

Three Articles from WIN magazine. 1973.

(1) Cesar Chavez On The Strike by Frank Greer and Jerry Kay; (2) Nonviolence In The Vineyards by Bob Levering; (3) Empowering The People by Wendy Batson and Bob Eaton.

Special Section on the United Farmworkers

Cesar Chavez On The Strike

(Frank Greer and Jerry Kay interviewed Cesar Chavez, United Farmworkers Union president, just after the strike was called in Delano in early August, 1973.)

Question: Three years ago you had many, many contracts. Today you have only a few. How would you describe the strength of your union right now?

Chavez: We have more people than we had three years ago, so we are stronger. Losing a contract is only a temporary thing. We'll get them back.

Question: What are some of the central issues in this strike?

Chavez: Well, there are many issues. The employers want to take back from us what we got in 1970. What we gained in 1970 they want to take back in 1973, and we are not about to give it back.

The hiring hall is the only way we can eliminate the hiring boss, the crew chiefs, the labor contractors, and we want a hiring hall. The employers don't want a hiring hall because they want to perpetuate the hated and feared labor contract system, and we want to end it; the workers want it to come to an end. That's one of the big issues we are faced with. We're not about to give it up. We had it for three years and it worked well—there are some administrative problems, but in the main it worked well and on those problems we are willing to negotiate and try to find solutions. There is nothing wrong with the concept, but the employers don't want it so we are fighting it.

Question: You called a strike today in Delano, and I think you've been out in the fields among the people. What's your sense of the spirit and the determination?

Chavez: There is great spirit in Delano as well as in Lamont. We have about 2500 out on strike in Delano now, which really means we have about 90 percent of the work force out on strike. There was quite a bit of confusion today—the first day always is like that. A lot of people are very difficult to mobilize and to structure but a lot of work is being done this afternoon to get the meetings going.

We struck the largest table grape grower in the United States, the Guimarra company, and we took about 80 percent of its workers out. We could have gotten more, but we just didn't have time to go to all the fields. For you to mobilize 3000 people on a picket line when the distance is anywhere from ten to fifteen to fifty miles is a very difficult thing to accomplish in one day. So we will be better organized tomorrow and better structured and we will be able to make better use of our time.

Question: How would you describe the conviction of the workers, many of them old people who have worked in the fields for long periods of time?

Chavez: They look at the union in this instance as a great hope for them. They respond to it in a way that makes trade unions throughout the United States marvel at the spirit of the people. They are totally committed to it. They have tremendous and unending love for the idea of unionism and the idea of brotherhood and cooperation. There is more love on this picket line for one another than you could find anywhere in the world. That kind of commitment and love and concern sees us through many of the difficulties we have.

There is more love on this picket line for one another than you could find anywhere in the world.

Question: Isn't the central issue who's going to control the workers? It's not really the wages, it's not really the hiring hall, it's one word, and that's control.

Chavez: No. The employers try to make that the issue, that's not the issue. For public relations purposes they want to say it is control. Nonsense, it is not control. It's a whole question that—we say the workers' only commodity is work; that's all they have. They should have a right to their own democratic processes in the union to establish hiring procedures, hiring hall rules and regulations, and to establish a way to preserve and to guard their seniority which is a very cherished thing among them.

The big problem is that the people who work here year in and year out—who do the pruning during the very cold months, who do all of the non-harvest and pre-harvest work—these people find themselves excluded from the better jobs when the harvest time comes around. Other people who come from the outside take their jobs away, and that is the fight. The fight is, we say, if a worker works for the employer ten months out of the year—nine months, eight months, out of the year—he certainly has a right to the picking and packing jobs when they come up. And these people should not have to wait two or three weeks or sometimes a month until there are jobs left over from other people who come here from the outside.

Question: During the three years you had contracts here, what were some of the changes you were able to start?

Chavez: Oh well, the right to have bathrooms in the fields, especially for women; the whole idea of having clean portable ice cold water with individual drinking cups; ten minute rest periods; no more mass firings. Now if a worker gets fired and he has a grievance, the union will move immediately on it, and we were able to get many of those workers back in their jobs. No more labor contractors; no more having to stand for a shake up; no more having to give kickback money to persons to get a job.

All these things have disappeared. That's why the workers like the union. The workers fight for the union because the union fights for the workers. And there's no two ways about it; the union is militant about workers' rights and the workers are militant about the union.

Question: How would you compare your relationship to the workers with the Teamsters relationship to farm workers?

Chavez: They don't really count. They don't even have meetings because they don't have a membership. We can't compare—we have a membership, we have a following, we have a great rapport with the workers. We are with them, we are part of them; we came from the same fields and we are going through what they are going through. We speak their language and they trust us, and we have infinite trust in them. There is no comparison.

Question: What do you see is the role of the boycott in this critical period of time when the contracts are out and the struggle is beginning almost all over again?

Chavez: The boycott is crucial—very necessary, very important for us. You see, we don't believe in cracking heads and using violence and intimidation tactics to get the people out. Our approach is one of convincing people, and we feel that we have things going for us that are in the workers interest. Those who oppose us are not too sure about what we are and can be convinced if we work harder. And that's what we are all about.

So, because of that, we are always going to need the boycott at the other end in terms of building economic pressure on the employer while we are taking our time, because it takes a lot of time to convince people nonviolently. We have great support for the boycott from the clergy, from the labor unions, from the young people, from the students, from many ethnic groups, and many professional organizations, civic groups, politicians. The support for the boycott is tremendous and it's growing every day and we need that to win.

Question: You are a person who means a lot to a lot of people. What do people mean to you? Obviously you dig being with them. You like touching hands a bit.

Chavez: Well, you see, the source of strength comes only from one place: it comes from people. And in order to get the strength, to be patient, to do the work the way we are doing it, you have to touch base with them, you have to be with one another so that the skin is touching and you are really one and the same with them. We come here and we get tremendous strength from them, and vice versa: they get strength from us. But we get more from them and this helps and encourages us to continue the job of getting the work done.

Ultimately there are some decisions that I have to make. Every day I am faced with some very difficult decisions and they are the source of help in making those decisions. If you touch base with the workers and you keep pace with them and you keep your ear to them, you can't go wrong. You can go wrong only if you want to, but you really can't go wrong ... they are there, and they are telling you what to do and you follow.

Question: Would you say this is one of the most important movements?

Chavez: I don't know. It is one of the most exciting movements in my life, and I am certain it is so for a lot of workers. And if we can just get our friends to understand that these things take time, that they are not done overnight, and keep the support we now have throughout the country, then the workers will carry through the struggle and we are going to be victorious at the end.

