Editorials

FOR A NUMBER OF YEARS now innuendoes have been coming from the Chavez camp regarding Farm Bureau. The innuendoes have precipitated the greatest threat to the United Farm Worker movement...that if it were not for Farm Bureau, particularly in California, the struggle to force all farm workers into the Chavez-led union would have been over long ago.

These innuendoes became irrefutable blatan facts April 28 when three leaders of the United Farm Workers National Union marched into the American Farm Bureau Federation's national head­quarters in 40 cities across the nation and in Europe. The innuendoes have applied that Farm Bureau is the greatest foe to the union of union-represented farm workers.

Making the demand were the Rev. Wayne C. Hartline, Los Angeles, with the California Migrant Ministry and one of the clergy in the forefront of the union's long siege of Delano; Leroy Chatfield of Delano, a member of the UFW board of directors; and Eliseo Medina, Delano-Imperial organiz­ing and boycott coordinator.

During the meeting with President William J. Kahler and three AFBF staff members, the UFW representatives issued an ultimatum. Either their list of demands be met by May 8 or UFW would mount a massive smear campaign against Farm Bureau in 40 cities across the nation.

The major demand was that the American Farm Bureau cease efforts to obtain legislation which would force farm workers to the right to vote on matters of union representation and which would outlaw the use of the secondary boycott in agriculture.

Specifically named were legislative efforts under­way in Washington, D.C., in New York, Colorado, Arizona, Oregon and Wyoming. Also included was a demand for withdrawal of the current effort in California to place a farm labor relations initiative on the November ballot.

Additionally, the UFW spokesman demanded that Farm Bureau withdraw its support of nine Northern California wineries and growers supplying these—the wineries against which the Chavez­led union has carried on its most recent boycott campaign. The demand also was that Farm Bureau cease showing the film, "The Road To De­lano," a documentary in which bonafide farm workers promote their cause.

UFW Makes One False, One Correct Assumption

We are well aware that the policy in UFW comes from the top down. Chavez and other UFW leaders decide each move of the union, decide what shall be included in the contracts, what is "good" for the workers. The rank and file farm workers have no voice in UFW policies.

UFW falsely assumed the same to be true in Farm Bureau...that the officers of the American Farm Bureau determine policies, tell State Farm Bureau what to do. What they did not realize is that the American Farm Bureau officers can do nothing more than carry out the policies established by the members through the policy develop­ment processes. And the members have ordered the American Farm Bureau to work for national farm labor relations legislation.

Fortunately in California, when the Legislature fails to perform its job, the citizens of this state can take the matter directly to the voters through the initiative process. Chuck up a petition, get it filled in and returned immediately to the Fair Labor Relations Committee. Give Chavez his answer!
CBBF Board Reaffirms Support of Farm Labor Initiative

T HE PICKETING OF Farm Bureau by Cesar Chavez and his United Farm Workers union was a recurring topic of discussion during the May 8 and 9 meeting of the Board of Directors of the California Farm Bureau Federation at Davis. By phone calls between counties and their directors, the Board had a running account of the May 9 picketing of County Farm Bureaus over the state.

If the picketing demonstration by the Chavez-led movement was intended to frighten Farm Bureau into backing off the labor initiative, it certainly backfired with the CBBF Board of Directors. The picketing shown and attempted smear campaign did nothing more than re-double the determination of the Board to 1) qualify the California Agriculture Initiative for the November ballot, and 2) work to get the voters of the state to pass the measure.

Highlight of the meeting was the announcement that with 59,696 members as of May 8, the California Farm Bureau had gone over its 1972 membership goal set by the American Farm Bureau Federation. However, the California Farm Bureau had yet to reach the goal; it had set for itself which was some 500 members higher than the American goal. The Board voted to continue to receive 1972 renewal memberships until June 1 or until the California goal was reached, whichever occurred first. The Board also adopted a formula for establishing the state's membership goal in the future to bring the goal more in line with that set by the AFBF.

While the majority of the two-day meeting was devoted to reports on the progress being made in carrying out policies adopted by the House of Delegates at the November, 1971, meeting, the Board did take a number of actions.

The Delegates in November called for an all out effort to be made for the adoption of the Watson Property Tax Limitation Initiative and for the California Farm Bureau and County Farm Bureaus to support this Initiative with manpower and money. The Board had taken earlier actions which helped qualify the measure for the November ballot.

At its May meeting, the Board set a goal of $600,000 to be raised by Farm Bureau members in California for use in gaining passage of the Watson Initiative.

