with distinction in California grapes. It is a sign of our relative contributions that he does not remember me but I do remember him from David Freedman. This difference in roles is one of the reasons why I labeled my Dec. 23rd posting as "hesitant".

Anyway, Doug responded, Dec. 26, to my remarks about "utopian" vs. "utilitarian." Perhaps oddly, I don't disagree with a great deal of his reply. Here's an attempt at clarifying.

"Utopian" means belief in the possibility of a perfect society and the attempts to build such. Historical evidence is pretty strong that a great range of people - from secular radicals to fundamentalist Christians and lots of other folks of myriad persuasions – have believed that such a construction is possible. I don't. Within the framework of classical Christian faith it is pretty easy to demonstrate that such a belief is construed as "idolatry". Since Cesar clearly was Christian, it seems to me to be valid to attempt an analysis within this framework. (For what it is worth, I hold that the same analysis and critique applies to those supporters and advisors of George II, err... President Bush, who in the recent election campaign are reported to have used "bringing in the Kingdom" language explicitly and certainly intimated such claims.)

Utopianism is nevertheless, an appealing vision, one that is easily confused with what might be called "practical idealism". (Odd phrase but stick with me.) I believe that Cesar and some of his supporters and advisors, particularly of the radical persuasion, were strongly influenced by utopian ideas at times. I also am convinced that the utopian fascination was a substantial contributor to some of the weirder, un-productive, and at times nasty episodes in UFW's history.

What Doug describes - dignity, contracts, farm worker self help in terms of Credit Union, housing, gas station, etc. - strike me as "practical idealism". He is absolutely right that it was a major break from the status quo. He phrases it as being a vision of "...opting out of that system." There we disagree. I don't view those goals and the progress toward achieving them as "opting out" but as realizable idealism: forcing the system to live up to its alleged standards and ideals. I view the UFW's successes as farm workers both forcing their way into the system and forcing major modifications of it as they did so.

Doug is also right that the various Migrant Ministries had to be called into question about their relationship to the structural abuse intrinsic in the farm labor system. The fact that National Farm Worker Ministry was formed as a successor to various Migrant Ministries and that it has played a valuable role in campaign after campaign, and that it perseveres today is testimony that at least a significant number of Churches and faith communities got the message and continue to get it. Of course the prophetic challenge of social justice to status quo religiosity is not new within Christianity nor Judaism. What was happening in 1965-70 with farm workers also was happening with the broader issues of civil rights. What Doug may not know - and what perhaps has not been commented upon - is the extent to which advancing those social justice issues took enormous, dedicated effort within the Churches. There are valid reasons for Christian groups to focus on reconciliation and on individual behavior. The large task - for those of us called to it - was (and IS) to prod the Churches continually to understand that reconciliation is not possible if abusive disparities of power and privilege are left in place and that personal piety and morality are not sufficient to achieve the dignity that is the intrinsic right of God's creatures.

Finally, in the present-day USA, the vocabulary and analytical framework of Christian social justice is hard to make heard. The mass media pay attention almost exclusively to pietist, quietist, fundamentalist Christians. Many of their spokespersons and leaders seem to me to be engaged in a different kind of idolatry, namely worship of unfettered brute capitalism and support for nationalistic triumphalism. See remarks above about George II. But there is a non-trivial body of us out here who have been grasped by Amos and Micah and Matthew 25. To quote Jim Wallis, we do not believe that God is a Republican or a Democrat. We do believe that creed and liturgy are rendered moot if not accompanied by tenacious, persistent effort at social and economic justice. A blessing of my life is that I was brought to these beliefs and to acting upon them because of the obvious injustices of the segregated society in which I grew up and by the eye-opening experiences of farm workers trying to get what was - and is - their due.

peace, Sam

**LeRoy Chatfield, 12/29/04**

**RE: HAPPY NEW YEAR**

LeRoy Chatfield 1963-1973

HAPPY NEW YEAR TO ALL

This is likely to be my final listserv discussion email. My Internet connection on the north coast is "closed for remodel." I found another temporary access 7 miles away.

Thanks to all who have participated in the discussion. It has meant a lot to those of us who served, and it will have a great deal of meaning for future readers.

I will be in touch in early 2005, and with your continued help and support, we will publish the results of the Farmworker Movement Documentation Project - just in time for the 40th Anniversary of the Delano Grape Strike.

My prayers for one and all . . .

LeRoy (Chatfield)

**Scott Templeton, 12/29/04**

**RE: Frank Ortiz**

Dear Ex-Staffers,

What became of Frank Ortiz? Did he leave on good terms with the union? Is he still alive? Is he part of this listserv? If his whereabouts have already been discussed, please pardon my asking.

Frank was an excellent manager. He made me a more productive staff member. He also cared about people as individuals.

Was he an or the architect of the organizational letter-writing campaign that we did against Lucky and Gemco Stores in 1980? I know that he was a persuasive proponent of it.

Happy New Year.

Scott

**Nancy Grimley Carleton, 12/29/04**

**RE: servants, foot soldiers, volunteers**

Since we've had some discussion on the listserve recently re various religious frames (thanks, Sam Trickey, among others) and how they might intersect with the history of the UFW, it got me thinking again about the metaphor of being "servants of the farmworkers," which LeRoy has also mentioned.

In my essay, I wrote about the many times we on the boycott were told we were "foot soldiers" for the union. I guess the more religious "servant" metaphor was deemed unlikely to compute for those of us on the boycott who grew up in a more secular context! (Although I grew up in a social justice Christian household -- i.e., liberal Protestant, UCC -- the "servant" idea was not one which was stressed -- if anything, the emphasis was more on "activism"). Although "foot soldier" was what I heard in the cities (at the boycott houses and at trainings given by Fred Ross, etc.), in La Paz, with Cesar, it was always "servant."

I'm interested in what others think of these metaphors -- whether "servant" or "foot soldier" -- and how they might have affected the trajectory of the union.

While "servant" may have a positive connotation within certain religious communities (and certainly did for Cesar), within the wider culture, it arguably has a more negative connotation and brings to mind someone with few rights, little autonomy, and poor pay. In its religious context, however, it expresses a deep sense of responsibility, surrender, and idealistic service.

The use of "foot soldier" I always found ironic, especially for the many volunteers that came to social justice activism in part out of the antiwar/peace movement. At best, it expressed the need for discipline to be effective. Other than that, it wasn't particularly inspiring, and was sometimes softened by the idea of being "of service."

Among other things, both metaphors in my experience seemed to be invoked primarily with the purpose of "Don't ask questions. You're here to follow the farmworkers' priorities." While following the farmworkers' priorities continues to make sense to me, I've become very suspicious of the ultimate health of organizations that place a premium on not asking questions (seems to me that many of the worst outcomes of the twentieth century, and now the twenty-first century, arise from that stance).

Nancy Carleton

Boycott Staff, 1975-1976 (San Jose, with one summer in the San Fernando Valley)

**Donna Haber Kornberg, 12/29/04**

**RE: charming, fun, lively, amusing, mischievous**

Dear Doug, Kathy,

That is a very interesting point. By the time of the first fast, the Teatro (including me) was established in Del Rey, in a Farm Workers' "Cultural Center" which we set up. I do remember visiting La Paz once during that time, and being astonished (and appalled) upon seeing Cesar fasting, looking weak and ill, barely able to hold his head up, and being idolized by praying acolytes. It reminded me of churches I had visited in Rome, where people approached altars in hushed reverence to view the relics of saints. Cesar seemed barely alive at that moment.

I wonder if his fast started as a personal journey -- he hadn't before that appeared to particularly pious. Perhaps I am being overly cynical to speculate that it might have ALL been done for effect?

Best to you both, and to all others on the list,

Donna Haber Kornberg  
Delano, 1966-68, London, 1970-74

**Susan Drake, 12/29/04**

**RE: soldiers, foot soldiers, volunteers**

Count me as balking at "soldiers" though "servant" outside the religious community does have a wheedling, hat in hand connotation for many. \* \* \* \*

Susan Drake (1962-73)

**Alfredo Acosta Figueroa, 12/29/04:**

**RE: UFW. Documentation Project**

To All from Alfredo Acosta Figueroa:

After reading some of the discussion, I felt that I had to give my input.

First, I would again like to thank Leroy for all of the time and effort that he put in undertaking this monumental task of contacting most of the people that were involved in building the U.F.W.A. No doubt that with the experiences and everyone's participation, what we have written will change some of the past perspectives that we had about the internal structure of the U.F.W. Speaking from my perspective, I was always an independent island on the outside waiting for my orders and rarely was involved in the conflicts that arose within. Only time will tell the truth.

I'm only sorry that the majority of the monolingual Spanish speaking organizers such as Jesus Villegas, Celestino Rivas, Pablo Carrizales, etc., didn't participate. I also feel that a lot of the U.F.W. organizers that were not from California and never participated in the Chicano Movement, perhaps do not have a clear understanding about how much of an impact the Chicano movement had on the U.F.W. struggle. During the early sixties and seventies when the civil rights struggle was at its peak, the UFW struggle was seen as one more cause or "causa" that had to be fought and many sympathizers of the Chicano Movement made a natural transition into helping the union fight for farmworker justice because we were all fighting for one thing, equality in the justice system, equality in the educational system, and equality in the workplace, whether it be out in the fields or in the factories.

When I became a full-time U.F.W. organizer in 1970, Cesar knew of my close affiliation with Bert Corona and the Chicano movement. He recognized that M.A.P.A.'s participation and advocacy in the Palo Verde, Imperial and Coachella Valleys played a very important role in the beginning stages of the Coachella Valley Grape strike of 1967-1968. The original organizers and participants preparing for the strike consisted mostly of members of the MAPA leadership team. When Manuel Chavez came down to Coachella to prepare for the strike we had to meet at Raul Loya's house (MAPA President) because not even Manuel's brother allowed us to meet at his house because he feared the growers. Jim Caswell, who was part owner of the radio station, was the only one who was willing to provide us a space to use as an office to organize the strike. He even furnished free rooms for Cesar and the organizers to stay during the strike. Right after the Coachella strike of 1968, Cesar told me to go to Yuma and see if I could organize a Mexican American Political Association Chapter among the progressive Chicanos there including the large Chavez family. We thought that by organizing a M.A.P.A. chapter it would serve as a base for the UFWOC as it did in the 3 valleys. My efforts were unsuccessful because of the fear and complacency of the Chicanos there. They were content in having their Mexican fiestas and not participating in the Civil Rights Movement.

During the so-called "Coachella Four Clap-Down Case" of 1968 it was Raul Loya, Jim Caswell, Tom Kay and myself, Alfredo A. Figueroa, who were identified as the leaders of the UFW strike and who were heading the protest against Congressman John Tunney. Though Cesar Chavez and Bert Corona had met with us earlier, they did not attend the rally. Tom Kay, a young seminar student from Michigan was the only one of the four that was not a member of MAPA.

We were identified as the provocateurs for disruption of a public assembly during a 4th of July, 1968, rally at the Dateland school, where Congressman John Tunney was speaking. During Tunney's speech, Tunney refused to acknowledge the existence of the UFWOC strike, much less support the boycott. At that point in his speech, I raised my special UFW flag that I always carried with me and the crowd that was around me began shouting "Huelga! Huelga," in unison. Tunney's voice couldn't be heard. The cops took pictures of everybody, but only the four of us were arrested. I did raise the flag but, the other 3 just shouted and clapped along with the rest of the crowd. After I returned from participating in the Indio-Calexico March on May 20, 1969, the four of us were arrested and incarcerated. It had been 10 months and all of our appeals had been denied. The Coachella Four case was a very publicized case due to its gross violations of our civil rights and free speech rights. We were unjustly sentenced to 120 days in county jail. We lost all our appeals until Bert Corona brought MAPA and they got MALDEF to intervene on our behalf. We took it to the State Supreme Court and finally won January 30, 1970.