Question: Negotiations have stopped. How are you going to regain some of the contracts that you've lost?

Chavez: Well, the same way we got the contracts in the first place. We didn't get them until we had enough economic pressure on the employers, until it became difficult for them to sell their grapes. When their grapes were being sold very cheaply, far below cost, then they got interested in talking. And so again they will not be interested in talking about contracts

until they can't pick the grapes, and when they pick them they won't be able to sell them, not even for half of what it cost them to pick them. At that point they are going to want to talk with us, and at that point we will get together and we will work things out.

This is a most critical time for the farm workers. Winning is the difference between having an honest, democratic union—a union of the workers and by and for them—and either not having a union at all or having a union that does not represent the workers' interests. So it is a very critical moment in our lives and in the lives of the workers.

The base of the union, the direction of what type of union these workers are going to have depends very much on what our friends throughout the United States and in the cities do about the boycott. If they stop eating grapes, if they help the boycott, if they pass the word around to everyone like they did back in 1968 and 1969, we will win again and these workers will have an honest and a democratic union of their own choosing. If they don't, there's going to be no union. At most there will be a union that is not going to represent their interests, and that is going to be a very sad, sad day not only for the workers but for a whole concept and idea of democracy.

What to Boycott

If you want to be sure, boycott:

all table grapes

and once again supply pressure on store owners not to carry these foods until the UFW holds the contracts once again.

Wines to boycott:

1. All Gallo wine, and wines under the following labels (a simple rule of thumb — if it's from Modesto, it's Gallo):

<i>Paisano</i>	<i>Andre Champagne</i>
<i>Thunderbird</i>	<i>Boone's Farm</i>
<i>Carlo Rossi</i>	<i>Spanada</i>
<i>Eden Roc</i>	<i>Tyrolia</i>
<i>Red Mountain</i>	<i>Ripple</i>
<i>Triple Jack</i>	

2. All Francia Bros. Wine.

3. From White River Farms:

<i>Tavola Red</i>	<i>Tres Grande</i>
<i>Winemasters Guild</i>	<i>Cooks Imperial</i>
<i>Roma</i>	<i>Roma Reserve</i>
<i>Familigia Cribari</i>	<i>Cribari Reserve</i>
<i>J. Pierrot</i>	<i>Jeanne d'Arc</i>
<i>La Boheme</i>	<i>Ceremony</i>
<i>Cresta Blanca</i>	<i>Versailles</i>
<i>Mendocino</i>	<i>Saratoga</i>

<i>Garrett</i>	<i>Guild Blue Ribbon</i>
<i>Alta</i>	<i>Saint Mark</i>
<i>C.V.C.</i>	<i>Citation</i>
<i>Virginia Dare</i>	<i>Old San Francisco</i>
<i>Lodi</i>	<i>Ocean Spray Rose</i>
<i>La Mesa (Safeway's)</i>	<i>Vin Glogg</i>

Wines you CAN drink:

Italian Swiss Colony and any other wine produced by Heublein.
Christian Bros, Paul Masson, Almaden

Write: United Farmworkers, Box 62, Keene, Ca 93531

Nonviolence In The Vineyards

Bob Levering

Eight years ago, a struggling Farm Workers Association joined the Filipino Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee in a strike against the grape growers in Delano, California. Together they called themselves the United Farm Workers and their five years of striking and boycotting won the original contracts with the table grape industry. The 1970 union agreement raised base pay from \$1.20 an hour to \$2.05 and ended the ten to twenty cent kickback to the labor contractor by creating the first hiring hall in grape growing history.

The three-year contracts expired early this year, and the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America moved in to sign contracts with the growers covering the grape workers. None of the field workers had been consulted in advance by the Teamsters or by the growers about the new contracts. As soon as it became clear that the growers had signed "sweetheart" agreements with the Teamsters, Cesar Chavez, United Farm Workers Union national chairman, responded by calling a strike.

Thousands left the fields as the strike and harvest moved northward from the Coachella Valley to Arvin, Lamont, Delano, and the San Joaquin Valley. The growers responded with court injunctions severely limiting picketing and strike activity, while the Teamsters simply hired what reporter Harry Bernstein called "thugs who ride herd on workers threatening to strike much as cowboys ride herd on restless cattle."

Besides the close collusion between the growers and the Teamsters (who AFL-CIO's George Meany has aptly called "striker breakers"), what stands out in this struggle is the Farm Workers dramatic and consistent dedication to nonviolence. It is this militant nonviolent action in pursuit of social justice for the workers—on the picket lines, strike lines, marches, and nationwide boycott lines, in the fields, jails, supermarkets, and organizing offices throughout the country—which has infused the movement with life and hope and drawn tremendous international support.

<p>Opportunities to talk directly with strikebreakers were rare on the mammoth farms, but when possible, personal explanations were often successful. When striking workers,</p>
--

together with Institute UFW session people, explained the Union to these scab fieldworkers, they abandoned their partially-filled crates to join the strike.

Against the sort of odds which many men and women would find hopeless, the United Farm Workers have taken the nation of nonviolence and turned it into a real, dynamic social force which can and will win democratic rights for field workers.

Bob Levering has recently been active in AFSC's Carrier Project in San Francisco. This summer he made numerous trips to the Valley to help with the strike and to report on the Union's struggle. Portions of this article originally appeared in the San Francisco Bay Guardian and in Fellowship.

“By our position of nonviolence, the Teamsters stood out like a sore thumb,” Bill Encinas explained. Bill, a United Farm Worker Union organizer, was referring to Teamster attacks on the UFW picket lines in the Coachella Valley in Southern California.

The UFW is engaged in a fight for survival. After a five-year struggle and a national grape boycott, the 1970 contracts the UFW signed with grape growers, now expiring, are going to the Teamsters.

Before embarking on the story of the present battle, it's important to place the whole Farm Worker vs. Teamster struggle in its real national perspective. Consider the following chronology.

In late November, 1972, less than a month after his re-election, Nixon met with Teamster President Frank Fitzsimmons at the San Clemente White House. Present at the meeting was Charles Colson, who, besides leading the Administration's “dirty tricks” department, was the chief architect of Nixon's labor policies.

On December 9, the Teamsters announced they were switching their \$100,000-a-year legal business from the Democratic Party-related Washington law firm of Williams, Connolly and Califano to the Republican-related firm of Morin, Dickstein, Shapiro, and Galligan. That same day, it was disclosed that Charles Colson would join the Morin firm soon after he left the White House in March, 1973.