As a first step in the fund raising campaign, the Board recommended that a letter of explanation and solicitation be sent immediately to every Farm Bureau member in the state, pointing out that the Watson Initiative was the only hope for property tax relief and asking for financial support to publicize the merits of the measure so the voters would adopt it.

Following President Nixon’s May 8 announcement of efforts to block supplies reaching the North Vietnamese, the Board went on record in support of the President’s policies and his efforts for an honorable peace in Vietnam.

In other actions, the Board supported a current move by the poultry industry to establish a temporary state marketing order to deal with surpluses in the egg industry. The proposed marketing order, which would expire December 31, 1973, and would have to be approved by producers, would remove a percentage of eggs from non-human use to bring supplies more in line with demand. Each producer would be assigned a percentage of his production to route to the surplus pool. The order also provides that growers could meet this surplusing requirement by removing hens from laying flocks. The Board in giving its support for the marketing order did qualify that support by stating that the order would have to be amended to entitle contract producers to also vote in the referendum.

Also coming before the Board was a proposed change in the California Beef Council Law under which funds are collected from producers to promote beef. Presently the law includes provisions under which producers may apply for a refund of the monies collected by handlers for the Council. The law also presently includes a provision that before a full mandatory program can be instituted, producers must approve such a program by referendum.

The proposed changes would delete the refund provisions and would delete requirements for a referendum to be held before the program could be made mandatory.

The Board went on record in opposition to the proposed changes in the Beef Council Law. It was pointed out that the change should not be made through the Legislature, but rather all producers should vote on whether or not they want a mandatory program. The Law, the Board said, already contains the machinery to bring the matter before producers.

The Board also pointed out that this particular program had started as a totally voluntary one. Then, the Board said, its leaders went before the Legislature and obtained a change to have the funds deducted by the handler with any producers objecting being able to apply for a refund. Now, the Board added, the leaders are back trying to change the law once more to now make support of the program mandatory, and they are trying to by-pass a producers’ vote in doing this.

In other actions, the Board voted support of Assembly Bill 71, which would enable school districts to conduct educational programs in venereal disease but which provides that any parent by written request may prohibit his child from attending such instruction.

The Board also went on record with a statement that it believes that fore-going inclusion of ethnic groups by percentages has no place in the 4-H program. The Board pointed out that the 4-H program over the years has done an outstanding job of erasing barriers between nationalities and races, of bringing all young members within a community together to work on common goals. To emphasize race by setting the program up on the basis of establishing quotas for each race as the U.S. Justice Department has ordered would be divisive, the Board said.

The Board also requested a committee appointed to make a study of agriculture’s research needs five and ten years ahead and to look for alternative means of funding such research in light of current efforts to curtail agricultural research funds within the University of California.

CALIFORNIA AGRICULTURAL INITIATIVE

By coincidence the mail on the first day of the CBBF Board meeting brought in enough memberships to place the California Farm Bureau Federation over the goal assigned it by the American Farm Bureau Federation. Marking the occasion by posing for a photo to be forwarded to the AFBF were (from left), Larry Horn, manager of the CFBF Member Relations Division; CFBF President Allan Grant; and District 4 Director Lorne Warren, who chairs the CFBF Membership Committee.

On the morning of the second day of the Davis meeting, the CBBF Board hosted a breakfast in Sacramento for legislators who are members of the Senate and Assembly Agriculture Committees and for key administration leaders. District 12 Director George W. Schmiedt (left) is shown welcoming Assemblyman Robert G. Wood who represents Chinn’s home culture, succeeding the late Jerry W. Fielder. The Assemblyman Wood is a Modoc County cattle rancher, who represents Chinn’s home culture, succeeding the late Jerry W. Fielder. The Assemblyman Wood is a Modoc County cattle rancher. The Board of Directors also went on record in support of Assembly Bill 71, which would enable school districts to conduct educational programs in venereal disease but which provides that any parent by written request may prohibit his child from attending such instruction.

The Board also went on record with a statement that it believes that fore-going inclusion of ethnic groups by percentages has no place in the 4-H program. The Board pointed out that the 4-H program over the years has done an outstanding job of erasing barriers between nationalities and races, of bringing all young members within a community together to work on common goals. To emphasize race by setting the program up on the basis of establishing quotas for each race as the U.S. Justice Department has ordered would be divisive, the Board said.

The Board also requested a committee appointed to make a study of agriculture’s research needs five and ten years ahead and to look for alternative means of funding such research in light of current efforts to curtail agricultural research funds within the University of California.

CBBF President Allan Grant, right, welcomes C. Brandt Christensen to the breakfast. Last month Christensen was appointed State Director of Agriculture, succeeding the late Jerry W. Fielder. The new director, a former member of the State Board of Agriculture and a Modoc County cattle rancher, has served on various state and national government advisory committees and has held leadership positions in numerous farm organizations.