Jim Caswell was a Canadian Anglo who had come to the Coachella Valley for his health. He was a humanitarian who joined our MAPA chapter in Indio to help fight for educational justice. When we were incarcerated he suffered the consequences of fighting for civil rights of farmworkers when the doctors at the detention facility refused to treat him or give him medication that he needed. His own personal doctor refused to treat as well due to his political affiliations. Finally, after the first month he became severely ill and real delirious and they had to take him to the Medical ward. He would never get over the fact that we were in jail for clapping. He would tell me that this is America and that they are not supposed to do this to us. I would tell him that because he joined the Chicano struggle he was going to suffer the same injustices we had suffered and that this was why we had to continue fighting. Besides not getting his medication, he was constantly harassed and called a Mexican Lover by the racist sheriff officers. Upon our release, on July 19, 1969, Raul, Tom and myself were transported to Raul Loya's house in Indio. Hours later, a sheriff vehicle showed up at Loya's house, and dumped Jim Caswell, still on a gurney, on Loya's front lawn. This was one of the most inhuman acts we had ever seen. The officers claimed they did not know where else to take him. We loaded up Jim Caswell, who had gone from a 260 lbs. pound man to a man half his size at 180 lbs., in our car and immediately took him to the county hospital. Tragically, a few months later, Jim Caswell died.

Yes, the "Coachella Four" won their case in the State Supreme Court, but one man had to die, Raul Loya was fired from his principalship and his teaching credential were suspended and Tom Kay, who was an epileptic, had to leave the UFWOC. We spent 52 days in the Riverside County jail and during this time, my family of 7 children suffered dearly at the hands of the racist public school district administrators and in the anglo community as a whole. Despite the obstacles, we continued in the struggle and eventually in 1972, we started our own alternative school (Escuela de La Raza Unida) that has survived to the present without federal or state funding. During the early years, ERU served as the UFW Blythe office for 5 years, and has continued to serve the farmworker community in Blythe for the past 32 years.

In 1976, another important M.A.P.A activity took place in Indio, when M.A.P.A. was not going to support Assemblyman Tom Suitt. Leroy was working with Governor Jerry Brown and he called me to tell me that Brown wanted to talk to MAPAs of the 80th assembly district and if I could arrange such a meeting which I agreed to organize. 20 of our members met with Brown and Gray Davis, his administrative assistant, in Indio and were able to negotiate 10 MAPA demands in exchange for MAPA's support of Tom Suitt. I was the only UFW organizer present. Our meeting with Jerry Brown produced one of the movement's most productive accomplishments in the history of the Chicano Movement when all ten of our demands were met in exchange for our support of Suitt.

This historical meeting came about due to Leroy's organizing skills and the fact that he called me to see if I could set up the meeting. To get an in-depth knowledge of the Chicano Movements participation in the UFW struggle I recommend the following books; Ernesto Galarza's "Farm Workers and Agribusiness in California 1947-1960." San Kushner's "Long Road to Delano." Mario Garcia's "Memories of Chicano History, The life and Narrative of Bert Corona."

As a native of the Colorado River and historian and researcher of the Mexica/Azteca Codex and creation story, I must add something that might interest everybody. The UFW struggle and the rest of the Civil Rights movement were all part of what is called the "Birth of the New Knowledge" (La Nueva Sabeduria). On November 14, 2003, when the seven sisters constellation, the Pleiades, rose to its zenith, what we refer to as the Era of Darkness, came to an end. This Era of Darkness began in 1535, when the Europeans destroyed the Twin Towers of Huitzilopochtli-Tlaloc in Mexico City. Since then, 468 years or nine X 52 years, have passed. The seven sisters constellation, the Pleiades, only rise to its zenith every 52 years as it has occurred throughout time immemorial. I have been researching the Mexican Place of origin, Aztlan, for the past 46 years, and I can tell you that where Cesar Chavez was born, on the confluence of the Colorado and Gila Rivers, is the middle of the triangle that is called Tonallan in the Mexica/Azteca Codex of the Five Suns.

Tonallan is where Quetzalcoatl went to find the sacred food "corn" to feed the humans of the Fifth Sun. In English, the local natives, the Quechan, call this mountain "Sugar Loaf Mountain," and Nahuatl, it is called Tonancatepetl. Is it fate or coincidence that this mountain is less than half a mile from where Cesar was born: this man, Cesar Chavez, who was able to organize us to bring forth the betterment of the farm worker that produces our food?

La Cuna de Aztlan begins at Spirit Mt., called Tlalocan in Nahuatl. It begins in the north at Spirit Mt., near Laughlin Nevada, and continues down to the Gulf of California, with the center being in Blythe, California (Omeyocan, the place of the two hearts, la mera Cuna De Aztlan). I have just recently published a book, "Ancient Footprints of the Colorado River," on this very topic, but unfortunately was only able to print 1000 copies. I am currently seeking funding for a second publishing.

Currently I'm working together with Riverside and San Bernardino Counties, Superintendent of Schools and the University of Riverside in documenting the history of the United Farm Worker struggle in Riverside County by its original participants. The UFW struggle made me realize that there are some good gringos here in the U.S. that cared for the least of our brothers. Being brought up in a small rural community and the neighborhood of El Barrio Cuchillo, as a child we were constantly fighting the "racist anglos" and I rarely socialized with anglos. My participation in the United Farmworker Struggle made me appreciate all races, and in particular anglos, because I saw their humanitarian deeds. The Creator has been by our side as we have been victorious in many of our struggles.

We will continue our struggle despite other organizations that have fallen prey to the large energy companies and become political lackeys. We have just recently defeated the notorious proposed Ward Valley Nuclear Toxic Dump 60 miles north of Blythe close to the Colorado River and have managed to stop a second Blythe Energy Plant from being constructed in the Coachella growers orchards in Mesa Verde just outside of Blythe. They have destroyed over 1500 acres where 400 UFW workers picked oranges in the year 2000 and this year only 80 UFW members worked part time.

La Lucha Indeterminable. The struggle indefinite. So must we continue to struggle for justice as so many others throughout the world until we all live as equal brothers and sisters on this Mother Earth, Tonantzin, together, as one human race. Tloque Nahuaque, meaning like the fingers on the hand, different sizes with different functions, we are all attached to one trunk. Together, We do all for the benefit of All.

**Sam Trickey, 12/29/04 (2)**

**RE: Documentation Project**

good afternoon

After three attempts at typing the address right...

Alfredo Acosta Figueroa made two comments which I want to highlight. He wrote

*"I'm only sorry that the majority of the monolingual Spanish speaking organizers such as Jesus Villegas, Celestino Rivas, Pablo Carrizales, etc., didn't participate."*

Excellent point. From the beginning of my involvement it was clear that being able to speak reasonable Spanish gave me a different level of engagement and understanding. Not having the reflections and commentary of the monolingual Spanish speakers is a clear loss.

Alfredo also wrote:

*"I also feel that a lot of the U.F.W. organizers that were not from California and never participated in the Chicano Movement, perhaps do not have a clear understanding about how much of an impact the Chicano movement had on the U.F.W. struggle."*

Certainly this was the case in Texas (during 1965-68), where UFW and more general Chicano organizing were hard to distinguish. My perception is that the influence was mutual - UFW had as much an impact on broader Chicano organizing as the other way around. I moved to Florida in Sept. 1968. Moved back to Texas (Lubbock) in 1977 but stayed only 2 years. During those two years Tony Orendain tried his Texas Farm Workers Union but it didn't get very far and in retrospect seems perhaps to have been a personal thing with Orendain. But La Raza Unida, MALDEF, and other organizations soldiered on in the very tough Texas social and political environment (think Phil Gramm, Tom Delay, etc.). Here in Florida, we had to teach people that there was/ is a Chicano movement and explain its relationship to the much more familiar black efforts. (This county had a school boycott and march in about 1969 or 70 - black kids protesting the closing of their high school in favor of the white school - and was under court order for desegregation until a few years ago.) Nowadays there are so many non-Cuban Hispanics in Florida (and Georgia and North Carolina!) that such teaching is no longer as much needed.

Thanks Alfredo.

paz y justicia, Sam

#### **Alberto Escalante, 12/29/04**

##### **RE: Alfredo Figueroa**

Alfredo Acosta Figueroa, El Primer Ministro de Canciones UFW y Atzlan, Que bueno que les has dicho la Neta de en donde nacio La Nacion Atzandia Chicanosa. Ya sabes que mi gente eran de Potholes y Calxico Y como dijo el Marshall "Si Blythe es la Cuna de Atzlan, Calxico-Mexical es la matriz!" Yo recuerdo buen cuando la quadrilla de organizadores de Fred Ross, jr llegamos en Blythe y Alfredo Figueroa nos dio un lugar donde quedar mientras estavamos alli en la area de Parker, AZ.- Blythe, CA. siguiendo la cozecha de lechuga de la desgraciada Compania Bruce Church (que yo los tengo en mis sospechas en la murte de nuestro lidere Cesar Chavez) La compania Bruce Church en esos tiempos eran los duenos de lo que antes era el terreno de la familia Chavez donde nacio el Cesar. Un dia nos corretio de el rancho el primo de Cesar Un viejo feo con el nombre "Charlie" Chavez que era el majordomo alli en la area donde estaba todo lo que quedaba de la casa de el Sr. Librado y Juana Chavez y sus ninos incluyendo un nino morenito Cesar Chavez que nacio alli en 1927. En 1976 ganamos el eleccion encontra la cia. Bruce Church. la cuenta de los votos cuando ganamos la eleccion se tomo acabo el dia de los cumpleaños de Cesar y el Jim Drake me dio el honor de hablarle a Cesar a decirle que ganamos la eleccion. Yo se que le dio mucho gusto y por varias razones unos muy personales. Alfredo te saludo como el luchador que eres! Y por que te queria tanto mi tia Golla. Hasta que nos viemos otra ves,

Tu hermano en la lucha,

Alberto Escalante de Volante 2004

#### **Sam Trickey, 12/29/04 (3)**

##### **RE: placing me**

Dear Doug –

No need to apologize for anything you've written nor for being unable to place me in your memory. I took no offense at what you said about the response of churches. I wanted to point out that there was a lot more in common in our respective remarks than might have been recognized at first reading. I also wanted to point out that even though churches and faith communities also have to struggle to be even approximately faithful to what they profess, there is evidence that they can do so.

There also is no reason why you would be able to place me. I was a graduate at Texas A&M Univ when you were in the Valley. I never went to the Valley. My involvement with the Valley struggle was from afar. Here's the story.

My first wife is chicana. Her Dad (Jose Angel Hernandez) had been fired in the summer of 1965 or 1966 (I'm confused about dates) from a Wisconsin migrant ministry (he was a Presbyterian pastor) because he supported a group of workers who knew about early NFWA activity and about Cesar and Larry and decided that they were going to bring worker justice to Wisconsin cherries. Grampa Hernandez "quit preachin' and went to meddlin'" as the southern phrase puts it, which is to say that he helped them organize a march and some other activities. Anyhow, the melon strike comes along and sometime in 1966, I don't remember when, members of Presbyterian student group at A&M spoke to me to the effect that your wife is mexican, you speak spanish, your father-in-law knows about Cesar Chavez, come explain it to us. Well I didn't know dip about unions or labor history or anything, but had been immersed in the desegregation struggles since lunch counter demonstrations in Houston when I was an undergraduate at Rice, 1958-62. (It was unlawful for my ex and me to get married in 1962 - anti-miscegenation in Texas applied to both blacks and chicanos.) So I learned about the Valley struggle and very rapidly became converted to the chavista cause.

We met when you were at David Freedman. I think 1972. But that would have been only a fleeting encounter for you, because I would go to California for a few days and then come back to Florida (I joined the faculty here in Sept. 1968). I was very visible in the Florida UFW work as a volunteer and supporter working under the banner of Florida Christian Migrant Ministry (which later merged into NFWM). I was for a time perhaps as visible as almost anyone except Augie VandenBosche, the FCMM Director, in the faith-based part of the struggle. Chris knew this and kept me and my ex "validated" by having one or the other of us come to California as often as possible to know the struggle first hand. (Presumably our being there was also useful!) This validation came in very handy when some Florida Fruit and Vegetable Growers or Florida Farm Bureau rep would start spouting off on what Cesar and the UFW were doing in California. My standard rhetorical device was to begin with "Have you been there?" "Do you speak Spanish?" "Have you stayed in migrant worker camps?" I could answer affirmatively to all three. Then when they would try to stammer around that, I would start in on the "southern boy and scientist" role - plain speaking, just get the facts, "it don't take a brilliant mind to walk in the fields and vineyards in Calif or Florida or Texas and see that these folks are abused and exploited. But for what its worth I'm also a scientist - and we believe in acting on facts and data. And the facts are these...." This from a professor wearing cowboy boots and speaking in a northern Texas accent. Of course I discuss it with confidence and joy today but in those days I was anxious all the time about the possibility that the Farm Bureau (in particular) would manage to destroy my career via the tenure process. Even after a cover story in their magazine called "Dear Dr. Trickey" they didn't succeed but that's another story.

paz y justicia,

Sam

**Ernie Powell, 12/29/04**

**RE: servants, foot soldiers, volunteers**

I think there is a better word and that word is "organizers." Every effort and campaign I was involved with included the principle of expanding the organization either with farm workers joining the union or people we met on the boycott taking an action or becoming volunteers/supporters. It did not matter on the boycott whether we met them for a moment in front



of a market or at a meeting to build support - we wanted folks to be part of the farm workers' movement in a way that brought action and results. I agree with other points of view written about on the listserv that we were regimented and there was, for lack of a better term, a chain of command. But, the essence of what we did was organizing and it is impossible to organize without structure and strategy.

