

The Delano Grape Strike: The Farm Workers' Struggle For Self Determination. February 1969

By: The Rev. Wayne C. Hartmire, Jr., Director, Calif. Migrant Ministry

"When we are really honest with ourselves we must admit that our lives are all that really belong to us. So, it is how we use our lives that determines what kind of men we are. It is my deepest belief that only by giving our lives do we find life. I am convinced that the truest act of courage, the strongest act of manliness is to sacrifice ourselves for others in a totally non-violent struggle for justice. To be a man is to suffer for others. God help us to be men!" (Cesar Chavez)

On December 1, 1968, *Presbyterian Life* printed a long article by Mr. Allan Grant entitled "California Grapes and the Boycott – The Growers' Side of the Story." Among other things Mr. Grant implied that farm workers in California are doing reasonably well economically. He also hinted that the leaders of the Union have no real interest in the workers or in social justice. Mr. Grant pieced together a large number of facts and conclusions (some accurate and some not): but he did not deal seriously with the underlying issues of the Delano Grape Strike: 1) Are seasonal farm workers underpaid and mistreated on the job? 2) Would an organization of their own improve conditions? 3) Do farm workers want such an organization; do they want to be represented by Cesar Chavez' UFWOC? 4) Is the agricultural industry opposing the formation of a strong and independent organization of workers? Answers to these questions might help Christians respond to one important ethical question that confronts us: *How are we to be servants to the men, women and children who harvest the crops?*

I would like to talk about the nature of the agricultural industry, conditions in the fields and trace the history of the Delano strike and in so doing try to address the basic human issues involved in the farm worker's struggle. I will then deal more directly with some other statements made in Mr. Grant's article. I am not writing as a detached student of this struggle. The California Migrant Ministry has been at work in the fields for 25 years. I have known Cesar Chavez for more than 7 years. Our staff has been present from the beginning of the Strike in September 1965. Our concern is for dignity and full life for workers, their families and indeed for all men in the agricultural community. We believe that self-determination for farm workers is one crucial element in a more just and human future. We believe that farm workers must have a strong organization of their own if they are to improve their life situation and we have tried to help them gain the strength needed to bring about that measure of equality that will make possible bargaining with their employers.

California's Most Powerful Industry

California agriculture is big business! Gross agricultural income in 1966 was a record \$3.95 billion dollars. Since then it has topped four (4) billion dollars.¹ California agriculture and related industries, by their own testimony, account for 33% of the jobs in the state.

Farm workers are pressing for change against the determined resistance of the state's most powerful and influential industry.

Agriculture in California has been characterized by large farms, specialized crops, high peak labor needs and a large supply of impoverished farm workers – often from other countries.² Although the majority of farmers in California are smaller landowners, the industry is dominated by the largest landowners. The 1964 U.S. Census of Agriculture showed 81,000 farms in California. 49,000 of those farms hire no outside labor. 7% of the farms employ 75% of the labor.³ 60% of California's farms average less than 50 acres but the total acreage of these small farms is 5% of California's agricultural land.⁴ The 1959 U.S. Census of Agriculture showed that 6.0% of California's farms own 75% of the land. Included among those large landowners are So. Pacific Railroad, Standard Oil, J. G. Boswell, Anderson Clayton, Tejon Ranch (L.A. Times), Bank of America and Giumarra Vineyards Corporation. Contrary to Mr. Grant's statements many Delano area growers other than Giumarra have large landholdings in excess of 2,500 acres.⁵

These powerful agricultural landholders and their economic allies dominate the agricultural industry in California. They and their predecessors have resisted unionization since the turn of the century.⁶ The farm workers' struggle for organization and bargaining may be focused today on table grapes but it is in fact a struggle with the will of the entire industry. And as many people in other states have noticed, it is a struggle with agricultural labor users all over the nation. If farm workers are to succeed against the resistance of the industry, they must succeed in Delano and in table grapes. If they can gain the right of organizing and bargaining in wine and table grapes then all farm workers may share in the benefits and the dignity of new found organizational strength.

