STATEMENT BY THE RELIGIOUS, CIVIC AND LABOR LEADERS
WHO CONDUCTED A POLL OF FARM WORKERS IN THE COACHELLA VALLEY
April 10, 1973

We have come to the Coachella Valley because we believe in justice for farmworkers and because we believe that farmworkers should be represented by a union they believe in. We have watched Cesar Chavez and the farmworkers with him work and struggle to build a union by and for farmworkers. We look forward to the day when the grass roots union can serve all migrant and seasonal farmworkers in our country.

The Western Conference of Teamsters has re-entered the grape fields. We have been told there are many Teamster organizers in the Coachella Valley and that they have been talking to workers and growers for more than a month. The teamsters claim to represent a majority of the farmworkers in the Coachella Valley.

Today our group of 25 church leaders, congressmen and their representatives, and labor leaders, visited approximately 1,000 workers in the grape fields. We went in small groups to 31 fields. We introduced ourselves, spoke to the workers in Spanish, and asked them to mark a simple survey form to indicate to us their preference for union representation. We did not ask the workers to sign their names and we made it plain that their participation in the survey was voluntary. A few workers chose not to mark survey forms. Most workers indicated their preference. We have kept personal custody of the ballots and the results are as follows.

United Farm Workers AFL-CIO ........................................... 795
Teamsters ............................................................................. 80
No Union ............................................................................... 78

It is clear to us that the vast majority of farmworkers in the Coachella Valley want to be represented by Cesar Chavez UFW, want to continue under the protections of UFW contracts and resent the intrusion of the Teamsters Union. It would be a great injustice to the workers if the grape growers make agreements with the Teamsters against the will of their workers. Such agreements would certainly not result in labor peace in the Valley. We find it hard to understand why any responsible labor union would attempt to make agreements with employers when it is clear that they do not represent the workers.

We wish to encourage the grape growers to take seriously the expressed wishes of their workers. We will return to our communities, our groups, and our churches to report on what we have found here and to continue to support the right of farmworkers to their own union.

"OVER"
STATEMENT BY 125 RELIGIOUS LEADERS, COACHELLA CA. MAY 18, 1973

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: THE REV. WAYNE C. HARTMIRE, JR.,
THE REV. FRED EYSTER (213) 386-6130

We have come from every major religious group and from every region of the Nation to be with
the farm workers of this valley in a time of crisis for their Union. We are convinced that love
must take the shape of justice in the affairs of society and we deeply believe that Caesar Chavez
and the farm workers with him are an example to all of us what it means to sacrifice and to
struggle non-violently for self-determination and justice.

We have concluded that the largest growers in the west are collaborating with officials of the
Teamsters Union to destroy the United Farm Workers movement. It is shamefully immoral and
a disgrace to the labor movement that any union such as the Teamsters would allow itself to be
used by employers against a poor peoples union that is composed primarily of black and brown
workers.

We have pressed Cesar Chavez on the question of elections and he is willing to proceed as soon
as the other parties are also willing.

We ask the Teamsters and growers to honor the rights of the workers and agree to a fair election.
If the Teamsters are unwilling to let farm workers have a voice in their own affairs then we demand
that the Teamsters leave the field so that farm workers will be free to develop their own union.

Most of us do not live in the Coachella Valley. We will be returning to our own organizations
and communities. We make a personal pledge today to boycott non-union head lettuce and table
grapes. We will also avoid Safeway and A and P stores until these major chains agree to support
the farm workers efforts. If the teamsters and the growers do not agree to elections in a reasonable
period of time we will use all the means at our disposal to spread the word of the boycott to our
friends and constituents. We are prepared to support the farm workers boycott for as long as it
is needed.