Regarding the idea of servant: For me my personal willingness to work for barely any pay plus the long hours and total commitment was based on the priorities I chose for myself at that time. I was a middle class kid who had become very alienated from my country and my culture. I wanted to work as an activist and an organizer in order to change the economic and social structure that had caused the poverty, racism and injustice of American society. I saw the farm workers movement as part of a bigger effort to win justice in a society full of in-equality.

Certainly we all "served" but, again, I offer that the term "organizer" better describes who we were, and, hopefully, still are. One can "serve" by doing service but organizing means working with people in order to gain power and to use that power to create change. It also means building an organization that counts and that forces decision makers such as politicians, employers, etc. to negotiate and or deal with that organization day to day. This form of change takes place in either an economic or political environment. Organizing for change means that power gets re-distributed - that is what organizers work to do. The farmworker leaders and organizers I knew then and now understood and taught these guiding principles.

The foot soldier idea - well - everyone I ever met in the movement was either a great leader or organizer. If they did not have the talent to act decisively with passion and commitment they just seemed to not last. Everyone in the movement had to be strong willed in order to face the forces and odds we faced and win the victories we won. My point - to do the work we did required strong personal skills, a deep knowledge of the issues and what was at stake, not just the ability to follow directions and orders. Hence, the foot soldier image just plain fails me.

Ernie Powell

Summers of 1968, '69, full time from 1970 to '73 in Los Angeles, San Ysidro, Napa and Philadelphia

**Susan Drake, 12/30/04**

**RE: servants, foot soldiers, volunteers**

I like Ernie's thinking: organizer! Even the years I was Cesar's secretary, I was trying to organize him as hard as any boycott or picket line efforts I ever conducted! :-)

Susan

**Norbert Herold, 12/30/04**

**RE: my two cents, just in time**

Thank you, Leroy, for making this listserv possible.

I left the UFW in '77, and having this forum after so many years have past has brought back many memories, good and bad. I had forgotten so much, and learned, also, that there was so much I did not know. Probably the main thing I learned was that, although the UFW played a huge role in my life, my role in it was so small.

As "La Causa" recedes further into the past with each passing year, I should not be surprised when I encounter "educated" people-teachers-(I am now a middle school teacher who works with same) who do not know of Cesar Chavez, let alone the UFW. So this forum has been great even just for the sake of reaffirming that which was once central to our lives. But of course, not all non-UFW staff people are ignorant of history. My superintendent knew of Chavez and the UFW, and asked me recently about it. While I much prefer these educated questions to ignorance, I still have trouble, nevertheless, with them. Where to begin? After a year of reading criticisms and defenses of actions taken in the name of the UFW, I still don't know.

I left the union a few months after the Prop 14 disaster. As far as I was concerned, that was the turning point, when lots of ugliness never before seen by idealistic eyes cropped up all over the place, and things were never the same. I'll never forget the meeting at La Paz, when Cesar climbed through the window to squash the debate taking place, after listening from the outside to the dissent within. After 6 weeks of hard work on the campaign in San Jose and San Francisco, I was one of many who felt we were unwilling participants in an inquisition. Instead of thanks, we were all under suspicion. Who was responsible for the loss? It had to be the enemies within. This was no longer the movement I had loved, that was for sure, and for the first time in my three years of service, I thought about leaving. There were other major signs that things were turning for the worse. When I spent time in La Paz, during those awful days, with Nick Jones, my boycott director, and found out he, of all people, was under suspicion, and he and Virginia were getting out, I was flabbergasted: I always knew Nick to be a Chavez loyalist to the core, an icon in the UFW. What was going on?

When I left in the spring, I felt bad about the whole experience. So bad that, until about 10 years ago, I would weep when a strong memory of the UFW came up, for example, hearing Joan Baez's beautiful album, Gracias A la Vida.

Many of my good friends like Bob Aderhold and Stephen Roberson, both of whom I once considered lifers, also became disillusioned, and I'd hear more details about what was going on on the inside when they left.

I am so sorry to hear about Jessica Govea's bout with cancer, and that she is so sick now. I did not know her when I was in the union. But I bring up her name now because I had the honor of meeting her and her husband at a party a few years ago when she lived in Montclair, NJ. She is yet another example of a former icon of the UFW, like Nick, like Marshall, like Chris Hartmire, who did such wonderful, marvelous things on behalf of the UFW, and yet was vilified. It is unfortunate that so many years of devotion ended up in bitterness. Believe me, she did not speak fondly of the leadership of the UFW. Instead, she shocked me with new ugliness that I had not been aware of before, including the charge of anti-semitism. I know that subject has been talked of during this forum, but I don't know if it has been sufficiently addressed.

But despite these negatives associated with the UFW, I have lots of positive feelings, too. For a few years, I really felt like I was making a difference. My life was about something really special. The staff had lots of really sharp people on it. I made deep friendships that endure to this day, and I am very thankful for them. I met and worked with some of the brightest and most talented people I have ever known. I learned a lot from them, and was later able to apply what I learned in the Union to organizing tenants.

Perhaps the experience is yet another example of innocence lost. Perhaps there is no such thing as innocence, and the harsh lesson learned is to stop believing in innocence: that the only protection from abuse is democratic accountability.

Anyway, sorry it took so long to throw in my two cents. But I have been busy, as we all are, I'm sure, and, I really do feel that my part in the whole big UFW story was miniscule. And yet, I somehow felt the need to say something before this chapter ended...

Norbert Herold – New Jersey Boycott 1974-77 (last few months with NY Boycott)

HAPPY NEW YEAR !!

**Alfredo Acosta Figueroa, 12/30/04**

**RE: UFW Documentation Project Happy New Year 2005**

To all from Alfredo Figueroa:

Thank you for all your wonderful comments. Yes, Susan, Jim Drake was one of the best friends I ever had.

Roberto Rodriguez and Patricia Gonzales have come to Blythe to pick up information on Creation Story.

When we first started the UFW Documentation Project it was just from 1965 to 1967 UFW participation but, now it has been open to all participants. In my original essay I excluded some of the major activities that happened after 1975 that were very, very crucial for the Farm Workers here in our area.

When we were working on the Bruce Church Campaign in the Reservation of the Colorado River Indian Tribes one of the most heinous crimes took place. It was when 3 farm workers got decapitated by the Bruce Church own evil premeditated device to prevent us (UFW) organizers to reach the growers workers at the camp. The company had ordered a Land-Plan earth moving machinery placed across the highway a few feet beyond the bridge of a canal. The 60 feet long-5 feet high land-plan was placed across the highway before you got to the Bruce Church camp. It was impossible to see the machinery as you approached the bridge until you got on top of the bridge. It was in the wee hours of the morning when the 3 local Bruce Church workers that have been working for Bruce Church for many years, were returning to camp after leaving some of the local bars. They didn't know that the land-plan was there when they hit the machinery. Their car went right under the long carriage rail that was at the same height as the wind shield, all 3 were instantly decapitated.

Despite all our UFW advice to the family, counseling etc. we were unable to get them to sue the Bruce Church Company. The company had compensated them and paid for all funeral services expenses. This preconceived crime has to be one of the worst tragedies that ever happened during the UFW organizing campaigns against Bruce Church or any company.

In case anyone wants to continue with the investigation of this case my cousin Gilbert Leivas who was a Tribal Police Officer at that time and I have a lot of information concerning this case.

I am now making public my research of 46 years so you will be hearing a lot of the Cradle of Aztlan place of human origin.

Escuela De La Raza Unida has recorded the first corrido of Cesar Chavez ever recorded on a CD which is titled "La Venida de Cesar Chavez 1967" sung by the Tenor Placido Garcia from Santa Elena California who was a part time organizer with me during the Napa nine winery campaign. The CD is for sale, which is a fundraiser for the Escuela de La Raza Unida. It has 22 songs beginning with the oldest song sung in the western hemisphere, the (Chemehuevi bird songs) to modern day (Chicano Rap). \* \* \* \*

A very Happy and Safe New Years 2005 to everyone who has participated. Hope that we can all meet again even if it is through e-mail.

Alfredo A. Figueroa

**Abby Flores Rivera, 12/30/04**

**RE: UFW. Documentation Project**

Dear Alfredo: Helen Chavez was born in la Mera Cuna de Aztlan, Blythe, if I remember correctly. Has anything been done in Jim Caswell's memory? I had heard of him before. Thank you for sharing this part of history with us. /abby

**Chris Schneider, 12/30/04**

**RE: UFW. Documentation Project Thanks to all**

When I first started a farm worker support group in Indianapolis, I relied on the writings of Chris Hartmire to explain the farm worker movement to others. He always produced excellent, succinct explanations of the farm worker movement in mimeographed question and answer formats.

As my last posting to the list serve, it is fitting that I quote Chris from his last post to the list serve:  
*All was not perfect- inside each of us & inside the union- but we did some amazing things together in those years & forged human bonds that will last till we die. I have regrets for things unsaid & undone but I rejoice as I think back on all we did & all we learned.....and all the people who learned as we did & are still fighting the good fight in the labor movement & elsewhere.*

Thanks again to LeRoy and all who participated.

Chris Schneider 1973-1989

**Nonie Fuller (Lomax) Graddy, 12/30/04**

**RE: Was Prop 14 the End of the Line?**

I agree, very good job!

I have been wanting to say 'Hi' Tom, I remember you fondly, and this posting reminded me why that is. Nonie

**Alberto Escalante, 12/30/04**

**RE: All About My UFW Experience**

My Back Pages

Crimson flames tied through my ears  
Rollin' high and mighty traps  
Pounced with fire on flaming roads  
Using ideas as my maps  
"We'll meet on edges, soon," said I  
Proud 'neath heated brow.  
Ah, but I was so much older then,  
I'm younger than that now.

Half-wracked prejudice leaped forth  
"Rip down all hate," I screamed  
Lies that life is black and white  
Spoke from my skull. I dreamed  
Romantic facts of musketeers  
Foundationed deep, somehow.  
Ah, but I was so much older then,  
I'm younger than that now.

Girls' faces formed the forward path  
From phony jealousy  
To memorizing politics  
Of ancient history  
Flung down by corpse evangelists  
Unthought of, though, somehow.  
Ah, but I was so much older then,  
I'm younger than that now.

A self-ordained professor's tongue  
Too serious to fool  
Spouted out that liberty  
Is just equality in school  
"Equality," I spoke the word  
As if a wedding vow.  
Ah, but I was so much older then,  
I'm younger than that now.

In a soldier's stance, I aimed my hand  
At the mongrel dogs who teach  
Fearing not that I'd become my enemy  
In the instant that I preach  
My pathway led by confusion boats  
Mutiny from stern to bow.  
Ah, but I was so much older then,

I'm younger than that now.

Yes, my guard stood hard when abstract threats  
Too noble to neglect  
Deceived me into thinking  
I had something to protect  
Good and bad, I define these terms  
Quite clear, no doubt, somehow.  
Ah, but I was so much older then,  
I'm younger than that now.

by Bob Dylan 1964

Friends.....  
Have a Safe and Sane New Years!  
I love you All  
Hasta luego!

Alberto Escalante 2004

**Abby Flores Rivera, 12/30/04**

**RE: Was Prop 14 the End of the Line?**

Hello Tom:

I have been meaning to ask you something. Are you the one who began the ball rolling for paid salaries for the Legal Department? It occurred to me a week or so ago when Sandy Nathan did his posting. I never did ask that question before in all the posting on the subject and I don't know why it never occurred to me. How did that all start? I know Marshall mentioned others from Salinas (organizers) who asked for pay, too. It all seemed to be coming from Salinas, too. I never heard of anybody, say in Delano or down south, asking for salaries. Does anyone know how that all got started? It seemed to have been the beginning of the end as far as I can tell. During our infamous "window" of opportunity we decided to ask for salaries. When I got wind of it through the grapevine at La Paz, I was surprised because it never occurred to me that we could even ask for a raise. I tell you, there is no way I would have asked either since I was a nervous wreck during Prop. 14 whenever I had to do the money transfers for our media blitz knowing how very little money we actually had. I never got over it. Can you shed some light on this one thing for me? siempre/ abby

**Hugh "Hawkeye" Tague, 12/30/04**

**RE: ALRB Elections**

Maybe I missed it, but I don't remember seeing anything in the discussion about why we won or lost in certain geographic locations or crops.