Poverty & Suffering Among Farm Workers

Some may ask: Why is such organizational strength necessary? Are conditions really that bad? "No other segment of our population is so poorly paid yet contributes so much to our Nation's wealth and welfare."⁷ So speaks the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor in its discussion of seasonal farm workers in the U.S.A. But as Mr. Grant implies it may be unfair to lump California farm workers into national conclusions since farm workers in California are paid more than in any other state (excepting Hawaii where farm workers are organized).⁸ California's Welfare Study Commission made the following statement in referring to farm workers: "one occupational group *in California* is so deeply locked in poverty that it is set off from all others."⁹ Allan Grant quotes the Governor's Advisory Commission on Housing but overlooks the following conclusion of their study: "Fewer than 20 percent of the California farm worker families covered in our study lived in dwellings which could be considered adequate by present standards of health, safety and comfort. Sixty-three percent of the dwelling units occupied by general field workers, the

only toilet facilities were pit privies. Thirty percent of the dwellings had no bathing facilities, and 25 percent lacked even so basic a necessity as a kitchen sink with running water. These conditions, to be discussed in detail in the body of the report, offer little evidence of improvement in the relative economic and social position of the agricultural worker in California. He remains, as he has since the state's early transition to intensive labor use farming, among the most poorly paid, poorly fed, and poorly housed of California's citizens."¹⁰

It is true that many grape pickers in California earn \$1.40 or \$1.50 per hour plus an incentive piece rate *during the peak harvest season*. But the peak harvest season lasts only four to six weeks.¹¹ During the rest of the year wages hover around \$1.40 per hour¹² and work is sporadic and uncertain. Even at harvest some employers pay a flat \$1.50 per hour¹³ and not all workers get steady employment. Mr. Grant quotes the \$1.65 minimum wage established by California's Industrial Welfare Commission. He failed to mention that California's grape growers sought to have that minimum wage set aside in court—an expensive legal action that can only be understood in the context of hourly pay under \$1.65 per hour. The \$1.65 /state minimum is for women only. Men are covered by the federal law but at a discriminatory level: \$1.30 per hour as compared to \$1.60 per hour for other workers. According to an independent study done for the University of California, the average grape worker in Kern County (where Delano is located) is employed 119 days out of the year. Full employment would be somewhere near 250 days.¹⁴ His *annual* income is comparable to the average for all seasonal farm workers in California: \$2,024.¹⁵ To make matters worse, the gap between farm workers and other workers is widening. In 1948, the average California farm worker earned 62% of the hourly wage of his counterpart in manufacturing. In 1965, average farm worker earnings were 46% of the wage earned by the average worker in manufacturing.¹⁶ Farm workers in California are poverty-stricken; real human suffering results from that poverty. Those who doubt the reality of that suffering need to spend some time in the barrios and rural fringe communities of our state.

Powerlessness

Annual income is only one aspect of the farm workers problem. They are relatively powerless on the job and in the life of the community. As a result, farm workers are excluded from unemployment insurance, and collective bargaining legislation. Mr. Grant affirms the protection farm workers have in California but enforcement of the laws that do cover farm workers in California is at best weak and inconsistent.¹⁷ The California Rural legal Assistance program, led by attorneys, has been investigating the enforcement of laws that are supposed to protect farm workers. In a preliminary report they noted 1,869 violations of state health and sanitation laws. Over 90% of the farmers in one county were in violation of state health laws.¹⁸ In another county they determined that only 14 of 139 farmers surveyed provided toilets for their workers and that only two of the 14 did so in

compliance with health standards.¹⁹ Even Governor Ronald Reagan has recently called for more effective enforcement of laws that are on the books to protect California's farm workers (in the same statement he opposed unemployment insurance for seasonal farm workers and the extension of the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA to agriculture).²⁰