-OVER-
Dedication of Religious Leaders to Co-counsel, May 17-19, 1973
Farmworkers struggled for five years to get the first table grape contracts in the Coachella Valley in Southern California. Those contracts expired April 15, 1973. Even before the contracts expired, grape growers were negotiating secretly with the Teamsters because of their desire to sign with a union that does not represent their workers and thus will demand little of the growers. Here is a brief run-down of the current situation:

1) The Teamsters apparently have contracts with 85% of the table grape growers in the Coachella Valley. Only two growers (David Freedman Co. and Keene Larson) have renewed their UFW contracts.

2) The table grape growers to the north of Coachella in Arvin, Delano and Fresno are watching the events in Coachella; it is likely that they will also go with the Teamsters. Most of those contracts expire this summer. Strikes are in progress at several ranches where contracts have already expired.

3) The lettuce struggle continues. Strikes are in progress at D'Arrigo farms and La Victoria farms (formerly Pic'n'Pac). The harvest has now moved to Salinas.

4) The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is investigating the charges that growers made illegal cash payments to the Teamsters in Salinas in 1970.

5) Cesar Chavez has asked for secret ballot elections in Coachella but so far the Teamsters and the growers are not interested.

The Teamsters and growers are seeking to destroy the UFW by continuing the fight in the lettuce while at the same time chopping away at the farmworkers' base of strength in the grape industry. It is the worst kind of grower-union collusion aimed at defeating an indigenous, poor peoples' movement.

Cesar Chavez and the farmworkers with him intend to keep organizing and striking and boycotting for as long as it takes to win. Since UFW has to drive the Teamsters out of the fields they might as well do it on the issue of grapes. A lot of Americans joined the farmworkers in the long grape boycott. All of us feel robbed!

You can help in the following ways:

**Priority #1**: Observe the Safeway and A & P boycotts and tell all your friends and colleagues.

**Priority #2**: Continue the non-UFW iceberg lettuce boycott and expand it to include non-UFW table grapes. The first table grapes will reach the market in late May. Please get the word out in resolutions, publications, action networks, etc.

**Priority #3**: In California and Arizona food is needed for the strikers. Contact Pat Hoffman in the L. A. office of NFWM for details.

**Priority #4**: Cash contributions are needed for food, for people, for paper and phone, etc. Checks can be made out to NFWM or UFW and sent to the address below.

**Priority #5**: Give Fitzsimmons a piece of your mind and please send us a copy of your letter. (Frank Fitzsimmons, General President, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue, N. W., Washington, D.C. 20001.)

Farmworkers want their own union. They are willing to keep sacrificing and struggling for that goal. They are asking for our prayers and our deeds.

**NATIONAL FARM WORKER MINISTRY, 1411 W. OLYMPIC BLVD., RM. 511 LOS ANGELES, CA. 90015- PHONE 213/386-8130**
Agribusiness interests, the Farm Bureau and the John Birch Society have decided on a common theme for attacking Cesar Chavez and the United Farm Workers: "Chavez is a power hungry labor boss who is opposed to secret ballot elections for farm workers." The growers, the labor contractors and their allies are now parading as the only true champions of "the rights of the workers." If it weren't a serious matter for the future of the farm workers' union, it would be laughable.

First let's look at some history:

1) In 1935 growers successfully opposed the inclusion of farm workers in the original Wagner Act (National Labor Relations Act).
2) From 1935 to 1970 growers successfully kept farm workers out of the NLRA and most other protective legislation for workers.
3) For over 100 years growers have fought (often violently) to crush every labor organizing effort by farm workers.
4) In September 1965 Cesar Chavez and the grape workers asked the Delano grape growers for elections and were refused.
5) On August 30, 1966 UFWOC won the first secret ballot election in farm worker history despite the fact that the company campaigned for another union. (Results: UFWOC-530, Teamsters-DiGiorgio-331, No Union-12)
6) In September, 1966 UFWOC asked Perelli-Minetti for an election and was refused.
7) In June and July 1967 UFWOC asked Giumarra Vineyards for an election and was refused. August 3, 1967, 90% of Giumarra's workers went on strike to prove they wanted to be represented by Cesar Chavez' UFWOC.
8) In the spring of 1968 UFWOC asked all California and Arizona table grape growers for elections: not one responded.
9) In July and August of 1970, UFWOC asked California and Arizona lettuce growers for elections: all but one refused. On August 24, 1970, 5-7,000 lettuce workers went on strike to prove they wanted to be represented by UFW.
10) From 1965 to 1971, there have been well over 50 valid elections in California, Arizona and Washington agriculture. In every case but one the election has been won by United Farm Workers. The one exception is being appealed because the labor contractor illegally intimidated his Filipino workers ("If Chavez wins you will all be fired and replaced by Mexicans").