We did poorly in the table grape industry where the UFW had the longest history. Why? I think that it was because we screwed up the hiring hall so badly and that we had only a handful of the Filipinos on our side by '75. Racism perhaps?

We did very well in Imperial Valley in '75-'76 elections. Why? Maybe because Eliseo had run a good field office there in administering the Interharvest contract and had encouraged local leadership to develop.

We also did well in places like Visalia and San Ysidro and Oxnard where we had very little history in the citrus and tomato industries. Why? Maybe just because we --hadn't had the opportunity to screw up the administration of contracts?

What do you think?

Hawkeye '71-'76

**Rick Tejada-Flores, 12/30/04**

**RE: Thank you**

Dear Brothers and Sisters,

Thanks for unleashing this incredible dialogue. LeRoy, you pulled it off again! I know now (even though I didn't realize it then) that the time I spent working with the UFW was the most important experience in my life, and I honor and respect all the people that I met and worked with during that too-brief time. It was great to connect with all of you, those I know, and those I am meeting through your words. We've poked and prodded at the experience like a scab that itches, but only, I think, because what we went through and came face to face with was so important - when we learned that there was a way to move from dreams to accomplishments. It was the social equivalent of splitting the atom. We know that there is immense power in people, and we now know how to unleash it. We'll never forget Cesar, and we'll never stop talking about what might have been.

When I was working on the film *The Fight in the Fields, Cesar Chavez and the Farmworkers Struggle*, Al Rojas told me that once, while he and Cesar were driving through the night, they talked about what would happen after Cesar died. Al told him that there would probably be statues, and streets and parks and schools named after him. Al said, "Cesar said to me, 'Statues are for pigeons to shit on. If you want to remember me, organize!'"

Rick Tejada-Flores  
La Paz, 1972-73

**Kathy Lynch Murguia, 12/31/04**

**RE: values and actions**

Ken Schroeder 1974-1989 wrote:

*"I'd like to address the issue of how we related to each other as volunteers, especially as to how consistent we were in our values and in our actions. The farm workers' movement worked to win justice through non-violent action. We fought against the idea that workers were mere implements of production. We worked to empower people to overcome fear and to speak the truth. I believe we often fell short in how we lived these values within the union".*

Kathy Murguia 1965-1983

Nicely put. Yes, values, and how we treat ourselves and others is key. I can only speak for myself on this one. I didn't see the purges coming. Looking back to the early days in Delano, however there was subtle evidence of what was to come. I interpreted some events as an indifferent spectator, not really having a voice in a workers' movement. That's a rationalization. Then I fell in love with Lupe my partner for life...a worker, organizer, former bracero. As I defined myself in my marriage, new clarity set in. I came to hold the belief that values were about supporting and sustaining life, no matter what the cost. There were disastrous moments, but together with others in the movement, my family and I grew and survived. I thank Helen Chavez deeply for her part in this. I still try to be kind. I'm still learning about this one. Truth can bring such pain, but it is liberating and refreshes the soul and I'm hoping to be honest with my own truth in this lifetime.

Again, thank you LeRoy for your efforts and the success in putting this together. As one member of this rag tag group of realistic, idealistic volunteers/foot soldiers/servants, it's been "interesting." There is a hecka more to do. \* \* \* \* Que Viva La Causa...

Kathy Murguia

**Jerry Brown, 12/31/04**

**RE: Thank you**

Dear Friends,

The worlds have all been spoken, and Rick has eloquently expressed what is in my heart as this dialogue comes to a close.

On the tombstone of Horace Mann, founder of free, public education in America, are these words:

“Be ashamed to die until you have won some victory for humanity.”

I know that we can all walk through life and face death immeasurably enriched by our work with la Causa.

In the last years of the Delano grape strike, a cartoon appeared in the *New Yorker*. A man with many sins in his life finds himself sitting next to St. Peter in heaven, astonished that he made it past the pearly gates.

“It was boycotting grapes that got you in,” observes St. Peter.

“Don’t mourn, organize...”

Thank you LeRoy for this incredible and enriching experience.

Jerry Brown, '66-'76

### **Despie Fausch Bonadies, 12/31/04**

#### **RE: Quickies and ... Just for the Record**

From: Despie Fausch Bonadies (1974-1975; 1976. Mostly San Jose Boycott...)

Dearest Listserve Folks -

I am so tired right now I can barely see straight, but for the last year you all have been so wonderful to express your ideas, your stories, and your hearts with me, an “anonymous listserv reader” thus far, that it just didn't seem right for me to let the listserv close without a quick email to thank you...

And, despite the fact that I feel *very dopey* doing this on the last day, I also wanted to email a written contribution, not because I think my opinions are extraordinary or unusual, but because I wanted to honor LeRoy's desire to have as many voices on the record as possible before the listserv closes...(Since the listserv is over today, I don't expect any response to this posting, but you can always email me at my email address if you feel the desire to give me feedback for any reason. Otherwise, I'll try to catch up with you all at the Yahoo thing, or in Delano next September!)

First, some quick “FYI” items for the history buffs that may or may not have been on the listserv previously.

I have had a coincidental re-connection with **Don Watson**, who has not been on the listserv. He was sent from the ILWU to work with the UFW for over a decade (I don't actually know how long). I know he worked quite a bit of time in the mid Seventies to the Eighties, in the San Francisco Boycott Office and the Salinas Legal Department. I saw him eleven days ago at a party (!) and he told me the following:

- ✓ Jacques Levy's notes and interviews for a second book (never published) are in a library at Yale University
- ✓ All of Don Watson's research from all those years (interviews, etc.) is still in his office at his home...Wish I was independently wealthy and could go help him sort it all out!

Second, here is a little of my history with the UFW.:

I was on staff for a very short time - from July 1974 through December 1975. I then came back for a stint to help with the last leg of the Prop 13 campaign in 1976. For most of this time I worked in the San Jose Boycott, but I also got to march to Modesto and work for an extremely brief time in Salinas during the summer of 1975. I was 19 to 22 years of age at the time. I worked with some of the most amazing people I've ever met...

Third, here are some of my “quickie” favorite memories...

After composing the serious reflections that are at the end of this email, I decided to take myself less seriously for a minute, and let my sense of humor have some free reign after all my introspection. I hope these are taken in the spirit they are offered... (Remember that 19 to 22 years old thang!) So, before I share my more thoughtful ideas, here are some “quickie” snapshots of some of my favorite time with the UFW:

- ✓ Performing street theater in front of the Hyatt Regency in San Francisco during a protest of Gallo Wine, and portraying the fake daughter from the “Madria Madria Sangria” commercials as a ... slut ! (It just evolved that way – I hadn’t worn makeup for so long, making her cheap and tawdry just kind of made sense!)
- ✓ Learning to drive with Robert (sometimes Roberto) Garcia and his pal Richard (sometimes Ricardo) in the back of my car. I had to drive them somewhere during the Morgan Hill strike, and Robert crouched– as best he could – on the floor of the backseat of the car the entire time I was driving, because I was such a bad driver!
- ✓ Dancing at “Pancho’s Villa” in Salinas, where the men would ask you to dance, then walk you to your seat and leave you alone - Heaven!
- ✓ Partying with supporters on the East Side in San Jose with a combination of Mariachi music and The Average White Band...
- ✓ Eating menudo on Sunday morning (muy cruda) at La Virgen de Guadalupe Church in San Jose. Finding out what the word “tripe” meant....
- ✓ Ver Forbes, Martha Diepenbrock, Joey Rubio & Wendy Greenfield, the Hirsch family, & Bill O’Donnell to name a tiny, tiny few...and the kindness of Fred, Jr.
- ✓ The San Jose Boycott was sent to support strikers in Yuma, Arizona in 1974. One night , while yelling out across the border in the darkness for potential strikebreakers to please not cross our picket line, the Migra threatened to deport me back to Mexico because I didn’t have proper ID. I explained to them that I was Greek and born in New Jersey, but they were not amused. ...
- ✓ Lots of crushes! I never acted on any of them, of course – I was a very repressed gordita then!...I’m neither repressed nor gorda now (eat your heart out, boys...) and happily married to an italiano for the last 24 years J OK, I’m not exactly gorgeous now, either – but I make a mean lasagna, and wear a great shade of red lipstick – keeps my old man happy...(I must admit, I thought there would be more talk of romance on the listserve this year. Maybe after we solve the problems of war, racism, and poverty...)
- ✓ Singing at rallies - and once with Holly Near (sweetest woman ever...) while, unknowingly I had poison oak – I thought it was the excitement of meeting her that was making me tingle all over...
- ✓ Arguing with my old hero, Tom Hayden, that he should help us, not become a Democrat (he did both...)
- ✓ Marching to Modesto about 30 or so miles a day , with my feet aching, aching, aching, and then getting to a town where the local UFW supporters had planned a party for us, and somehow my feet waking up and dancing, dancing, dancing all night long!
- ✓ My Latina (then called Chicana!) friends from San Jose State – they taught me that you can be a brilliant activist and feminist and still look hot on a Saturday night!
- ✓ Meeting FIVE of my “Union idols” – Dolores, Cesar, Jerry Cohen, Marshall Ganz, & Phillip Vera Cruz – at different times for very brief moments throughout my time in the Union, and EACH of them somehow was able to joke and laugh with me for a minute! (Hmmm...maybe they weren’t laughing WITH me, maybe they were laughing...)
- ✓ Danny Valdez singing “Primavera”. “Nuf said...



- ✓ Smoking Marlboros, drinking beer, and arguing class struggle one night with “La Raza Unida” and UAW guys in San Jose. They told me I was “Okay for a Greek girl!” and I told them they were “Okay for old guys with beer bellies”...We became good friends, and they were my best picketers.
- ✓ Bumping” (as in dancing) with everyone (including Cesar once!) at Union dances...
- ✓ Union women in Salinas – beautiful, tough, filled with love and laughter...
- ✓ Learning to drink Tequila out of the back of a truck with an old farmworker (who, thank god, was a gentleman!) Straight Tequila was my favorite drink for many years...Luckily I don’t drink anymore... I’m surprised Jose Cuervo is still in business....

Oh, that felt good!

Apparently, I danced a lot...Just to be clear, I actually did do some organizing, too!

Now for the serious stuff....Just for the record...

\* \* \* \* \*

After reading all of your posts this year, I have developed so much compassion for the different aspects of the Union’s history – both for Cesar and for all of us who spent time with the UFW, no matter what our contributions...

1. First, the listserve reminded me again and again how Cesar, no matter what his faults and mistakes, had a transformational and profound effect on the lives of so many people, as well as the course of American history and civil rights. It seemed no coincidence to me that in the last year, when the discussion delved into criticizing Cesar, there has consistently been strong and often emotional defenses and/or responses by Latino and Latina listserve members.

I am not Latina, and I have never been a farmworker, but I grew up female in a family where girls and women were not treated very well...and I know what it is like to feel anger, sadness, and despair at one’s lot, and to see one’s loved ones humiliated ... I will never forget some of the posts on this list serve about self respect and self esteem... Honoring the human spirit is hopefully the end result of all the different activities I pursue...Cesar is a hero to the Latino community (and others) and there is a damn good reason why. I do not question the hearts of people whose lives, and whose children’s lives, have forever been transformed by this man.

2. Conversely, I have also read so many stories in the last year about how Cesar’s leadership – though well intentioned to keep the UFW alive, I’m sure - sometimes hurt and damaged so many people in his path. I am saddened not by Cesar’s very predictable human behavior (“absolute power corrupts absolutely”) as much as by the fact that there was not a system within the Union that prevented the Union’s dependence upon the will of one man.

History shows over and over again that an organization must make the transition from the strong leadership of a charismatic, heroic visionary who leads the movement in its do-or-die struggle beginnings to a democratically based institution. The movement must evolve past the power of a few personalities to fulfill its mission - or things begin to fall apart. I know a lot of the UFW’s problems with this process had to do with the power and strategy of our enemies constantly putting us on the defensive, but I’m still sad that the Union was not able to develop a better system to evolve more democratically.