California farmers are not especially cruel or corrupt. They are men like us who happen to have too much power over the lives of their workers. They have become accustomed to an over-supply of poor and unorganized workers, which has allowed them to control all the important decisions about wages and working conditions. Being human, they have paid more attention to their own economic interests than to the interests of the workers. As a result workers in agriculture have been denied the improved wages and working conditions that are commonplace in industry.²¹ The vast majority of farm workers in California do not have contracts; they do not get overtime pay; too often they do not even know their rate of pay while they are working; there are no holidays or vacations with pay; they do not have health or pension plans; in many instances they must provide their own tools & equipment; safety provisions are minimal; there are no regular rest periods; toilets and sanitary drinking water may or may not be provided. Farm workers go to work not knowing how long the day will be or how many days of work there will be in that week. Workers are laid off in the middle of the day, in the middle of the week, for days or weeks at a time with no notice and no clear indications of when work will be available. If a male worker is told to show up for work at 6 A.M. and the equipment is not ready or the trees are wet and he does not work until 10 A.M., he is not paid for those 4 hours. Speed-ups and abusive supervision are all too common. Farm workers can be fired at any time without explanation. There are no established channels for grievances. The many who will dispute these realities can point to examples of better wages and working conditions but their examples do not represent the experiences of the majority of unorganized farm workers in California and the U.S.A. The farm workers' powerlessness on the job crushes his dignity and leaves him no alternative but resentment and suffering. Justice demands that there be a change—for the sake of workers, the industry and the larger community.

Change Through Organization

But how will that change come about? Should workers wait for their employers to make the needed changes? In California they have already been waiting for 100 years. Should they wait for Congress to pass legislation that will protect their right to bargain with their employers? All farm workers in our country have now been waiting 33 years for that day.²² Workers could leave agriculture. But what would be the alternatives in the city for a man with farm labor skills?

In 1962 Cesar Chavez made a decision to do something about the conditions of farm workers. He left his job as an organizer for the Community Service Organization (CSO) and moved to Delano, California. He and his wife and 8 children lived on their minimal savings and on sporadic field work earnings while Cesar began to build a self-supporting

organization of farm workers that would in time be strong enough to bargain with employers for improved wages and working conditions. By September 1965, the NFWA had about 2,000 family members, nearly half of them in the Delano area. There was a credit union and a death benefit insurance plan tied to the \$3.50 per month dues.²³

Allan Grant who is the highly paid professional spokesman for a four billion dollar a year industry²⁴ implies that Chavez is a money- and power hungry labor professional. Cesar Chavez *is* an experienced and skilled organizer. He is also a dedicated Christian who is pouring out the substance of his life in an effort to achieve a new kind of dignity for workers. After 16 years as an organizer he lives in a small, four-room house in Delano. He does not own a car. Since the strike began in 1965 he has received no salary. He and his family live like all of the Delano strikers; \$5.00 per week spending money, food from the strike kitchen or store and basic bills, e.g., rent and utilities paid by the Union.

In September 1965, the now famous Delano Grape Strike began. It was at first a joint effort by the Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee (AWOC) of the AFL-CIO and the independent National Farm Workers Association (NFWA). The two organizations have now merged into the UFWOC of the AFL-CIO, with Cesar Chavez as director. As a result of the Delano strike and the several boycotts that have accompanied the strike, there have been union representation elections, bargaining and contracts with 10 wine grape growers. The aspirations and the organizational energies of the workers are now focused on table grape growers.

In May and June of 1967, UFWOC carried on an organizing campaign among the workers of Giumarra Vineyards Corporation (12,500 acres, approximately half of the acreage in table grapes). In June, UFWOC sent a registered letter to Giumarra stating that the Union represented Giumarra's workers and asking for a meeting to discuss a union representation election. The Company did not respond. The Union then sent a telegram, asked the State Conciliation Service to arrange a meeting, and through other independent parties tried to get a meeting with the Company. The Company refused. *Note* that the workers were not asking for recognition or for immediate bargaining. They were only asking for a meeting to discuss fair procedures for a secret ballot election that would determine the will of the workers. The Company would not even discuss such an election and since that time has resisted all mediation efforts by church groups and others.