On December 12, Fitzsimmons spoke before the American Farm Bureau Federation's annual convention in Los Angeles, starting that he would “welcome an alliance” with agribusiness interests. Fitzsimmons acknowledged that his appearance at the convention of American agribusiness' primary lobbying body had been arranged by Laurence Sibelman, Nixon's Undersecretary of Labor.

Several days later, the Western Conference of Teamsters announced that it had renegotiated with lettuce growers un-expired 1970 lettuce contracts which covered almost 30,000 workers in California and Arizona. Later in December, the California Supreme Court upheld the UFW contention that those 1970 lettuce contracts between growers and Teamsters were “sweetheart contracts” which did not represent the workers.

Whether or not it was in December, 1972, when Teamster officials began meeting with California grape growers as well, the contracts began soon. By mid-April, 1973, the Teamsters and the grape growers of the Coachella Valley announced the signing of contracts covering nearly 80% of the valley's grape workers, this within just 12 hours of the expiration of the 3-year UFW contracts. This signing began in earnest the joint effort of

agribusiness, the Teamsters and the Nixon administration to destroy Cesar Chavez' 40,000-member union. At the time, the base of the UFW's strength—and 30,000 of its members—was in California's table grape vineyards.

That's how the current battle was joined, a battle between the Teamsters (led by Fitzsimmons, paid \$125,000 a year plus expenses and a private jet by his union) and the UFW (led by Chavez, paid \$5,144 in 1972 by his union, including \$1,904 for medical expenses resulting from his Arizona fast). And unless the UFW can muster the nationwide public support it has won in the past, this is a battle which will dramatically cut back the gains of the farm workers over the last eight years in wages, working conditions and protection against pesticides.

Priest Beaten

When Cesar Chavez and the union membership—charging collusion between the growers and the Teamsters that has now resulted in a grand jury inquiry—called a strike, the Teamsters responded by hiring (at \$67 a day plus expenses) quite a number of short-fused, anger-oriented “guards.” For three months, a daily drama was re-enacted between hundreds of UFW strikers, clinging to nonviolence, and Teamster guards who have often moved quickly from threats and taunts to physical attack.

Fr. John Bank, whose nose is presently hidden under a mass of bandages, was beaten badly by Teamster employees in a Coachella restaurant. He described to me 40 separate minor Teamster attacks—mostly in June—in which arrests were made by police, as well as one major Teamster attack. The latter assault resulted in the injury of more than two dozen UFW strikers. “The union leadership was nonviolent in every instance.” Fr. Bank commented, despite the use of iron pipes, bat-sized wooden stakes and even iron chains by the Teamster “guards.”

Most of these “guards” were recruited from Teamster locals in the Los Angeles area. Bud Novinn, of LA Teamster Local #208, told me that an International Teamster Union official (identified by Carlos Valdez, business representative of #208 as Ray Griego) “Offered to give me \$100 a day to go down there (Coachella) against the farm workers.” According to Novinn, Griego “recruited men who were broke and needed the money,” telling them they were going to Coachella to protect the Teamsters working there. “Most of us didn't even realize there was strike going on.” Novinn recalls, adding that many of his fellow Teamsters left Coachella as soon as they learned what was really happening.

Unfortunately, not all Griego's recruits returned to Los Angeles, and the UFW has charged that their “guards” were engaged in a systematic reign of terror aimed at intimidating both the strikers and the strike-breakers—and at attempting to provoke the UFW supporters to retaliatory violence.

“In one memorable scene,” writes Harry Bernstein, LA Times labor reporter, “a Catholic priest was leading a large crowd of Mexican-American workers in prayer. The workers were kneeling in the dust. Facing them, standing, was a line of a dozen beefy Anglos, several with dark glasses, staring contemptuously at the praying workers. The Teamsters ‘muscle,’ in white T-shirts, hard hats, and blue jackets with ‘Teamsters’ emblazoned on the back, had been hired for \$50 a day, plus expenses. Most were armed

with bats, hoe handles, sharpened grape stakes, and other weapons which were later confiscated by sheriff's deputies. With such enforcers, growers felt workers would stay in the field, and many did."

Teamster Dissent

Not all Teamster members are proud of their International's activities in California's fields. At a recent United Farm Worker rally, more than a hundred UFW –supporting Teamsters were present. One of them, Harry Orr of Local 85 in the Bay area, told me at the rally, "There's no reason why the Teamsters should be spending our dues for 'goons' ...If you took a poll of the guys in my local, you'd find 9 out of 10 think the International is up to no good down here." He and other Teamsters present predicted membership opposition to the national Teamsters' farmworker policies would grow quickly.

Bill Encinas, who was physically assaulted after having his car forced off the road by Teamsters, explained that the "guards" were trying to provide the strikers on picket lines to violence. According to Bill, Teamster guards would single out one picket on the line to assault. While that person tried to "protect" himself or herself, others on the picket line had to refrain from joining in and causing a general melee. "We learned that if knocked down, the best response might be to stay down and not fight back," Bill explained.

Bill gives much credit for maintaining discipline to the picket captains. "The picket captains have tremendous responsibilities because it's difficult to contain the people—very difficult: the heat (usually over 110 by noon in Coachella), the pressures, the long hours, the brutalities, and the provocations. But we have proven it. *Si se puede!* We have proven it!"

From June 19-26, the following events occurred in Coachella: a UFW member's car was blown up by a home-made bomb; a strike-breaker, mistakenly identified as UFW, was kidnapped, beaten and stabbed six times with an ice pick; Cesar Chavez' car was stoned by "guards," a striker's trailer house was burned down; several strikers' cars were forced off the roads and their occupants attacked by Teamster "guards." The most serious attack that week took place June 23 when almost 200 Teamsters attacked a UFW picket line of 100-150 men, women and children with lead pipes, knives and clubs, injuring 35, hospitalizing four.

Still, the strike continued. According to Fr. Bank, "There were more than 1,400 registered strikers who picketed daily. With the 900 workers at the two ranches under UFW contract, that means that we had 2,300 workers who directly supported the union in Coachella out of a total work force of 3,800."

Chavez' goal in Coachella was to block picking or shipping, through the strike, of as many as possible of the normal table grape shipment of 3,000,000 boxes from the Coachella Valley, and to go for a massive consumer boycott on those which slip through. Already, Fr. Bank claims a partial success, saying that because of the strike much of Coachella's grape harvest hasn't met the federal sweetness standards, and the price for grapes has generally dropped below the growers' break-even profit point of \$7.50/box.