3. I believe that no one needs to have their truth distorted or minimized for any reason, even to protect our beloved leader. I believe that what Nancy Carlton wrote at the beginning of this discussion is true: Cesar will be honored throughout history as a great civil rights leader (I think that’s what she said – it’s been a long time!) Cesar is, and will be, a cherished hero to many Americans for transforming the lives of so many. I echo the sentiment so often expressed on the listserve that we don’t need to be afraid of telling our stories, even our sad ones . Then we are able to move on to continue our next good work ....
4. About the notion that the Union was about “sacrifice”...

As I read the listserve, I found myself perceiving non-farmworker volunteers in various groups to try to see the context of different stories. Two categories that arose for me for non-farmer volunteers are obvious: “lifers” and “short termers”. “Lifers” were people who were ready to dedicate their lives to the UFW. Obvious examples were LeRoy, Marshall, etc. Short timers were like me, I suppose – we may have started out with an idea that the UFW might be our niche in life, but had a clear idea after a couple years at most that our life paths lay elsewhere as our histories with the Union progressed. I have so much respect for those of you who dedicated a relatively large part of your lifetime to the UFW. As a “short termer”, however, I do not believe that “sacrifice” is the word I would use for myself, or for many of us who volunteered for the Union.

I read Saul Alinsky before the age of 19 when I joined the UFW, and the classic organizer premise that we are motivated by self interest still holds true for me – I just think our self interest includes not only our physical and material needs, but our emotional and spiritual needs as well - the kind of human needs that are fulfilled by the love we feel when our lives resemble Che Guevara’s famous quote: (to paraphrase) that a true revolutionary is guided by great feelings of love...

Some of us (farmworkers and Latinos and Latinas, I think) volunteered because the Union was PERSONAL – our lives and our children’s lives depended upon it. But most of the non-farmworker volunteers I worked with were there because we thought the Union was a part of the Greater Human Cause – be it political, spiritual, or both - which was PERSONAL to us for our own respective reasons. Either way, I would say nobody really “sacrifices” when they chose to work for a social movement that at first glance doesn’t obviously concern them – these volunteers just choose one aspect of their self-interest (one’s emotional and spiritual needs) over immediate material gain or physical safety. I’m not saying the choice is easy – it’s often courageous and noble. But I just don’t see it as a “sacrifice” – more a personal investment with alternative rewards...And with the UFW, the rewards *for the volunteers*, as we have read and read, were enormous...

So, honestly, I feel that in the “contract” most of us made with the UFW, the volunteers came out way, way ahead of the bargain – or at least I did. I needed the UFW at least as much as it needed me. As I wrote in my essay, it gave me a chance to walk a human path in an inhuman world...

5. This brings up the “foot soldier” analogy, which ultimately reflects upon the deeper question of what role non-farmworkers had in the UFW. Although the listserve discussion has recently ascribed some negative qualities to the term “foot soldier” I must speak about what was true for me: At the time I worked for the UFW: *I saw myself as a foot soldier*. And I honestly believed that this is analogy was the best one for organizers like myself.

I have always been an independent thinker, yet still I wholeheartedly agreed with what I was told when I joined the Boycott Staff in 1974: that the UFW was fighting a do-or-die war with extremely powerful enemies on behalf of Farmworkers’ lives. Cesar was the General, members of the Board were the Lieutenants, and down the line...The military analogy made sense to me, because it felt like a struggle of immense importance that required battle strategy.

I don’t doubt for a minute that the UFW would have done better if it had become a more democratic institution *but I don’t believe volunteers like myself are the ones that should have been included in that democracy*...Perhaps volunteers should have been treated with more care and development – if only as a better strategy for developing a more stable workforce, but I don’t believe it was our job to vote on internal policy.

6. I believed then and now in the powerful process of self-determination. And that meant that, although I was there to work in the UFW as part of a larger Human Movement, specifically the UFW was not my Union to direct or control. Additionally, at the time racism was an *inseparable* component of what the farmworkers were confronting. And whether or not it’s fair or not (considering the various racial makeup of farmworkers throughout history and the

country), the UFW as I remember it in California was inextricably linked to the Chicano (now Latino!) civil rights movement. Yes, all unions are tied to the struggles of the working class, but racism in America is such a divisive issue that the civil rights aspect of the UFW became one of its main points of focus.

I believed that the UFW ultimately was supposed to be run by and for people who *needed it* to have a better way of life for their own lives and for the lives of their children. So the concept of self-determination for the UFW in my mind was a somewhat hodgepodge compilation of people whose credentials included Farmworkers/Latinos/Filipinos/People of Color medley. Maybe this is not fair, and can be debunked in an objective analysis, but that was and is my *intuition* about who the movement “belonged” to...

7. The most difficult questions I’ve thought about as I’ve read the listserve this last year have haunted me. Cesar needed an “army” to fight the battles against agribusiness. He could get kids like me to willingly work for little money and long hours because, as I wrote previously, we knew working for the UFW was good for OUR LIVES, and we had no claim to challenging his power. So Cesar needed us and we needed Cesar, who validated our volunteerism. But...didn’t our continual presence indirectly keep the UFW functioning as a non-democratic movement? In other words, didn’t this arrangement eventually grow into a dysfunctional system?

Was it inevitable, given the nature of the Union’s volunteer (read: non-farmworker) staff, that the development of farmworker participation and farmworker “ownership” of the Union not progress in a manner that would have made the Union more democratic for farmworkers themselves? And what would have been the consequences for us non-farmworker volunteers if the Union had continually built up rank and file participation - would we have “lost our places” eventually to farmworkers?

Because people like myself (volunteers who accepted that we were there to do what the Union told us to do, not to vote on policy) were both expendable and ethically bound to follow the Union’s orders and not question the Boards’ decisions, did our existence eventually hamper the development of the UFW, because the hierarchy never had a chance to learn to deal with dissent in a more democratically based staff? I know we did a lot of good – I’m just questioning the effect of our volunteerism over the long haul....

8. Reading the listserve this year has reinforced my belief in a phrase that I have found to be true again and again: *the opposite of love is not hate – it is fear*. It seems to me that the UFW faltered when fear and paranoia drove the policy and the decisions of leaders and/or followers..I don’t know if fate would have allowed the Union to evolve any other way, considering the history of the Union and the times... but it seems fear led to some regrettable decisions and behavior.
9. Finally, The UFW always had to decide between the utopian hopes of the longer term vs. the risk of losing everything if we didn’t concentrate on the shorter term...Like most activist endeavors, this tension of “ends vs. means” is an impossible dilemma to solve with certainty. I always believe the “short term vs. long term” balancing act is the mandatory tightrope that must be negotiated to effect any kind of social change – and it’s almost impossible to not fall off by leaning too far one way or another. The only secret to getting anywhere, I surmise, is to work on improving your balance over time, keep getting back on the tightrope when you fall off, and keep moving forward, no matter how many times you fall to the ground...

So above all, I have so much respect for people who had – and continue to have - the guts and the faith to get back up on that nearly impossible path over and over again. To echo a common opinion here, I have nothing but respect and awe for the individuals who dedicated their lives to the Union, no matter what their contributions.

Bless you all. You have given me so much...Thank you.

And to all, a good night.... Despie Fausch Bonadies 1974-1975; 1976

**Richard Cook, 12/31/04**

**RE: Despie Fausch Bonadies's "Quickies" etc.**

Thank you, Despie, for one of the most (to me) insightful and helpful contributions of the entire yearlong discussion. Your sensitive but clear eyed analysis of the motivations and the role of the volunteer is especially helpful to me.

As Norbert Herold wrote, so movingly the other day, for years after leaving, tears would flow when strong memories came.

Remembrance "is important  
but not more than the people  
whose survival it serves . . .

so that they may speak what is true,  
and have the patience for beauty . . .

for want of songs and stories,  
they have dug away the soil,  
paved over what is left . . .

Oh, remember the oaks that were here . . .

To remember,  
to hear is to remember, is to stop  
and walk on again  
to a livelier, surer measure."

from "In a Motel Parking Lot, Thinking of Dr Williams" by Wendell Berry

Richard Cook

NFWM/ UFW 1972-83 (La Paz, Arizona, St. Louis, Salinas, Florida, Prop 14, with occasional ventures into Juarez, Cuernavaca, etc)

PS. Like you, Despie, I am surprised there has not been a bit more said about "romance" in the UFW. Anyway, I recall vividly one time a whole bunch of us went . . . Oops, I see my time is up.

**Mary Sheehan, 12/31/04**

**RE: Thank you**

Friends past and present: I want to come in at the eleventh hour to say it has been a wonder reading this listserve during the past months. I have relived some of the best days of my life reading through the reminiscences, the challenges, sometimes the anger or joy of what we experienced. I am responding on Rick's posting as he expressed some of my feelings to a t.

For many of us coming into the Union in the early '70's, we had ideas of solidarity, power to the people, and other phrases and the Union gave us a chance to really put to the test our commitment, our chance to go beyond words to actions that might have some meaning and effect.

For the past nearly three years, I have been working in Sri Lanka, and I am here tonight, as on this island we work to try to respond to the devastation around us from the events of Boxing Day.

In spirit, we will always be together,  
Viva la gente y la causa.

Mary Sheehan  
1971-1974; Denver, LaPaz, Arizona

**Alberto Escalante, 12/31/04**

**RE: Mary Sheehan's smile**

To the List,

I remember walking past Mary Sheehan in the California Capitol anteroom where she served as receptionist for a certain ex-Jesuit who was then Governor of California. Suspended from the ceiling and walls in her office were all of these huge Rockets, Missiles and trains. I recall thinking to myself, what a strange juxtaposition that this diminutive woman of obvious Irish descent made as she was obviously the real power that all those of much less vitality sided up to so that they could bask in the aura of her powerful presence. Next to her, even Gov. Brown seemed to pale in comparison. As we left she looked up and smiled a smile that was as sweet & pure as an Irish sunrise. Happy New Year! And may all your dreams come true!

Alberto Escalante 2004  
Don't Fear Love

**Ernie Powell, 12/31/04**

**RE: Thank you**

I want to say thank you to LeRoy and all of you as well.

LeRoy, it has been very good for me personally to reflect on my life in the way that this writing project has truly made happen. I know how much work and dedication you have put into this and I cannot thank you enough.

And then, to see what my brothers and sisters have written and to learn more of the history of the union has added so much. I had glimmers and pieces of some of the information from conversations with friends over the years but the exchanges I have read in the past few months are invaluable - all good though sometimes difficult lessons. Further, through this period of writing and reading it has enabled me to be in touch with people that I either knew when I worked in the movement or later in the CCC days - for me from 1977 to 1980. Re-establishing those friendships has meant a great deal.

Happy New Year, and again, thank you.

Ernie Powell

**Margaret Murphy, 12/31/04**

**RE: Si se puede!**

To all on list serve –

Just a couple of comments before the listserve closes down later today.

Thank you LeRoy for your vision & your tenacity. It's been a wonderful experience to read & reflect on so many different folks' recollections.

Thank you, thank you Doug! You are quite the historian. I've known many UFW folks over the years, but have never heard a personal account of the March to Sacramento or the Plan of Delano. Thank you also for the great summary of events in Texas. What a great tribute to Gilbert Padilla you gave us!

To follow up on a posting re: Cesar's health before he died. The posting states that Al Rojas revealed that Cesar did not remember or recognize him at some meeting. We saw Cesar in Davenport, Iowa in November '92, just a few months before his death. He had come to accept the Pacem In Terris Award from the Archdiocese of Davenport. We drove from Milwaukee for the event. After the ceremony was over, I brought my kids to meet him. He waved at me from a distance & then immediately called me by name. This was 15 yrs. after I left the Union. He seemed to be very intact at that time.

One of the other postings talked about how Cesar was so comfortable to be with in the '60s. That was also true during part of the '70s. After the fast in Arizona, I went with Cesar & others for a couple of days to a retreat outside Tucson, (I believe it was Mt. Lemon). During that time Cesar

taught me how to make salsa & flautas. He was very light hearted. During the Prop. 22 Campaign in L.A., he stood with us doing human billboards. He obviously was enjoying himself.

I don't know what happened later, but I agree that something changed in a dramatic way. And that change seemed to be very unhealthy. I left the UFW as Salinas folks began being called to La Paz for the Game. As I listened to others' experiences with it, I knew it had nothing to do with organizing farmworkers.

I was struck by the posting that reported that Sr. Florence had refused to play the Game. It made me wonder what would have happened if other members of the leadership had also refused to play. Would events have been different had they done so? Obviously, Cesar was not alone in using the game to close down clinics & fire field office staff. Other Board members & leadership participated in those actions.