This same offer to discuss election procedures has been made to all table grape growers in California – large and small. Without a single exception (so far) table grape growers have refused to meet with representatives of organized workers to discuss elections or other issues having to do with representation and bargaining. In Jan. 1969 UFWOC offered to meet with employers even if there were only one agenda item: the effects of chemical pesticides on workers.

On August 3, 1967, after two months of trying to meet with Giumarra a strike was called by UFWOC. I watched 80-90% of the field workers leave their jobs to join the

strike. The Company began recruiting strikebreakers from Mexico and elsewhere and the struggle was on. The boycott against Giumarra's grapes began in the fall of 1967. Other growers loaned their labels to Giumarra to help him minimize the pressure of the boycott. In the spring and summer of 1968, the strike spread to Coachella Valley and southern Kern County. There are now 42 strikes certified by the U.S. Dept of Labor. Also in the spring and summer of 1968, as mentioned above, the offer for elections was made to all table grape growers. In the face of the unified resistance of the industry to any conversations with organized workers, the boycott was expanded to include all California table grapes. Church groups, unions and public officials all over the country have given their support to the boycott.

The hard reality is that the workers need and want organization and collective bargaining and their employers are resisting this change with all the considerable power at their command.²⁵ The industry is attempting to cloud that reality by talking about "outsiders" and "labor professionals" and by stating that the "real workers" don't want Chavez and UFWOC. But who are the "real workers"? Mrs. Josephine Gabaldon (mentioned by Grant as a "real worker" opposed to Chavez) is not a field worker but a crew boss. Jose Mendoza (also mentioned by Grant) is a shoe salesman hired by the National Right-to-Work Committee to represent himself as a worker and to spread anti-union propaganda. He makes speeches all over the country but has no solid organizational base at home, no following among farm workers and is just the most recent example of the willingness of some minority people to sell themselves to the very forces that keep their brothers poor and powerless.

Do Workers Want a Union?

But the claim is made that the workers don't want Chavez and UFWOC? Why then don't employers agree to fair elections supervised by a neutral party so the workers can vote their will? Employers argue that they know what their workers want and don't feel the need for an election. But if they are so sure why not have an election and thus destroy the effectiveness of the boycott? And how can they be so sure since workers have voted for the union every time they have had a chance? In the three secret ballot elections and the five card check elections held to date, the workers have *in every case* voted to be represented by UFWOC.²⁶ These elections are the only hard, public evidence we have that indicates the will of the workers. Perhaps grape growers *do* know the will of their workers and are, for that reason, resisting the only fair and free way of determining that will.

I will conclude with comments on some of Mr. Grant's "facts and conclusions" that have not been dealt with above:

- 1) Mr. Grant claims that "it was not local farm workers who were picketing" (in 1965 and 1966). The striking farm workers have asked for and received help. From church groups, civil rights groups, unions and others. They do not apologize for that nor do

we think that anyone is an “outsider” to the problem. But to state that the picket line was composed of or dominated by non-farm workers is a complete distortion of reality. CMM staff and many other churchmen were on those picket lines and watched Delano farm workers walk out of the fields and develop roving picket lines to communicate the Huelga (strike) message to other workers.

- 2) Mr. Grant states the “90% of the more than 5,000 pickets hired at the peak of the harvest in Delano are residents of the area.” He documents this by referring to a booklet published by The South Central Farmer’s Committee – a Committee composed of struck Delano growers. Independent research carried on before the Delano strike indicates that approximately 60% of the grape harvest workers in Kern County are migrants.²⁷ Almost the full 100% of the harvest work force are seasonal workers—as opposed to year-round hired hands. Whether migrant or local, seasonal workers are locked in the same poverty, have similar aspirations for their children and have the same need for organizational strength and the protections of a contract.
- 3) Mr. Grant says the harvest season lasts for four months and that grape pickers can work almost all year-round. Dept of Employment figures show that the labor *needs* in Kern County (where Delano is located) fluctuate greatly even during the harvest period:²⁸