“We’re going to send you all home today . . . “

After Coachella in early June, the next front was the Arvin-Lamont region (near Bakersfield) where grape ranchers also abandoned their expiring UFW contracts in favor of new Teamster pacts. Here, in the San Joaquin Valley, the UFW is up against both the Teamsters and some agribusiness giants with potent political connections.

Roberts Farms, one of the largest grape growers in the Lamont to Delano area, is managed by Hollis Roberts, whose chief financial backer is C. Arnholt Smith. Smith, a San Diego businessman and close personal friend of Nixon, recently made the news when his financial empire was attacked by the SEC, the IRS and the Justice Department for a variety of alleged improprieties. Also in the area is Tenneco, the huge conglomerate which ranks #26 on the Fortune magazine list of the top 500 U.S. corporations.

The Lamont signings with the Teamsters brought on an instant replay of Coachella: UFW strike, pickets, injunctions, Teamster “guards” and subsequent violence. On June 28, just five days after a similar attack in Coachella, there was large-scale violence at the Kovacovich ranch near Lamont. More than 90 people were injured when some 40 Teamster “guards” charged a UFW picket line.

Victoria Medina, one of the picketers, described that scene to me: “They had wood sticks bigger than baseball bats. “They jumped from their cars and a pickup truck and said, ‘We’re going to send you all home today.’ We saw one of them hit Daniel Delarosa on the back of the neck with a stick. He fell down. When he tried to get up, about six guys kicked him with their feet until he didn’t move.”

Four strikers were hospitalized, including 60-year-old Juan Hernandez, with severe head injuries.

Unlike the Coachella attack, in Lamont sheriff’s deputies intervened and arrested 30 of the Teamster “guards” on charges ranging from assault with a deadly weapon, assault and battery, to disturbing the peace. But later, on July 12, the Kern County DA’s office told UFW lawyer Jerry Cohen that 11 the felony charges would be dropped, and only the disturbing the peace charge was to be pressed.

One unlooked-for result of the Teamster violence has been its propaganda value for the UFW. Guadalupe Huerta, a former strike-breaker who has now joined with the UFW, explains her own case: “At first I didn’t believe in the union. I never read newspapers or anything. I thought the Teamsters were good the way the ranchers used to tell us about them. But then I began reading about them in the *‘huelgistas’* [strikers] paper. Then I saw the Teamsters went around beating up people. That’s why I walked out. I walked out about a week after the big attack because I wanted to be on the huelga side, not the Teamsters’, because they were no good.

“Rural California is like Mississippi.”

Shortly after the June 28 attack in Lamont, William Grami, director of organizing for the Western Conference of Teamsters, announced that the “guards” were being removed, but defended their use. “Law enforcement in those areas,” he claimed, “was not adequate

to protect workers from intimidation, harassment and physical violence by UFW supporters.” He went on to say the Teamsters were now satisfied with local law enforcement, and called on the UFW leaders to “enforce their policy of nonviolence.”

This is the same William Grami who whimsically told Harry Bernstein that “Sometimes I feel like one of those hired gunslingers you see in old Western cowboy movies.” (“But,” adds Bernstein, “the men who hired the Teamsters are not hapless ranchers [in need of a gunslinger]. They are corporate owners who are faced with the prospect of losing control of work force which for decades has accepted backbreaking jobs in almost stolid silence at below-poverty wages.”)

In the words of UFW lawyer Jerry Cohen: “The whole power of the county is lined up against us to break our strike. Sheriffs act like a private army of the growers. Most people don’t realize that it’s like the South during the early ‘60’s around here. Rural California is like Mississippi.”

The departure of the “guards” didn’t end the Lamont violence. On July 10, for example, a man (later identified by a local owner bar owner as a Teamster organizer) smashed the windows of the Lamont UFW storefront office. And on July 13 an employee of the Sabovich ranch near Lamont sprayed a UFW picket line of some 150 people with a chemical pesticide.

According to picketers at the scene, the employee, Marle Pace, drove a tractor out of a vineyard onto a highway in front of the picket line and started spraying. More than a dozen people immediately began vomiting; 18 women and two men were sufficiently affected to be taken to the Delano UFW clinic, and two were kept there for several days. UFW striker Maria Saenz described for me what happened next: “Two of the cops stopped him and talked to him for about five minutes, and then he took off without being arrested or anything.”

By mid-July, with the grape harvest at hand, Lamont growers went to court to strengthen their position. And on July 12 Kern County Judge John N. Naim tightened the restrictions on strikers, restricting picket lines to 25 people, each person at least 100 feet from the next, and prohibiting use of the bullhorn (the primary way of communicating with strike-breakers in the field) more than one hour a day. Faced with these restrictions, the UFW strikers defied the injunction and the mass arrests began—more than 2,000 between July 18-21 alone. “We’re out picketing to convince the strike-breakers to come out of the fields,” argues John Ganza, one of the arrested workers. “If you read the injunction, all we can do is to stand out there with a flag.”

Cesar Chavez, who has faced this kind of odds many times before, retains a strong public optimism: “We have more support now than at any time in the history of our movement,” he’s quick to proclaim. And in the strike area itself, the support is in fact becoming visible, particularly from the Catholic church and several liberal Protestant denominations.

Non-vindictive Attitude

Nagi Daiffullah, a 24-year-old farm worker from Yemen, became the first United Farm Worker Unin fatality of the strike when he died August 15th from injuries suffered at the

hands of a Kern County Deputy Sheriff. Although the incident which led to Daifullah's death occurred outside of a Lamont bar near midnight, the UFW has reacted to the death as being directly linked to the struggle.

"There's a pattern of excessive force being used by the sheriff," said UFW attorney Jerry Cohen. "If their skin is a different color, they are going to use excessive force."

Nearly 10,000 UFW members and supporters attended Daifullah's funeral in Delano on August 17th. Mourners walked in silence for several miles from a funeral home in Delano to the UFW's headquarters just outside of town. Daifullah's coffin was followed by a contingent of nearly 400 fellow Arab farm workers, most of whom had also come to the U.S. seeking opportunity and economic security but found themselves mired in the exploitative farm labor system in California. The Arabs were followed in the procession by thousands of mostly Mexican farm workers with black armbands, many of whom carried UFW flags with a background of black instead of bright red in honor of their slain Arab brother.

The funeral itself was both Muslim and Christian with most of the comments being translated into Arabic, English, Spanish, and Tagalog. Cesar Chavez' eulogy stressed the UFW's non-vindictive attitude toward the slaying; "The hand that struck Brother Nagi now trembles in fear. It too is the victim of the climate of violence, racism and hatred created by those men who own everything and kill what they cannot own."