District 12 Director George W. Schmiedt talks with the Assemblyman from his home area, Robert Monagan. Sharing in the conversation is Fred Reininger, CBBF First Vice President. As Minority Leader of the Assembly, Monagan was one of the featured speakers at the breakfast. Following the event, all those in attendance received a gift pack representative of some of the State’s finest farm commodities.
UFW Supporters

Cesar Chavez and his United Farm Workers forces have again learned that Farm Bureau won't be bullied, that no matter what the leaders of the Chavez movement threaten, Farm Bureau will continue to work for what its members believe is just and right.

On April 26, as reported in Mr. Grant's editorial in this issue, three leaders of the United Farm Workers union arrived at the American Farm Bureau Federation's headquarters in Park Ridge, Illinois, and demanded a meeting with President William J. Kuhluss. During the meeting, the UFW leaders presented a list of demands and issued an ultimatum. If the demands were not met by May 8, the UFW would mount a massive smear campaign against Farm Bureau in 40 cities across the nation and in Europe.

On May 9, Chavez mobilized his forces to "attack and discredit" Farm Bureau. The American Farm Bureau reported picketing of State Farm Bureau offices in 23 states.

On that day in California, County Farm Bureaus in Imperial, Riverside, San Diego, Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, Santa Barbara, Ventura, Kern, Tulare, Fresno, Madera, San Luis Obispo, Monterey, Santa Cruz, Kern, Tulare, Fresno, Madera, San Luis Obispo, Monterey, Santa Cruz, Santa Clara, San Mateo, Stanislaus, San Joaquin, Sacramento, Napa and Yuba-Sutter reported picketing of their offices. The state headquarters building in Berkeley was also picketed.

While Santa Barbara and Tulare did report another day of picketing, the UFW campaign consisted mostly of the one day thrust. Perhaps because the publicity UFW so thrives on was "backfiring"—newsmen were printing both sides of the story and the public wasn't taking kindly to UFW's protests against giving farm workers the right to vote.

The number of pickets at County Farm Bureaus here varied by County. Chavez and his UFW forces, Grant said this "exposure" would bring before the public the true issues involved in farm labor organization.

Grant stressed that Farm Bureau would intensify its efforts to explain the truth to the people the true issues and to get them to sign over their work force or go out of business.

Fifth Morgan Enters Membership Race

Would you believe still another Morgan horse will be awarded in this year's membership campaign? The fifth Morgan, a two-year-old registered Morgan gelding, is now running in his own separate race.

In the CFBF Derby, which started in March, County Farm Bureaus have been divided into four classes depending upon size. Each class is racing against each other for the highest average percent of 1973 and 1972 membership goals. The top county in each of the four classes will win a two-year-old registered Morgan. This year, however, will be awarded to the volunteer worker in the winning county who signed up the most new members.

In reinstituting the rules for the Derby, the Board of Directors of the California Farm Bureau Federation felt it had set up a fair contest. However, at a recent meeting of the Board, the question arose: What if the top winner in one county doesn't happen to be in a winning county? The Board pondered this and decided in the average percent of new sign-ups, the top of recognition should be developed for the state's top membership worker.

According to the Board the debate over the rule opening the way to an appropriate alternate award, District 10 Director Forrest Jones volunteer to operate an additional Morgan horse—a registered two-year-old gelding. It was Jones' donation of the original Morgan filly which launched the Federal into running the Derby and led to its purchasing three additional Morgan foals, Jones in order to make it a fair race.

Now, about winning that fifth Morgan horse.

Since the fifth Morgan only recently appeared upon the scene, the Board decided that the race for it would be a separate one in which only volunteer membership workers would participate. And since the horse entered the contest on May 1, the Board decided that only those new 1973 members signed between May 1 and December 10 would be eligible to receive the horse.

The Board did place one restriction on the new race—only one Morgan to a membership worker if the state's top membership worker should also happen to be in the county winning a Morgan horse, he or she would have to choose between the gelding and the filly. In the event this should occur, the membership worker second in the state in membership but a new member signed also would receive a horse.

So, if you want to win a registered Morgan horse—top your County Farm Bureau office, pick up a book of membership applications and hit the road. If you sign the number of new members between now and December 10, you will get the gelding. You might even make your county a winner, which means you would have a choice between the gelding and a filly.

This year marks the 30th annual national observance of April, Mother's Month. Few persons the nation over think of California when they mention Mother's Month. Few persons the nation over think of California when they mention this date.