As many on the listserve have said, their years with the UFW were some of the best years of their life. I say Amen! What a privilege! What a legacy! I also feel that it's important to remember that those who have questioned or have seemed critical of events in the Union have the same passion as the rest & are still trying to understand what happened & wishing it had been different.

I also want to affirm what so many have said about the contributions that the UFW made to other movements & its continuing impact today. Although the UFW is not as it was in the '60s & '70s, it does live on. Contracts are still being negotiated, although fewer than those after the success of the grape boycott & the initial ALRB elections. There is still an RFK Medical Plan &, as Doug has affirmed, a Pension Plan. La Causa lives on.

Si se puede!

Margaret Murphy

1971-1977

Delano, Salinas & Coachella Clinics, Arizona Fast, Prop 22 & Prop 14, etc.

#### **Jerry Kay, 12/31/04**

##### **RE: Let's say, "Guidance."**

I was not going to post another comment since my last 'conclusion', but I found this at the beginning of an autobiography by George Seldes, 'Witness To A Century' - one of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century's premier muckraking and investigative journalists. Under an 'AN UNUSUAL DISCLAIMER,' he wrote:

"...Telling the facts (or truth, if you wish) should be respected, for the departed as well as the living."

I do not subscribe to the cliché 'de mortuis nil nisi bonum'. I favor the viewpoint of the great 'Biographie Universelle de France' whose motto is: "we owe respect to the living; to the dead nothing but truth." Truth, not libels."

#### **Graciela Cisneros, 12/31/04**

##### **RE: the end**

What a hard day, the end. I have been fighting tears all day. I hope to continue hearing your voices on the new site or seeing you at the reunion in Sept. 2005.

graciela cisneros

71-73

#### **Doug Adair, 12/31/04**

##### **RE: thanks, and what's next?**

In a message dated 12/29/04 . . . [Alfredo Acosta Figueroa] writes:

*To All from Alfredo Acosta Figueroa:*

*After reading some of the discussion, I felt that I had to give my input.*

*First, I would again like to thank Leroy for all of the time and effort that he put in undertaking this monumental task of contacting most of the people that were involved in building the U.F.W.A. No doubt that with the experiences and everyone's participation, what we have written will change some of the past perspectives that we had about the internal structure of the U.F.W. Speaking from my perspective, I was always an independent island on the outside waiting for my orders and rarely was involved in the conflicts that arose within. Only time will tell the truth.*

*I'm only sorry that the majority of the monolingual Spanish speaking organizers such as Jesus Villegas, Celestino Rivas, Pablo Carrizales, etc., didn't participate.*

Alfredo!

It was so good to see you at Mark Day's wedding, and to hear of your 50th wedding anniversary party, and now to hear the latest from the Chicano Valientes of Blythe. You are truly respected and loved by the farm worker community of the Coachella Valley.

I join you in thinking about the voices left out, the stories not yet told. I agree with LeRoy that there needs to be an end to Chapter #1, just from an administrative point of view, to see what we have and how it can be handled. I think his original project was to stimulate and gather the essays, which meant putting together the mailing list. But the e-mail enabled us to be back in touch with each other, and set off this amazing round table. \* \* \* \*

\* \* \* \*

UFW Oral History Project: Some of us participated in the Cal State Northridge project. I thought the goal was to get transcriptions and translations of those histories onto the computer, indexed, and accessible to the public. Interviews include many not here (Luis Valdez, Julio Hernandez, Bill Chandler). Maria Serrano of Coachella was over the other day, remembered back to being organized by Padilla in Stockton in 1962. Would the CSNU be a possibility for funding and joint ventures for reaching folk for whom writing and the internet are an obstacle?

Worker Participation in Management? I know Chapter I is your project, LeRoy, and I am extremely grateful for all the time and energy you have put into this. I assume that you have ideas for how to invest any donations and income that this project generates. But I'm hoping that part of your vision is some kind of non-profit, an alumni association or something; an entity with warm relations and supportive of the Union, but independent, maybe even democratically controlled by "the workers," the folk who took the time to participate in preserving this history. Do we get a share of the royalties to the future movies (The Awesome Adventures of Hawkeye the Huelguista!? I envision it as a Road Trip movie with sex and red flags...)

Great visits this week from Nancy Elliott and also Nanci Jarvis, both veterans of Coachella Valley Campaigns.... Come visit our farm . . . or come by the Alhambra Farmers' Markets on Sunday mornings. And I look forward to the Reunion in September.

All best wishes for the New Year,

Viva la Causa,

Doug Adair ("El Malcriado," "Pato")

El Malcriado, 1965-70

Grape boycott, Lettuce boycott, Philly, St. Louis, 1970-71

Legal Dept., 1975-77

Under UFW contracts, 1971-73 (Tenneco, Ducor), 1977-89 (David Freedman, Coachella) (card carrying, dues paying member/ pensioner, United Farm Workers of America, AFL-CIO)

**Jackie (Brown) Davis, 12/31/04**

**RE: thanks, and what's next?**

I am humbled and grateful to all of you, LeRoy especially, to have been part of this discussion. In fact, I might just have to get a therapy appointment!! :)

By the way, Doug Adair's dates are a glimpse of the divine. They delighted our Christmas visitors.

All the best to each and every one.

Jackie Davis

**Theresa and Blase Bonpane, 12/31/04**

**RE: thanks, and what's next?**

thanks to leroy and all – theresa and blase bonpane

**Hugh “Hawkeye” Tague, 12/31/04**

**RE: Cesar and Hubert Humphrey**

Today I was hauling junk out of a house and I found a Hubert Humphrey pin. It reminded me of an incident in '72:

Roberta Jaffe and I were handing out leaflets at the Florida State Fair and along comes Hubert and Muriel Humphrey. HHH looked like he was already dead. He was pale and had inches of pancake makeup on. Muriel was handing out cookie recipes.

Roberta hollers out, "What are you going to do for the farm workers? Hubert pokes in the chest (between her rather large breasts) and says, "I've known Cesar Chavez for 15 years young man."

I'm sure glad that he didn't win the primary!

Thanks again everybody. Love, Hawkeye

**Abby Flores Rivera, 12/31/04 (1)**

**RE: Health and Safety: Okay, just TOILETS**

Dear Brothers and Sisters of the Listserv:

Cesar used to embarrass me when he would tell the story of my father. He would bring the story up unexpectedly at meetings or gatherings after something triggered his memory. He would tell everyone about the time in the early days of the strike when he observed my Dad receiving the last gallon of donated milk then turn happily around at long last to leave stopping short noticing that the woman behind him was pregnant then handing her the milk. Cesar would say he was moved because he knew my father had a large family that needed fresh milk, too. Cesar never knew but it embarrassed me because others would think I was being praised through my father. I lived by the same precepts practiced by my Father to never let the right hand know what the left is doing. In sharing my many experiences with this listserv it was never my intent to glorify myself but that they might serve those studying history learn about the life of a farm worker volunteer juxtaposed with the many experiences of UFW volunteers who came from all walks and backgrounds to help us have a better life by building a union. Speaking as a farm worker and for my family (my parents, brothers and sisters) we will be eternally grateful to all of you for your help, dedication, understanding, forgiveness for hurts and for your strong commitment and desire to help us. Success and blessings to all of you as you continue doing good by helping the poor in our society and throughout the world.

One last thing though, I thought Jerry Cohen was crazy as he stood facing us at a Friday night meeting at the Filipino Hall in Delano in the early days. He kept talking about toilets. *We would have toilets in the fields.* Oh, no thought I, that will never happen as I visualized the grapes fields and orchards dotted with outdoor toilets up and down the San Joaquin Valley. It made me doubt that this lawyer who kept running his hand through his wild hair or that even Cesar for that matter knew what they were doing. You see, I begin to fathom ranchers providing outhouses and especially when I knew how troublesome they were to build and maintain. I pictured them being



placed out there on some dirt road by the crops then every few years having to dig a new hole and moving the toilet to a new spot. Really, it seemed impractical to me and it seemed doubtful to me that the ranchers would ever agree. It was too much work. Therefore, I ignored the toilet demand that seemed to please everyone by the smiles and the applause Jerry got at that meeting. So it turned out that I thought everyone present had lost their marbles by asking for toilets because I knew that never in a million years would the growers do that for us. I lost hope in this thing called “union”.

There were rules for doing your business in the fields. Never and I mean never do your thing where the crop has yet to be picked. Always and I mean always take a group of women with you to form a little circle that will shield you as they stand guard; facing out of course. Third rule, always remember where you went before and don't go there again for obvious reasons. One woman didn't follow the rules and went off by herself without anyone noticing. Then we heard her screaming at the top of her lungs and all of us charged in her direction, men, women, and children. I thought SNAKES for sure. When we came near there she was dancing a fine cumbia, round and round, shake, shake, twist, her pants at her ankles exposing her rump to the high heavens all the while screaming, “Las hormigas, las hormigas, no me miren, no me miren” (“The ants, the ants, don't look at me, don't look at me”). She couldn't put her pants up either as we quickly surmised all the while frantically waving like a flag the unused toilet paper wrapped around her hand. I was a kid so I doubled over in a fit of laughter, the men politely came to a halt and respectfully turned away trying not to show even a sign of a smile although I was close enough to some to hear stifled laughter; the kind that hurts when you try to keep it in. The older women gave us all dirty looks; so dirty they could kill. The indignity!

For the next few hours a group of women and young girls like me working close together in a steady pace had a jolly talking about this little mishap and it helped make time fly. I heard so many stories that afternoon about incidents out in the fields but also a lot of advice. You shouldn't do this, you shouldn't do that, had she done this, had she done that, she was stupid, it was her fault, I remember the time when, or tell them about when so and so...on and on it went until we all felt superior in our knowledge and sad about the unfortunate woman who now seemed foolish compared to us. As smug and puffed up as I was feeling I became aware that I had not been following some of the rules either but I wasn't about to confess that to these women of experience. The new rule learned which no one bothered to mention because it was obvious is never, ever, under any circumstances, scream when your pants are down. **Ask me though if anyone of us ever said that the grower should provide toilets out in the fields for us to use. Hell, not one of us thought of that. As high and mighty as we had become in those few short hours, it was so beyond our experience and imagination we couldn't even draw it out as a possibility, so we didn't.**

The day came when I finally understood. I even went into field to inspect *one* I was so fascinated. Like Jed Clampett would say, “Ooh, doggie.” I was impressed and red in the face. So there was a way of getting toilets into the fields after all without digging a hole. So that Jerry Cohen wasn't so crazy after all. Hey, if he could get toilets, he could move mountains as far as I was concerned. He did and Cesar, too. So in those meetings whenever Jerry Cohen, Cesar, Dolores, Larry Itliong, Jessica, Marshall, Gilbert or Eliseo would say we had to do something, I never doubted that we could. Ever. You see, doing the small things convinced me to have faith in our ability to do big things.

Traveling south of Second Street on the 99 Hwy in Selma here in the San Joaquin Valley a few years ago with my four-year old granddaughter I passed by a plot near a grove of trees where ladders and toilets are stored during the night by a local grower. I pointed to the toilets to my right and told my baby-girl. “See those toilets, Hijita? They make me happy because now we don't have to do poo-poo and pee-pee where people can see us, like the way we see dogs.” At her age, and sense of self, she understands the indignity. “Oh no, Nanie, that's terrible.” She listens and learns about the life of her abuelitos and life moves forward.

To all, have a Happy New Year and a Great Vida! Thank you LeRoy, siempre, abby

**Patty Park (Proctor), 12/31/04**

**RE: 2005**

How many of you hate as much as I do midnight on New Years Eve and all the kissing that goes on with people you don't care about and sometimes don't even know.

How about ending this year with farmworker "clapping" and a very big "Que Viva La Causa" and a very loud " Si Se Puede."

That's how I'm bringing in my New Year here in Canada.

Thanks to everyone. It has always been a privilege to be part of the farmworkers movement and union.

Patty Park (Proctor)

**Abby Flores Rivera, 12/31/04 (2)**

**RE: thanks, and what's next?**

Dear Doug:

DOUG - WRITE THAT BOOK, WRITE THAT BOOK, WRITE THAT BOOK! Also, since you brought it up and I love it immensely, HAWKEYE, MAKE THAT MOVIE, HAWKEYE, MAKE THAT MOVIE!!!! (Only make it w/o sex so my grandchildren can watch it; YOU KNOW A Wild DISNEY PRODUCTION OR BETTER YET, SPIELBERG! Yeah! That's a whole lot better. Both of you should have a web page were we can periodically go in and have a good read.