Chavez continued: "Farm workers everywhere are angry and worried but we are not going to fall into the trap that our persecutors have fallen into. We do not need to kill or destroy to win. We are a movement that builds and not destroys. Let Brother Nagi's death be a reminder to us that persistence, hard work, faith and the willingness to sacrifice will bring us victory. In this way we can win and keep our self-respect, build a great union, and do honor to the great sacrifice Brother Daifullah has made for all of us."

Chavez called on all UFW members and supporters to engage in a three-day fast in honor of Daifullah and which was to be "a time to think again about violence and nonviolence."

Not only did the strikers have Daifullah's death to mourn that day, but less than 24 hours before the funeral, Juan de la Cruz was shot to death while standing on a UFW picket line near Arvin. According to strikers at the scene, de la Cruz was standing with more than a dozen other pickets at the entrance to one of Guimarra's ranches waiting for strike-breakers to leave. One of the strike-breaker's cars passed the line at a high speed when one of the car's occupants, a 20-year-old Filipino strike-breaker named Bayani Advincula, started firing a gun toward the picket line. Juan de la Cruz immediately grabbed his wife, and as he was pushing her out of the way, was hit in the chest by a bullet which pierced his heart.

De la Cruz' death has been a deep personal loss to many of the UFW's leaders. The 60-year-old farm worker had been one of the UFW's original members when he joined the grape strike in the Lamont-Arvin area in 1965.

The two deaths followed weeks of violence aimed at the farm worker strike. The day before de la Cruz was killed, Fernando Chavez, Cesar's eldest son, was shot at while picketing a grape ranch near Delano. Fortunately, the six shot fired in his direction narrowly missed him. However, three other strikers were not so lucky in previous shooting

incidents earlier in August near Delano. Though none was killed in the shootings, the incidents indicate that de la Cruz' death was not a freak accident.

5,000 Arrested

Besides the shootings, three other strikers were run over by cars near Lamont, dozens of others have been beaten by Teamsters and police throughout the San Joaquin Valley. And more than 5,000 have been arrested mostly as a result of defying court injunctions which place severe restrictions on picketing.

Despite the considerable amount of violence that the UFW has been subjected to, incidents in which UFW strikers have responded violently have been infrequent and isolated. Yet they have happened. On August 16th, at one of the Gallo wine ranches near Livingston (also in the San Joaquin Valley), I witnessed a rock-throwing incident. A strike-breaking tractor driver pulled his tractor off a road to enter a field which was being picketed by some 150 strikers. Although he was not apparently trying to run over any strikers, he did drive nest to the picket line and soon was surrounded by dozens of pickets. There ensued a great deal of loud shouting, and as the tractor driver started to pull into the field, several rocks were thrown in his direction. None hit him though one hit a fellow striker in the back of the head (with no apparent injury to the striker).

Soon after that incident, the strikers left the line for their usual noon lunch break and held a general meeting to discuss the events of the morning. One of the strike leaders, Jose Villasaze, began by lecturing the strikers: "I've told you thousands of times not to throw rocks and not to talk bad to scabs. We don't know what their tactics are. They're bringing the pickers close to the road because they might be able to get us mad enough to do something drastic so they can lock us up—or so that we'd do something stupid so that they can get an injunction against us."

At this point, another striker, Feliziano Urrutia chimed in, "When that rock hit our own person, that's not showing how really angry we are about the scabs, it's just showing how stupid we are."

Villasaze then began talking about abusive language toward the strike-breakers: "The way to gain their confidence is to talk nice to them and not throw rocks. We have to talk to them as if we were angels. If we start treating people bad, when we meet them in town, they'll just call the police on us. That's not the way. We have to talk to them every chance we have."

The UFW policy of trying to win over workers nonviolently has seen considerable success in the Gallo strike. On the first day of the Gallo strike, June 27th, 130 of the 150 year-round Gallo workers went out on strike. Their number had grown to more than 200 by the middle of August. On the first day of the grape harvest, August 16th, the impact of the strike was dramatic. According to striker Bobby de la Cruz, "Normally there are 40

crews in the fields picking grapes on the first day. Today there were only 11 crews working. There weren't more than 50 scabs in the field. Normally there are about 250."

"Live-in" Prevents Eviction

The Gallo strikers have had other chances to test their nonviolence. In early August, the Gallo strikers engaged in a five-day "live-in" which prevented the eviction of Rogelio and Maria Ramirez and their eight-month-old child Antonio from a Gallo-run labor camp, Rogelio Ramirez has worked with Gallo for four years and has lived in the labor camp housing all of that time. Camp #2 where the Ramirezes live is typical of the housing which migrant farm workers have been provided with by their employers. There's no hot water; the four families and 20 people who live in the camp share the same toilet and shower facilities, and those bathrooms emit an awful stench because there has obviously been no attempt to fix any of the toilets for months, if not years.

Ramirez was fired by Gallo on May 14th for protesting to a Gallo supervisor the company's sanctioning of a Teamster rally for workers (which only about a half-dozen showed up for). On the same day he was fired, Ramirez was given an eviction notice. On June 27th, when other UFW members struck Gallo, those who lived in Gallo labor camps were similarly given eviction notices at the same time they were fired.

Since Ramirez had been fired first, the outcome of the attempt to evict him affected some 71 other families and more than 400 people.

On August 1st, after weeks of legal maneuvers, the Merced County Deputy Sheriffs informed Ramirez while he was on a picket line that they were going to evict him that day. When Ramirez arrived at his home, the Sheriff's department had pulled up a moving van to his camp. Shortly thereafter, more than a hundred UFW pickets came to the camp from the picket line. According to Ramirez, "They said they were willing to go to jail before they'd let us be evicted." Because the people were there, the sheriffs decided to retreat and to wait for further instructions.

Two days later, Ramirez received a court order in the mail which indicated that his eviction could take place immediately. Upon receipt of this notice, dozens of UFW strikers reappeared at the camp and commenced a five-day and night long vigil at the Ramirez house. "There were 70 of us that first night," according to Inez Roze. "After that we had over a hundred during the day and about 20 or 30 at night."

Finally, on August 7th, the Sheriff's Deputies reappeared with the intention of evicting the Ramirez family. However, when confronted by dozens of strikers who insisted that they also would have to be taken to jail, the police decided to negotiate the issue. Because the eviction order had been written so as to specify only Room No. 8 of the camp, the deputies indicated that they would accept Ramirez moving next door to the vacant Room No. 9. "If the people hadn't been here though, they probably would have taken us out of both rooms," Ramirez declared when I talked with him at the camp.