December 2, 1967	200 workers	(harvest)
Dec. 18, 1967—Jan. 27, 1968	3200 workers	(pruning)
February 24, 1968	400 workers	(pruning)
March 30, 1968		
May 13—June 1, 1968	3500 workers	(thinning)
July 13, 1968	800 workers	(thinning)
Aug. 7—Sept. 2, 1968	6000 workers	(harvest)
Sept. 21, 1968	1500 workers	(harvest)
November 23, 1968	50 workers	(harvest)

A small percentage of workers work year-round. The vast majority of seasonal workers (migrant and local have long periods of unemployment and unemployment. As stated earlier the average grape

- 4) Allan Grant contends that there is no strike in the grapes and that the Union does not represent the workers. It is *the classic argument* used by employers who oppose the unionization of their workers. How can employers in an unorganized industry know the deeply held convictions of their workers? How can the public know the will of workers when employers refuse to allow elections?

The grapes *are* being picked. It is slow and expensive but growers have been willing to pay the cost of recruiting strikebreakers from Mexico and the Southwest rather than to discuss issues with their original employees. Can it be said that there is no strike just because there are too many hungry people in the U.S. and Mexico — some of whom are willing even to be strikebreakers in order to meet the basic needs of their families?

Mr. Grant quotes UFWOC membership figures as an indication that Chavez is a failure. He fails to mention that these are family memberships and that many families include 2-3 workers. He also compares these membership figures with the total number of farm workers in California when the UFWOC organizing drive has been mainly limited to grape workers since the strike began in September 1965. (California agriculture produces more than 200 commercial crops.) I freely acknowledge that more farm workers need to be reached by the organizing struggle. My conclusion from that is that the strikers need more help: more food, money and volunteer assistance—more help so they can win the strike *and* reach out to workers in other crops. It is ironic that growers point to slow progress in gaining members & contracts. It is *their* own unified resistance to reasonable social change and a more just future that makes the struggle so slow and so difficult for all parties. It is their unified refusal even to discuss elections that makes the boycott necessary.

Problems of Small Farmers

- 5) Mr. Grant pints to the cost-price squeeze that is affecting many farmers. The vast majority of churchmen and farm workers empathize with the plight of the small farmer. However, it must be pointed out that most workers in California are employed by large commercial farms (see earlier figures in this article). It must also be said that even the hard-pressed small farmer is not in the same economic position as the worker. The farmer can sell his land; he also has credit at the bank; normally he has an established place in community life and access to the decision-making process. Humanly speaking, the plight of the worker still demands priority attention.

Farm workers, although in sympathy with small farmers (who tend also to be laborers), are now saying: “we will not tolerate any longer a situation where your survival in business is purchased by our poverty and the poverty of our children.” With concerned churchmen the workers would press small farmers to organize themselves for effective collective bargaining at the market place. Ralph Kittelson, the National Organizing Director for the National Farmers Organization (NFO) has said that farmers must stand up for their rights or the problems will grow.²⁹ He and the NFO are organizing farmers not to oppose the

legitimate aspirations of the workers but for effective use of power in the marketing of their products. The NFO is now active in California. In the CMM we have argued that if farmers would organize for the sake of a fair price at the market place and would articulate their demands and their strategy, churchmen would support their efforts. This, after all, is what the workers are trying to do—help themselves through the strength of their own organization.

- 6) Mr. Grant quotes with satisfaction the anti-strike conclusion of Vancouver Mayor Thomas J. Campbell. However, Mayor Campbell is an exception to the general rule. Starting as far back as December 1965, distinguished visitors to Delano have generally supported the reasonable demands of the workers, even when their travel expenses have been paid for by the growers or the chain stores. Two (2) Minneapolis–St. Paul clergymen Father Edward Flahavan & the Rev. Wm. Merriman, sent by the chain stores in their area to become “weekend experts” on the growers side of the strike insisted on examining all sides and returning home to testify that the Calif. grape growers were anti-union and racist in their attitude toward workers. An editorial in the St. Paul Dispatch Pioneer Press then accused the ministers of being “overnight experts” (i.e., the wrong kind of overnight expert).