DOUG: I need your help with a correction before the end of the year. Who was the artist who did the Skull Grape Boycott Poster? (Grape cluster in the shape of a skull.) I thought it was Zermeno because that is what Lou (Lu) Chavez told me so I always assumed we were picking up his posters. However, he only did caricatures so who did the other? Please let me know right away through Doc Proj so I can clear this up because I left Escalante hanging. He thought the artist may be the same one who did the Cesar in a field of skulls poster and I tend to agree with him. HURRY! HELP! siempre/ abby

**LeRoy Chatfield, 12/31/04**

**RE: THANK YOU ONE AND ALL**

LeRoy Chatfield 1963-1973

YES, the last day. I hate to see our online discussion come to a close, but it is time to move on, and publish the results. I am very grateful for your kind and generous words of support. I am pleased to have been of service, such as it was.

\* \* \* \* I am too old to be discouraged or disappointed with the book funds raised thus far, but truthfully, I believe we can do better. I hope we will.

A book has more meaning than just for our individual – or collective – ego. A book is a tangible, physical object that marks our presence and our contribution to the farmworker movement. A book will serve a future generation of academics and others interested in one of the most significant social movements in the history of our country. You were a part of it, you built it, and I will not rest until we have a BOOK that marks its significance. I am not perfect, you are not perfect, life is not perfect – we built what we built, we made the best contribution we could – now it is up to others to make their judgment about the meaning of it all.

I say again: I believe we can do more to make the BOOK a reality. Please consider doing your part to make it happen.

All the best,

LeRoy (Chatfield)

**Julie Greenfield, 12/31/04**

**RE: Hello/ Goodbye**

Dear Listserv members,

I, too, am coming on board with a last-minute contribution.. it was difficult for me, as I know it was for others, to figure out how to relate to this project. But I am glad that it has happened, and can only hope and trust that the information in it will be used for the right purposes.

To all of you whom I have not seen for many years, bless you all; we have all played our own little (or big) role in history, I guess. I hope to see you in September at the reunion...

Love,

Julie Greenfield

P.S. I am pasting my memoir in here, as I have a Mac without MS Word...

United Farm Worker reminiscences of Julie Greenfield

In 1967, I was a teenager on Long Island, New York, active in anti-Viet Nam war activities. My parents, Gordon and Doris, were old labor and progressive activists. And it WAS the 60s, with the explosion of the civil rights movement happening all around us! So it was natural that my sister Wendy and I would become interested in the farm workers' struggle.

I have to admit that Wendy, my little sister, actually got involved first. It wasn't until I saw a store manager pushing her around that I realized I had to become involved personally! However, once we were mobilized, we and several friends from our high school, Syosset High, including Gordon Victor, faithfully picketed and cleaned out not only our own town, but eventually neighboring towns of the offending scourge grape! At that time, the Long Island boycott was organized by a housewife named Gretchen Haynes, an Englishwoman, I think.

When I graduated from high school and went on to N.Y.U. in the fall of 1969, I volunteered to take on the Gristedes store which was only one block from my dorm room. (Gristedes was a small N.Y. chain, catering to the affluent--the only chain in N.Y. which never succumbed to the boycott.) I got SDS (Students for a Democratic Society) activists and anyone else I could to help me. I got to know the N.Y. staff, which became family to me--Mark Silverman, Ray and Barbara Ortiz and her five children, Marilu Sanchez, and later, Jerry Kay. When the semester ended I moved into the Brooklyn boycott house, behind the Ex-Lax factory, and basically started working full-time for the union (although technically I was still in school). Our office at that time was in the ILGWU building. I knew little about organizing techniques, was not trained, but had a lot of enthusiasm, and did the best I could. I remember riding the subway at all hours of the day and night and thinking that, although I was only 19 years old, this was probably the best, most meaningful job I would ever have.

After the exciting victories of the first grape contracts, in the spring of 1970, and the momentous other events in the world (the invasion of Cambodia, resulting in big demonstrations, Kent and Jackson State, and resulting bigger campus unrest and occupations, which I was involved in at NYU), I officially left school.

In June, I set out with two Catholic seminarians, one of them Richie Ross, in an old, barely functioning Renault, and drove to California to see what all the excitement was about. Relieved that we made it through the desert, and over the mountains, we stopped briefly at La Paz, where we were greeted by Kathy and Lupe Murguia, and then on to Delano. There I was assigned to the new JFK medical plan, posting hours by hand, tedious work, but just being in Delano was exciting to me. After a few weeks, we started hearing things about the situation in Salinas heating up, and happily for me, I was sent there just as the lettuce strike was starting!! What an amazing experience--the huge rallies--the rousing speeches by Cesar, Dolores, and many others--I tell everyone that is how I learned Spanish (at least partly true!). The 3 AM rising time for picket lines--thousands of farm worker cars bearing the eagle flag proudly zooming through the Salinas Valley.. listening to workers on the picket line and seeing how this event changed their lives and view of themselves from one of subjugation to one of pride and dignity--this was and is a pivotal event in my own life as well.

After the high of the Salinas strike (end of Sept. I think) I was sent back to N.Y. to work on the lettuce boycott. Jim and Susan Drake, the Iziguirre family (from Salinas), Paul Chavez, others, we all drove in a car caravan back to N.Y. I was the Manhattan organizer, but the truth was I had fallen in love with California, and wanted badly to go back. I ended up resigning from the union in February, and drove a union car with my sister Wendy, Gordon Victor, and one other person back to Delano.

In Delano, the construction of the medical clinic had just started, under the direction of Molly Mallouf, a wonderful contractor from Marin County. Wendy and I were put to work, digging ditches for the foundation, which was backbreaking, but a totally new and empowering kind of work for us. I remember the first time Cesar came by and saw us, he said to one of his aides, "Get those girls out of there!" However, we soon convinced him that we really wanted to be there, and he left us alone...I ended up staying for the entire period of the clinic construction, and even later (until November 1971, I think). It was a wonderful growing time for me personally. I got to know many of the union leadership, and volunteers, and made some friends that are still with me today (Flo Kelly and Pat Kelly particularly come to mind). Kevin Brown, Clyde Golden, Mike Kratko and other members of the crew I have not had much contact with, but remember fondly. Duane Anderson, the union mechanic, a conscientious objector, was my main love interest at the time....

One small incident which may have been a harbinger of later events in the union was a small protest which occurred among the 40 Acres staff not long after I got there. There were several families, including Maria Flores, who was Cesar's secretary at the time, who I believe circulated a petition asking for a raise in the \$5/week stipend. They were mainly families who had children, who were finding it increasingly difficult to explain to their children why they couldn't go on field trips, or do many things that the other kids could do. Their requests were modest--I think they wanted \$10/ week--can't remember all the details. There was a big meeting in the hiring hall. Cesar rejected the demands. Afterwards he fired the people involved in the petition effort, including Maria. I had a very hard time accepting that...I even approached Cesar on one of his many walks around the clinic site, and to his credit he spent probably a half hour talking to me about his reasoning. He told me that I really didn't understand, that there were people basically out to take over the union. Afterwards, there actually was some effort made to make conditions somewhat better for those families--(I think we started getting a grocery allowance, etc..) But I still could not understand what happened at the time...

Near the end of my time in Delano, the medical staff arrived. Dr. Dan Murphy, his future wife Janet, and the rest of the MDs and nurses from Stanford. It was very exciting, and helped move me in the direction I eventually did move in, which was to become a nurse, and then a nurse practitioner. I originally hoped to work in a farm worker clinic, but it did not work out exactly that way. I do work with Mexican and other nationality immigrants a lot in my work, which is now as a school nurse in Hayward, mainly focused on handicapped children. Everything I learned in the union comes into use in the course of my work. I try never to forget where the people I work with come from, the hardships they have had to endure to get here, that they endure every day to survive. I see myself as an advocate for them.

My organizing skills came to good use the past few years as they were threatening to eliminate the school nurses in my school district. I knew, as some other people apparently did not know, that we had to organize--get people to write letters, come to school board meetings, speak for us, if we were to survive and do the work we felt was important. So far it has worked. The greatest compliment I remember getting was in the letter of reference that Jim Drake wrote for me to get into nursing school--"Julie Greenfield," he began, "is an organizer."

I think that is about all I have to say. I left staff at that point. I did not want to move to La Paz. It seemed too removed from the people. I did help with the Prop. 22 campaign, and was and am a supporter. I played a very small part in the UFW, but the UFW has played an enriching, meaningful part in my life.

VIVA LA CAUSA!

**Jerry Brown, 12/31/04**

**RE: *Saludado sisters***

Hi brothers and sisters,

In Delano during the table grape boycott and in Toronto during grape season of 1969-70, Juanita and I worked closely with the Saludado sisters, two high school girls who were the daughters of Mr. and Mrs. Saludado, two of the union's fervent supporters in Delano. I'm sure one of the girls was named Petra, but I can't remember her sister's name. Does anyone know what happened to Petra or her sister, or where they are today?

- Jerry Brown, '66-'76

**Abby Rivera, 12/31/04 (3)**

**RE: *Saludado sisters***

Dear Jerry:

It would be Petra and Sally (Celia?) Saludado if they were close in age. Maria Saludado, (remember her and Antonia the older sisters) works at La Paz. I asked Maria's son, Emilio, about them a while back and they are married and doing fine. I believe Petra is a teacher and Sally married an Oceanographer and lived in Guam for a long time (still might). Write to Maria c/o La Paz she will be happy to hear from you. I share this info. because I know Maria will be pleased to learn you asked about her family. /abby

**Jeff Sweetland, 12/31/04**

**RE: *Gracias a todos***

Many thanks to all of you, and a special thanks to LeRoy. He organized all of us to make a new commitment to La Causa, and look what we have accomplished. For 7½ months we have shared our most precious thoughts and our most basic emotions with one another. Sometimes we have made each other laugh, sometimes cry, sometimes wince, sometimes scream in outrage. Sometimes we have amazed the entire group with tales of marvelous achievements, large and small. Sometimes we have forced the group to face painful, sometimes heartbreaking, realities. But always we have helped each other remember and, by remembering, reach down into the very core of our being.

In doing so, we have given to the Union and to posterity a first-person historical record second to none. Who but a group of dedicated UFW volunteers could have done that?

Perhaps we shall all see each other in September, but even if we don't, this was truly our grand reunion. May each of us be blessed with peace and all good.

Que viva la Causa!  
Que vivan los campesinos!  
Que viva Cesar Chavez!  
Si se puede!

Jeff Sweetland

1975-1978, 2003-2004

Long Beach Boycott, Calxico, LA Legal, Salinas Legal, Documentation Project and Listserve

**Kathy Lynch Murguia, 12/31/04**

**RE: *Saludos y gracias de parte de Lupe***

Lupe Murguia would like to send his saludos a todos uds. y decir gracias a todos. He remembers many of the names I have mentioned who have participated in this process. My thoughts have been my own and as been already mentioned it would be important at some point to gather histories from the farmworker volunteers, (los huelgistas) and the membership during those incredible years. Lupe respects and values the hard work and sacrifices of all of us. Sometimes I

catch him in deep thought, and in reflecting on this he notes there is so much more to be done... He works hard at helping la gente in Tehachapi.

Prospero Ano Nuevo a todos. Gustaria a verlos mejor que escribirlos. Que Viva Cesar Chavez y Que Viva Helen Chavez y Que Viva Mi "boss" Chris Hartmire..... De Parte de Jose Guadalupe Murguia de Nava.

**Sandy Nathan, 12/31/04**

**RE: ALRB Elections**

Here are a few final responses to some of the recent postings. I write now in order to avoid the last minute rush.

To Abby Rivera: She asked if Tom Dalzell had been responsible for "getting the ball rolling" for paid salaries in the legal department. Tom must be disconnected from cyberspace now, and so with this thing turning into a pumpkin very shortly, I thought I should keep the record straight. Most assuredly, Tom did *not* initiate the idea of salaries. I don't actually recall exactly whose idea it was, and I am not even sure it was anybody's idea. My recollection is that there were field office personnel and people in the legal dept. who understood that the union had reached a point where a stable staff providing continuity had become crucial (circa 1977). It was also true that people wanted to figure out a way to stay with the union for a long time. Out of discussions about all of that, the idea of paying people who could make something like a lifetime career commitment emerged. So, the idea of compensation did not grow out of greed or any interest in harming the union. To the contrary, it was born out of a perception that a permanent staff was essential to the union's success. So, at the risk of sounding ridiculous, it was initiated out of love for the union.