When asked where he would go if evicted, Rogelio Ramirez gave an answer typical of the response of other strikers I interviewed: "No se. [I don't know.] Probably we'd end up out there [pointing to the road]. I guess we'd put my station wagon out there and use it as our home."

Other strikers talked of setting up tents outside the labor camps I evicted. What is clear from the attitude of the strikers is that Gallo will not be able to break their strike by evicting the strikers. As many of the other growers in the San Joaquin Valley are learning, their attempts to destroy the UFW are being met by a movement united in their commitment to nonviolent resistance.

“We Will Win”

Still, despite the buoying effect of the local support and the now-depleted AFL-CIO money, the UFW is having trouble lighting the fires under its traditional national supporters, the liberal voters, consumers and politicians who were so stoutly behind the UFW cause during the last big boycott.

“It seems,” writes John Fry in *Christianity and Crisis* magazine (July 9, 1973), “that what the UFW people want is to stay alive in the hardest fight they have ever been in. And since all they can ask for is justice or help in *another* consumer boycott of Safeway, A&P, lettuce and—yawn—table grapes, they are tiring their friends. If only the UFW had had the good sense to get all their grape contracts renewed, to throw the Teamsters out of the fields and to win favorable national legislation for agricultural workers, they could now enjoy all that dynamite support from so easily fatigued consumers and quickly bored liberal politicians.”

Chavez and his fellow unionists are hopeful: “It may take another five years to win this struggle,” Chavez told a Coachella group in May, “But we will win. We have no place else to go.” To win this battle however, the UFW again needs the kind of national consumer boycott and political pressure which worked against growers in 1970. Now the fight will be tougher, as long as “friend of labor” liberals brush it off as a mere jurisdictional dispute, one union against another, and keep their hands off.

The collusion between the growers, Teamsters and the Nixon administration proves that this isn’t one of your fraternal squabbles among workers. It is, as AFL-CIO President George Meany said, “one of the most vicious union-busting efforts we have ever seen.” The farm workers won their organizing battle and the UFW was born in 1970 with the help of a concerted national campaign. Now, the two-million-member Teamster organization joining with the agribusiness monopoly to crush the UFW and jettison its gains in wages and working conditions, it’s time to hear once again from the liberals who have been so vocally behind Chavez in the past.

“If all you’re interested in is going around being nonviolent and so concerned about saving yourself, at some point the whole thing breaks down — you say to yourself, ‘Well, let *them* be violent, as long as *I’m* nonviolent.’ Or you begin to think it’s okay to lose the battle as losing as you remain nonviolent. The idea is that you have to win and be nonviolent. That’s extremely important. You’ve got to be nonviolent — and you’ve got to win with nonviolence.”

Cesar Chavez (in the September 6 issue of *Win*)

win
Peace and Freedom Through Nonviolent Action

"The liveliest magazine on the left." (The Village Voice)

"... pretty good little rag..." (The Institute Journal)

Published weekly in Rifton, New York with the support of the War Resisters League.
Subscriptions: \$7 a year; \$4 for six months. A real bargain!

WIN * BOX 547 * RIFTON, N.Y. 12471

Empowering The People

The farmworkers' struggle — perhaps the most important experiment with the social force of nonviolence going on today — is raising fundamental questions around workers rights, democratic control, the nature of power and the way in which conflict is handled.

(This is an edited transcription of a recent conversation between Institute worker Wendy Batson and Bob Eaton of the Philadelphia Resistance. It was taken from a Monday night discussion at the Institute on the Union and the implications of its work.)

Wendy: I think it's important to understand that the struggle happening now between the Teamsters and the growers and the United Farmworkers is not the same as the one that happened five years ago. New and stronger elements have been introduced, and what comes out will be different. If the Farmworkers and the growers once again sit down and renegotiate a new set of contracts, those people are going to be very different from who they were the last time they sat down at that table.

The situation right now is specifically different because of the introduction of the Teamsters, which gives the growers an option they never had before, and it tends to slow down that whole process of learning to deal with one another that's gone on between the Farm Workers and growers the past three years. But one option is gone: the idea that they can have nonunion farms. That's gone completely and most of them say it and that's a real change.

I think that the kind of conflict which the strike and boycott bring out is inevitable. What I'm interested in, though, is some sort of assumption that, in relationships such as those between farmworkers and growers, the conflict does not necessarily have to be fatal. And because it doesn't have to be fatal, it can be a very strong learning process between groups of people. To me, it's the expectation people have that such conflict is so necessarily fatal that's so terrifying and begins shoving them off in a lot of nasty directions. One of the things that excites me is that it's possible that the Farmworkers and the

Teamsters and growers will go through this process again, will sit down and renegotiate contracts, and once again learn that conflict with one another does not have to be fatal and there are many doors which did get left open along the way for communication. Some of the growers should begin reaching that point.

Out of the sixty growers in the Valley, two growers who went through extreme economic straits for the five years of the first grape boycott decided this time around to stick with the Farm Workers Union. And they didn't even talk about it in a very charitable, loving way, but they did say that they had come to understand that it was necessary that there was going to be a union in their fields. Given that basic fact of life, they respected what the Farmworkers had done the previous five years in establishing their union and they'd be damned if they'd sign with the Teamsters. That, to me, is the important step that happens during this kind of struggle and, perhaps this time there will be five more who feel this way.

Bob: I agree with you that we'll never get rid of conflict. I think that's going to exist; I see enough of it in myself that I can't see it going away. But the important thing that you look for in a social system is what are the elements in the social/political/economic/cultural structure which are making conflict inherent and also preventing people from organizing and acting against it or allowing them to somehow wage an equal battle. It seems to me that the situation with the Farm Workers is that you have a whole structure at work which has denied them any ability to organize effectively, to somehow or other at least come out on a relative par with the people who are controlling those grapes. And so anything that begins to redress that balance is not a comprehensive solution by any means, but is nonetheless a step forward because it has empowered some people.

One of the great strengths of the Farm Workers has been that it has been a union in the fields, built from the bottom up. We were in Fresno when they announced that the strike benefits were out. The strike benefits were not great anyway, and the announcement was made in terms of, "There are no more benefits; we're going to have to call off the strike." And the people unanimously said, "The hell with that. We're not going to call off this strike." That doesn't happen in very many unions in this country when strike benefits dry up, and that's a real source of power.