A three man Fact-Finding Committee from Toronto composed of Mr. Ron Haggart, a reporter for the Toronto Telegram Reporter; Mr. Wm. Archer, former City Controller and the Rev. Edgar File of the United Church of Canada carefully spent blocks of time with growers, workers, union leaders and public officials. They concluded that “the over-riding issue in the California grape dispute is the right of collective bargaining which is being denied to the farm workers. From our examination it is clear that the table grape growers are unwilling to allow their workers to choose their own representatives and let them bargain freely for themselves. . . . we are satisfied that the UFWOC has substantial support among the vineyard workers in the Delano area.”³⁰

Rabbis Jacob Lantz and Judea Miller of Boston spent a week in California examining all sides of the grape controversy. They concluded that the strike was both real and legitimate and called on their constituents to support the farm workers. Rabbi Miller in a report to his congregation made the following comments: “. . . we toured the vineyards, spoke to growers and farm workers, to representatives of industry and of the Union, including Cesar Chavez. It is our conclusion that there definitely is a strike there . . . Despite contentions by the growers that the conditions of the farm workers in that region are better than those in other regions in the natin, still the conditions that we did find were wretched. We have studied the entire situation and find this to be a moral question. The exploitation and dehumanization of other human beings for the sake of profit is a religious issue.”³¹

Non-Violent Social Change

Many churchmen sympathize with the plight of the workers but balk at unions and boycotts. They worry about strikes at harvest; but UFWOC has agreed to no-strike clauses in all its ten contracts. They are concerned about the ability of the Union to service the contracts; but the wine growers under contract have testified to the integrity and sense of responsibility demonstrated by UFWOC.³² As fellow Christians I urge you to put yourselves in the workers' place. How can they change unjust conditions without organizing and pressing their demands? What else *is* a union than an organization of farm workers seeking changes through collective bargaining? They have asked their employers to discuss representation elections and been refused. They cannot call on the legal machinery of the NLRB because the law excludes them. Having sought changes through discussion and negotiation and been rebuked, what alternative do they have other than to apply pressure through strike and boycott? The workers are asking for a reasonable thing: collective bargaining. They are pressing their demands *non-violently*.

What will happen if farm workers do not get support from men of good will? Fresno Mayor Floyd Hyde is worried: "We have left the poor people of the (San Joaquin) Valley no alternative and there are growing signs they realize it. We are pushing them toward violence."³³ But Cesar Chavez is determined to liberate his brothers without resorting to violence: "one drop. Of human blood is worth more than all the contracts. We'll use strikes and we'll use boycotts to get recognition, but we'll wait as long as we must to get contracts without violence."³⁴

Will militant non-violence succeed in bringing a measure of justice to the "factories in the fields?" Can Cesar Chavez and the pioneer farm workers with him maintain the momentum of their struggle and expand the dignity and raise the hopes of farm workers throughout the nation? The answer depends very much on what churches and churchmen do. Farm workers need our concrete help. With the reset of the world they are calling on us to be servants.

Footnotes

1. New York Times Magazine Section, Nov. 17, 1968, p. 84 (article by Dick Meister)
2. "Calif. Farm Labor Problems", Part 1, Report of Calif. State Senate Fact Finding Committee on Labor & Welfare. 1961, pp. 13-16.
3. Los Angeles Times, Sunday, Nov. 17, 1968 (article by Leonard Greenwood)
4. Howard Gregor, "The Plantation in California" *The Professional Geographer* Vol. 14, March 1962.
5. e.g., Bianco, 6795 acres: W. B. Camp, 4908; Divizich, 5500; Elmco Vineyards, 3610; D.M. Steele, 4187; Marko Zaninovich, 3686. Just under 2500 acres; Milo Caratan, 2183; Pandol & Sons, 2288; A. & N. Zaninovich, 2283, V. B. Zaninovich, 2157. Statistics from Assessors Records — Kern and Tulare Counties, Agricultural Conservation and Stabilization Service Cropland Figures, 1959 U.S. Census of Agriculture.
6. "California Farm Labor Problems" *op. cit.*, pp. 200-205.