To Norbert Herold: He asked about the issue of anti-semitism being raised in this forum. Regrettably, in one of the earliest postings on this listserv, Richard Ybarra made an anti-semitic remark in what he thought was a private note to LeRoy. LeRoy never really addressed that, and that failure left a very bad feeling about the Listserv for some people. Richard offered, in his words, "blessings" and "apologies." The greater issue of anti-semitism wasn't dealt with during the past 40 years and it certainly wasn't going to get resolved on this Listserv. Anti-semitism was a minor but very real issue in the UFW. It doesn't go away with blessings and apologies. It would take a good deal of honest scrutiny and energy to process that one. Not many folks would have the stomach to mess with it. Richard Cook was really the only one who took on the issue in this listserv. I admired his willingness to do that.

To Lupe and Kathy: In the summer of 1973 I think I was inside every rural jailhouse from Calxico to Yuba City, and I would swear that Lupe Murguia was inside every one of them as well. On the other side of the bars. And always smiling. Heckuva' guy.

To Hugh Tague: He asked about the union's successes and failures in the different crops and geographic areas. The answers to his questions would tell you an awful lot about the history of the UFW. But it's late in the day, and as Ranger Doug would say, it's time to bring out the dogs and piss on the fire.

Sandy Nathan, La Paz

**Maria Fuentes, 12/31/04**

**RE: Gracias y Feliz Ano Nuevo**

Estimados amigos y amigas,

I'm writing tonight from Bakersfield. Earlier today, I went to the outskirts of Lamont with my sister-in-law to visit her parents -- strong and loyal huelgistas. It was a reminder to me that the strikers of this valley are the seed of what connects all of us together.

My sister-in-law's mother mentioned that at first only her husband worked, but that as her eight children got older she joined her husband trabajando en la uva. Every night she would be up until 12:00 washing (on a washboard) and ironing her children's clothes so that they would have clean

clothes to wear to school each day. She would get up at 4:00 a.m to make breakfast and lunch for the whole family. When she and her husband would leave for work, though the children were still asleep, their meals were already prepared. She says her hands show the many years of hard work and sacrifice. She also shared that every day she thanks God for all that she has in life. We know her story is repeated thousands of times over in many other farm worker families who like her's, with passion and faith, joined the union, went out on strike and stood up for their rights and those of others in the hope that their working conditions and their children's future would improve. She and her husband like many other huelgistas today continue to live peacefully in the valley. I am always humbled by my sister-in-law's parents' sacrifice to go on strike. I also feel much happiness knowing that for their courage they achieved a dignity that no one can ever take away and that they they leave their children, grandchildren and great grandchildren a most treasured legacy they will never forget.

Many of you on this listserv were born, still live or spent many, many years living in this valley. I just want to share that tonight at 6:00 pm, after days of rain - you could literally see for miles. As we drove back from Lamont to Bakersfield on one of the many quiet roads you could see row of lights from cars traveling on the grapevine -to and from LA, you could see far away a horizon of lights from Bakersfield and the other valley towns. The dark and peaceful sky sparkled with stars and moonlight among a few clouds - the valley looked calm, quite and serene.

As we end this listserv on the eve of 2005, I share my wish for 2005....I hope and pray that somehow all the gods of the humans on this earth help us become real men and real women who understand that we are all one world and that any tragedy or injury to anyone of us happens to each of us. Our purpose here on earth is not to hurt or destroy the lives of others, but rather to bring health and happiness to as many individuals as possible.

To all of you who dedicated so much of yourselves to bring dignity and respect to the life's of farm workers -- thank you again from the bottom of my heart. I'm sorry for the pain that many have endured and I hope you always remember that not one sacrifice was in vain.

Con todo gusto les mando un abrazo. Que tengan salud, paz y amor en el ano 2005! Nos vemos en Septiembre!

Maria Fuentes

**Barbara Pruett, 12/31/04**

**RE: Si se puede!**

I am watching a TV tribute to country singer George Jones as I write this. I mention this because one of the songs is "A Picture of me without you" and it hits home regarding what we have been saying these past number of months about Cesar Chavez and the work we did for the UFW/farmworkers. It is true that each one of our lives has been strongly affected by our individual experience with Cesar. A picture of each of our lives in part contains Cesar and the farmworkers. A picture of our lives without Cesar would be so different we wouldn't recognize it. He and his mission, and those involved in it, have shaped the lives of each of us. Maybe that is one of the most important pictures to come out of all of this.

Happy 2005 and my best to you for your future.

Barbara Pruett

**Richard Ybarra, 12/31/04**

**RE: THANK YOU ONE AND ALL**

LeRoy,

As always it gives me great pride to be associated with you, and by extension of what we knew of and with Cesar, with him as well. May he always be our guiding light among those we walked with on this earth and may we someday be truly worthy to walk in his footsteps.

Again you have shown and led the way to what some of us still believe was part of our best life experiences and learning periods of our lives.

I am forever grateful to him and you for teaching and showing me by example what it is to be truthful, loyal and never again afraid of fear itself for any reason on this earth. I am not sure we had so much a history lesson here, but we shared some lessons as best all could recollect.

I want to also thank those who shared Minnie Ybarra's health situation over the last three months. Their prayers and good thoughts were for sure part of her miraculous turnaround in what was very nearly her passing to the other side. Minnie Milagros Ybarra is grateful to all of you who cared and shared.... May the the Lord's Blessings be with you and all who walked with Cesar into history and for the small parts we all played in freeing farmworkers, Mexican-Americans, Mexican immigrants of every status, African Americans, and poor and working poor throughout the USA and beyond. As Margaret Murphy added recently and Jerry Brown the first stated here, that small pebble continues to spread its actions and affects through all the Huelga folks of yesteryear and this past and coming year.

Richard Ybarra de L/H

**Kathy Lynch Murguia, 12/31/04**

*RE: Auld Lang Syne*

**Auld Lang Syne**

"We'll drink a cup of kindness yet" for "old long ago". And we shall discharge all the quittances, but remember and give tribute to what we remember of the good times... and there were so many, many, many. I have forgotten how many. We do live in uncertain times. My Irish heritage has found such a home with "La Causa." Tonight I drink along with others that cup of kindness..

... cultures follow the New Year's stroke of midnight with the song "Auld Lang Syne." Early versions of the song came from medieval Scotland... the Gaelic lyrics reflected hope, companionship, and the uncertainty of life in those times. The phrase "auld lang syne" translates literally to "old long ago," Good cheer and ... much more. K. Murguia

**Abby Flores Rivera, 1/1/05**

*RE: response to Jackie Davis*

Dear Donna: I more than anyone know the many "hats" Kathy wore at La Paz (Vivan Los Murguias) and all that passed by her desk. I never said she was a busy body or would have said so straight-up otherwise. (No masco mis palabras; I don't chew my words.) It is my opinion, though, that reporters, writers, staff, and supporters were the one who put Cesar and his family on display. siempre/ abby

**Donna Haber Kornberg, 1/1/05**

*RE: response to Jackie Davis*

Dear Abby,

I HAVE noticed that you don't chew your words -- and have enjoyed reading your postings. If I misinterpreted one of them, I apologize.

I'm sure that your opinion is at least partly right, if not fully. It is difficult to isolate causes of various phenomena, as I think that generally there is more than one cause for, e.g. Cesar's private life being on display.

Very best wishes,

Donna

**Fran Ryan, 1/1/05**



LeRoy - Thank you for providing the setting for volunteers to share so deeply. This has helped many of us, undoubtedly, flesh out thoughts, feelings, understandings we didn't even know we had. Such a contribution in so many ways.

.....

May the new year find us able to rise to the tasks before us and be able to do them with much love and carefulness.

ARRIBA!

**Ed Chiera, 1/2/05**

**RE: Thank you, LeRoy! ¡Feliz Año Nuevo!**

LeRoy –

Just following Fran Ryan's lead. Since I haven't used the listserv address before, I thought I would try it. Also, would you please forward the new listserv address to folks like me who fail to keep up with such things?

I want to express my deep appreciation for the work you are doing in documenting our experiences with the United Farm Workers. As you know, there have been many professional writers who have given accounts of the early days of the union organizing and Grape Strike and of Cesar, but few have the understanding of what we as volunteers experienced, felt and learned.

Your document - or should I say ours - is a very personal story. One that will give a whole new perspective on the farmworker movement.

Thank you for being our leader.

Ed Chiera 1967-1969

Just a little note to listserv folks about my involvement with the early UFWOC days of union organizing in Delano and at various boycott locations nationwide. I joined the farmworker movement in the summer of 1967. Earlier that year I had just returned from work with the Peace Corps in Bolivia and AID in the Dominican Republic and started a graduate degree program at Stanford. While studying at Stanford I heard about the grape strike in Delano, joined a food caravan from Berkeley, and attended a UFWOC Friday night meeting in Filipino Hall-lead by Cesar and Larry Itliong in 3 languages. I was hooked! I wanted to quit academia and join the movement! I wrote Cesar asking if I could help out - do research or something! Getting Cesar to invite me to work in Delano is a story in itself. (Something about a guy named "Chiera" sounding too much Italian like "Guimarra"-must be a grower spy, right?) In Delano I lived in a safe house with Marshall and Jessica, picketed grape fields in the early morning, worked in the Pink House doing research with Jim Drake, and then, as happened to all volunteers, Cesar sent me off to boycott world! I worked briefly in Philadelphia and Cleveland. Since boycotting Guimarra alone did not work, Cesar called us all back to Delano to strategize our next move. The international Table Grape Boycott movement was born. In February 1968, in the midst of a cold winter in the West, a caravan of several old farmworker cars and a yellow school bus took off from Delano - destination New York City! Joe, Tony and I (sorry about last names, folks - just a little senior moment problem!) were the bus drivers - I being the only member of the group who had ever been the New York City! We sang huelga songs and ate either peanut butter and jelly or bologna and cheese sandwiches on white bread all across this broad nation. Oh, just to make it easy, the "heater" in the yellow bus blew cold air! (Many stories about that trip). I worked with a group of boycott organizers directed by Fred Ross, Sr. Dolores Huerta was Cesar's official representative. After many months living at the Seafarer's Hall in Brooklyn and working in the Big Apple, I returned to Delano. Cesar then sent me with Fred Ross and others to East Los Angeles to register voters and start the RFK campaign. Like others, I experienced the fateful nightmare of being at the Ambassador Hotel when Robert Kennedy was murdered. Shortly, thereafter, I went to Portland to help Hijinio Rangel on the Grape Boycott in Oregon. (Hijinio was called back home - Nick and Virginia took his place). Lastly, after Hijinio and his family were sent to Detroit in the late spring

of 1969, I joined him to run the Michigan Boycott effort. I met my (former) wife Elizabeth there, got married and expected a child (maybe, not in that order!), and left the movement just as the Grape Boycott was being won! After my daughter Laura was born, I spent a few weeks in Salinas volunteering to help out as the Lettuce Strike began. That's my farmworker history.

In 1991, I formed my consultant practice to help union leaders manage structural changes in the workplace and to develop union-based job training programs. ¡Feliz Año Nuevo! to all my UFWOC brothers and sisters, former volunteers and contributors.

Ed

**Marshall Ganz, 1/23/05**

**RE: JESSICA GOVEA**

## JESSICA GOVEA

LeRoy,

You may be interested to know that Jessica died this afternoon around 3:00, after a 15 year battle with cancer. She died peacefully, accompanied by her mother, Margaret, and her husband, Kenny. A memorial service is being planned. Que en paz descanse.

Marshall

Sunday, January 23, 2005

**Carlos and Linda LeGerrette, 1/31/05**

**RE: SERVICE FOR JESSICA GOVEA THORNBURNE**

MESSAGE RECEIVED LAST NIGHT FROM CARLOS AND LINDA LEGERRETTE RE: EAST COAST MEMORIAL SERVICE FOR JESSICA

Jessica passing leaves us with heavy heart and tremendous sadness. Jessica's life demonstrates that one person can truly make a difference, and her actions weave a beautiful path throughout the following words of Nathan C. Schaeffer.

“At the close of life, the question will be not how much you have got, but how much have you given; nor how have you won, but how much have you done; not how much you saved, but how much have you sacrificed, not how much you were honored, but how much have you loved and served.”

\* \* \* \*

Viva,

Carlos & Linda LeGerrette