The dilemma is that the boycott is going beyond it's appealing or petitioning for aid and support. People can either go 'thumbs up' or 'thumbs down.' But to a certain extent that 'sweet light of reason' we talked about earlier at least can function in that realm because it's reason—and a little emotion, too—that's gong to make me support or not support that boycott. The sweet light of reason will never be a functioning element, it seems to me, in the decision of management to concede to workers' demands. What management is going to concede to is pressure, and only pressure by and large.

There are enough people working on farms that if farm workers throughout the country organized they'd be the biggest union in the country. One of the interesting things in terms of dynamics is that the struggle the Farm Workers have now has been brought on by their own success, because they've proved one thing which nobody believed before, and that is that the farm workers can be organized. Particularly in this area where illegals and scab labor can be brought in so simply for short periods of time, they've shown it can be

done. That's been registered now; management accepts it. Ten years ago management would have fought the Teamsters as hard as they're fighting Chavez, but now they've invited the Teamsters in.

Really, the critical difference between the two unions is what they're demanding in terms of power for the workers: the question of controlling the conditions in which they have to labor; the question of hiring halls and the question of pesticides—those are two very simple things, really, but the Teamsters won't touch them. All they're interested in is getting the minimum wage—and they are doing that, though it is an even lower wage than the Farm Workers are struggling for. But what is critically different is that the Farm Workers are demanding hiring halls and some democratic control from the ground up by the workers in terms of conditions they must work under.

Wendy: I got a much better understanding of that one night while I was down in Fresno when I spent about three hours talking with one of the larger packer-growers in the Fresno area. I asked him about the Teamster-Farmworker dispute and whether he had a preference and what he was going to do. And he said to me, "The Teamsters are a *real* labor union; they make wage demands and they leave the rest of it up to us and that's what's our business." And he said, "I'll be goddamned if I'll ever recognize the Farmworkers Union because I'll never recognize the hiring hall." It was at that moment that I realized that the hiring hall was one of the most crucial elements in that very struggle for a different kind of power. The Teamsters do just talk in terms of minimum wage and in terms of potentially becoming consumers, and it's a language that the growers understand. The Union talks in terms of pesticide control and the hiring hall which gives them a great deal more to say about who works where, how they work and under what conditions they work. I think it's that element particularly that's going to make it such a difficult struggle with the growers.

The San Joaquin Valley has also been literally destroyed in the last fifty years. It looks nothing like it looked when settlers first came over. One of the main reasons for its destruction has been the unlimited use of pesticides, and since that directly connects to farm worker lives in the central area of California, it is one of the nonnegotiable items of the Union contracts with the growers. It's called a protection clause, not only for the worker but for the consumer, because they in their way are beginning to try to make that kind of link between what happens in the field and what happens to the food that is produced for our tables.

It's one of the areas with which the growers most strongly disagree. They are not particularly interested at this time in enforcing more stringent pesticide laws either among grapes or any other crop. The Union refuses to back down. Statistics around the deaths of Union members in the central area of California are very high. It's estimated at one time that one thousand people in a year were killed due to use and lack of control over pesticides.

The hiring hall is the other important issue. There are two major methods which a union uses to supply workers to any sort of production: the labor contractor system and the hiring hall system. In the past, up until the Farm Workers Union came along, the growers always used a labor contractor system, which means that a major grower hires a

man who's called a labor contractor and turns over a sum of money to him. The labor contractor is then responsible to go out and recruit the number of workers that grower wants in his field. All the communication between the grower and the workers is handled through the labor contractor, and he is also in many cases responsible for things like building bathrooms in the fields, water, transportation to the fields, housing, etc. The labor contractor has a great deal of power indirectly through the grower over what kind of conditions the workers have.

In a hiring hall system, which is what the Union uses at this point, the communication is direct between the Union and the grower. The grower comes to the hiring hall, tells them how many people he wants in any particular field and for what particular length of time, and then everything else is handled by the hiring hall. They decide who goes where (usually in terms of seniority), who gets what kind of jobs, what sort of pay they're going to have, and what sort of conditions they're going to work under. It makes communication much more direct between a union and an employer, and that's one of the reasons the growers don't like it at all.

The reason they usually say is because of the seniority system. Every union has a seniority system whereby you decide who gets hired when you've got too many workers for any one area or who's going out to what fields. The Union started out with a seniority system based on how long you've been inside the Union and they tried that for about six and half months and decided it was disastrous because a lot of workers resented it. It meant that they didn't get to go back to the fields they had worked in for perhaps the previous ten years, and a lot of growers resented it because they wanted workers back in their fields who had some previous knowledge of their particular crops. So at that point the Union switched over to a ranch seniority system, and the whole system whereby decisions are made inside the Union is now based on that ranch seniority system made up of what's known as ranch committees.

So if you've returned regularly over a period of time to one ranch you get first priority at getting sent back there when you go to a hiring hall to get a job. Then, while you're on that ranch, you elect yourselves a committee and the committee elects a representative who directly deals with the full-time Union officials. The decisions about when to go on strike, about what kind of demands are made, about how things are going inside the fields are all discussed through the ranch committee, and the representative of that committee goes back and tells the Union in their series of meetings about how things are going out in the fields.

It also makes the growers directly responsible for how they're treating people, how they're paying people, and how relationships are in general and that's something they really don't want to be. That's still another reason why they're so anxious to recognize the Teamsters.

So the struggle goes on, and the only real question is at what point do you stop it? You could stop it right now, and things would be significantly different from what they were ten years ago. I would say, though, that that event had then become a reformist rather than a radical process because people had stopped at that particular point. If the Farmworkers quit right now, those fields would be unionized, wages would be higher, working conditions would essentially be better, child labor laws would be enforced — a whole series

of important kinds of reforms would have happened inside the fields. The thing that excites me about the Farmworkers Union is that they've taken that step beyond reform and are willing to go through the next process of struggle from which something significantly different will come out. That reformist element in terms of people's actual day-to-day lives being significantly better is not enough because what they're talking about is access to a different kind of power which the growers don't want to give them. It's a kind of power which goes beyond \$2.10 an hour, it goes beyond having toilets in the fields and having cold drinking water every two hours provided by the growers.

But that step beyond reform can't be taken alone. The Farmworkers need our help to bring enough economic and public pressure on the growers so that they will recognize the farmworkers' own union. Consumer boycott work is the most important thing to do now, particularly since nearly all strike work in the Valley has been called off. And it's interesting, too, on the boycott line you can find out, or begin to experience in a way that a lot of us don't at this point, a lot of what's going on inside American's minds about the state of this country and where we're going. I've gotten into some of the most fascinating conversations recently on the boycott line. And I also start losing my temper when people are being consistently rude to me and pretty soon it's a struggle not to be consistently rude back to them.