7. "The Migratory Farm Labor Problem in the U.S."—1968 Report of the Committee on Labor & Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, made by the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, February 19, 1968, p. 27.
8. It is not as unfair as California farmers contend. Farm labor organizing all over the country depends on success in California. The aspirations of workers in Michigan, New York, etc. are tied to UFWOC's efforts in the grapes.
9. Welfare Study Commission Report—The Pattern of Dependent Poverty in California March 1963, p. 370.
10. Appendix to the Report on Housing in California – Governor's Advisory Commission on Housing Problems, April 1963, p.656.
11. Calif. Dept of Employment: Weekly Farm Labor Report, 881A, #1184, August 3, 1968.
12. Los Angeles Times, op.cit (article by Greenwood)
13. Calif. Dept of Employment: Weekly Farm Labor Report, 881A, #1191, September 21, 1968, also #1193, October 5, 1968; #1195, October 19, 1968, etc.
14. William H. Metzler – Technological Change & Farm Labor Use, Kern County Calif. 1961 (Giannini Foundation 1964, Berkeley) Part II, p.27.
15. Calif. Dept of Employment, Disability Insurance Report #835, parts 5a, 5b, 5c, 5d, 1967.
16. U.S. Dept of Agricultural, Human Resource Division: U.S. Dept of Labor Bulletin #1370-5.
17. For a national perspective see "Migratory Farm Labor Problem in the U.S.", op.cit,p.37.
18. Los Angeles Times, Monday, July 1, 1968, Part 1, p.3.
19. *California Farmer*, May 18, 1968 (article by Don Razee)
20. Los Angeles Times, Wednesday, December 4, 1968 (article by Jerry Gillam)
21. These conditions are not universal. There are some employers who are unusually sensitive to the needs of their workers. But the conditions described are the natural result of too much employer power and they are the conditions experienced by the vast majority of workers in California and in the nation.
22. Agriculture is specifically excluded from our nation's basic collective bargaining legislation (the NLRA) which was first passed in 1935.
23. The staff of the CMM watched this development firsthand. This is not hearsay.
24. Mr. Grant is the full-time paid executive officer of the California Farm Bureau Federation.
25. Farm News: The Voice of Kern County Agriculture, October 23, 1968 (article by Bill Mead)
26. Results of the secret ballot elections: (procedures and supervising body agreed to by workers and employers: DiGiorgio (Delano & Borrego) UFWOC, 530; other unions (Teamsters), 331; no Unions, 12; —DiGiorgio (Arvin) UFWOC, 281; other Unions, 0; no Unions, 199; Goldberg (Delano) UFWOC, 285; other Unions, 0; no Unions 38.)
27. William H. Metzler "Farm Mechanization & Labor Stabilization", Part 1, pp. 38, 40 90; Part II, p.46.
28. Figures taken from Weekly Farm Labor Report, 881A for the dates indicated.

29. Los Angeles Times, op.cit. (article by Greenwood)
30. Presentation by the Fact Finding Committee to the Mayor and City Council of Toronto. November 20, 1968.
31. Temple Tifereth Israel Bulletin (Boston Mass.), November 12, 1968.
32. Los Angeles Times, Monday, December 16, 1968 (article by Harry Bernstein) A few quotes from this article: “representatives of Schenley Industries & DiGiorgio Fruit Corporation said relations with the Union (UFWOC) have been remarkably good. (George Morrison of Almaden said): “Our contracts have increased labor costs but we’re not hurt. It is unfair to say this is not a responsible Union.”
33. Los Angeles Times (article by Greenwood) op.cit.
34. Ibid.

Printed by the Calif. Migrant Ministry 1411 West Olympic Blvd., Room 501 Los Angeles,
California 90015 February, 1969