So one of the things I gradually begin trying to do is to think about being a young woman, 24 years of age, and probably having two or three children. I try to think about being in a household where I'm working on a limited managed budget, which most of these women are, and I think if I put myself in their position ... I walk out to the driveway carrying all three kids and I get in the car. I drive down El Camino Real, which is a hell of a drive on the best of days, to my nearby Safeway in Menlo Park and I get out. I walk across the parking lot, one kid crying because one kid in three usually is, carrying my purse, trying to buy my shopping for that day and what hits me but this freak dashing across the parking lot saying, "Don't shop at this store." Think of what that's going to mean if you're inside that position. You've got to think about taking all three of those kids and getting back into that car, and quite often in the case of the stores we're boycotting, drive anywhere from another two or five miles to go to another supermarket. It's really gong to burn you out, and we've got to keep that in the back of our minds all the time when we're walking across that parking lot.

When I finally flashed on that one day it was because a third young woman in row, as soon as I got out my, "Good morning, m'am, would you like to not shop at Safeway today?" turned to me and said, "Go to hell" in a really loud voice. And the other line I most often got from people like that is, "don't tell me what to do," which is a statement I got not just from young women, who are in the process of raising kids and dealing with a different anger and frustration already, but I'd say it's one of the most consistent responses I've gotten from people who are in some sense angry.

I think that's a very interesting response showing what's going on inside American's heads. And before answering I often try to figure out where that "Don't tell me what to do" comes from. Sometimes I just back off and say, "I'm asking you to help," which really in tone and in quality, if you mean it when saying it, is a very different thing from saying, "Don't shop at Safeway," which *is* telling them what to do. They're a lot of very valid

reasons to me why many people are really resenting that right now—after the last ten years, after the process of the Vietnam war, after this wholly thing with Watergate, and with food prices going up as they are. They are pretty damn sick of the whole thing and they haven't been able to come up with any new answers which account for it all or consistently order the universe in such a way that this particular time makes sense. And I don't think there's anything harder than living in a time that's not making sense to you.

So, I tend to try to find a response that is not hostile but leaves enough space for the person I'm talking to, with their anger, to tell me specifically what the anger is about. Although sometimes it's hard, I think it's important to get yourself into the kind of feeling that you don't talk back to somebody when they come out with that "Go to hell! Don't tell me what to do. Get out of my way." Sometimes when they're so angry I just step aside and say, "Well, at least don't buy grapes or lettuce," and let it go for the next time around.

Other times it's been interesting to in some way phrase a question back which essentially asks them, "Why are you angry and what are you angry about?" Once I even asked directly, "Why are you angry at *me*?" and she told me, very specifically, why she was angry at me. She told me about being hot and tired and the kids cross and one was sick and she wanted to get her goddamn shopping done. And we then got into a little bit of talking that there were a lot of people who felt that kind of anger, who felt that kind of frustration, and what were different ways we could deal with that. We finally struck a compromise agreement—she'd shop today at Safeway and wouldn't buy grapes or lettuce and perhaps the following week would consider going somewhere else.

Bob: Ultimately it seems to me that it really comes down to a question for us, who are basically consumers, for better or worse, and for those people down in the Valley who are producers and consumers, how is it that we find ways to seek power, power over those things that dominate us. I don't think that ultimately the individual solution makes any sense. What's exciting to me about the Farmworkers, and what is the fundamental difference in my mind between them and the Teamsters, is the way in which they pose this question. The Farm Workers are clear: yes, they want power, they want power over their own lives and how decisions are made which affect their own lives. The Teamsters, however, have come in with an old union organizing approach and said, "We don't want power, all we want is money," because they think they can get their power through money. So the Teamsters go in as a union, and things are better for Teamsters workers than they were for nonunion workers, but all they come out with is money. They think that if they have the money that can go out and begin to control something.

What Chavez' union is trying to do in fact is to raise much more fundamental questions about power over their workplace, power over the conditions and how they live their lives, and one of the questions which comes back to us as consumers is when are we as consumers (and also producers in other areas) going to demand the same kind of power? And then how do we mesh that so that it doesn't become a competitive thing, where everybody is scapegoating everybody else and saying, "Those goddamn Farm Workers, we wouldn't have to pay so much for our monthly shopping bill if they weren't organized." That's part of the instinct, I think, among a lot of people who walk through that Safeway. Ultimately it's self-defeating because the power is there. The power now is monopolized in

places we have little access to and the Union, in trying to break that down, is trying one of the most difficult things in the world. Few Unions have tried it in this country and few have fought as tenaciously for it. A lot of them tried, a lot of them started out that way but gave up pretty quickly. The Teamsters are one; it doesn't have a dishonorable history, but it has a pretty dishonorable present because it's going for the buck and a lot of people see the buck as power.

I think one of the interesting dynamics you strive for in any nonviolent campaign you wage skillfully is the understanding that conflict is inherent in most social systems and that you cannot increase communication by somehow maintaining that conflict isn't there. In fact, one of the best ways of getting people talking and understanding is to go in and expose that sore, just as a cancer—you just take a knife and start whittling at it, and in fact heighten the tensions, and heighten stereotypes perhaps. All of these things are probably going to flow; they flow very naturally whenever anybody jiggles the status quo a little or challenges it. But one of the mechanisms that comes into play in a nonviolent campaign is that, because you don't stereotype people as the enemy necessarily, you seek to look at the overall system that's operating and how that's changed.

One of the things that gets in the way and breaks down communication is defining enemies, because ultimately it's not enemies that are the problem; it's the system. There are always people who man the outposts of the system, who do bad things. But the boycott forces the growers to begin to look at a situation they grew up in that they never had to look at before. I don't know if reason will ever change the growers per se, ultimately I think it will be pressure, but how that change takes place is important. And in a nonviolent campaign you try to keep that communication open. You never see those growers as being evil. You understand that they're trapped in their own little boxes just as everybody else is in a certain sense and you try to ease that change so that the communication in fact opens up in such a way that there are no final victors.

In a nonviolent campaign, ultimately everybody wins. In fact, some people are going to lose their roles. Those growers are going to lose their 'big grower' macho roles—that's a fact and that's going to go. Some of them aren't going to like it' they're going to resist it and die embittered old men and that's unfortunate but it's going to happen. Others perhaps are going to begin to change. Hopefully, though, the whole social fabric will begin to change and they'll begin to understand that it is in fact legitimate for farm workers to organize for their rights.