The Farm Bureau has tried to argue that these many elections were not valid elections. But the evidence proves that they were:

a) The elections were supervised by a neutral arbitrator chosen by all parties to the elections, e.g American Arbitration Association, Federal Mediation & Conciliation Service, Protestant Clergy like the Rev. Lloyd Santjian of the Methodist Church of Palm Springs and the Roman Catholic Bishops Committee.

b) The rules and procedures for every election were agreed to in advance by all parties to the elections.

c) The different kinds of elections used (card check, secret ballot and ratification) are all approved by the NLRA as valid expression of the will of the workers (under many circumstances strikes are also recognized by the NLRA as valid expressions of the will of the workers.)
(1) What organized farm workers think of it?

(2) Who is supporting it (those contributing are not farm workers)?

(3) Does the legislation provide for other kinds of elections other than secret ballot elections under the Secret Ballot provision for other kinds of elections?

(4) Would it allow the secondary boycott?

(5) Would it allow the election to vote? WILL THE

(6) What is the election process like, as far as the farmers involved? WHO ARE the farmers involved?

(7) Was the legislation drafted for other kinds of elections that apply to farm workers, union have to be approved by state officials? IS THIS A SPECIAL REQUIREMENT?

(8) Does the farm workers union have to be approved by state officials? IS THIS A SPECIAL REQUIREMENT?

(9) Are there remedies for workers against unfair practices and intimidation by growers and others in the industry?

(10) Does the bill bar bargaining on certain specific issues (e.g., one bill eliminated pensions and benefits)?

(11) Is the bill for collective bargaining?

As far as I can see, the bill is drafted to protect the rights of farm workers, please ask questions. The farm workers with the potential rights to real protection of these rights and protection of their workers, are entitled to the right to vote. The ONLPP and the right of the workers to have their rights respected, and for the workers to negotiate. The workers who are gainfully employed and as a result, union will give all farm workers the right to vote. In every case, if it is approved, the bill will allow the workers to vote. In every case, if it is approved, the bill will allow the workers to vote.
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THE CATHOLIC CHURCH'S TOP NATIONAL LABOR EXPERT
SPEAKS OUT ABOUT THE LETTUCE DISPUTE!

Msgr. George G. Higgins
Secretary for Research
United States Catholic Conference

"Father Higgins", as he is known to thousands of trade unionists, knows as much about this Farm Worker crisis as any living American. He helped end the infamous Bracero Program. He has mediated national disputes in the rail-road and copper industries. He is the chairman of the famous UAW Public Re-view Board. Most important, he is chief consultant to the American Catholic Bishops' Committee on Farm Labor.

Here are four recent columns of his nationally syndicated "The Yard-stick" which appeared in February and March of this year on the role of the Teamsters Union in the lettuce controversy. Father Higgins tells it as it is! No one is better qualified to do so.

UNITED FARM WORKERS, AFL-CIO
P. O. Box 62 Keene, Calif. 93531
(labor donated)

Discovering a new plot: (First In The Series)
DEFYING TEAMSTERS AND FARM BUREAU

In 1935, when the National Labor Relations Act (the so-called Wagner Act) became the law of the land, farm workers were excluded from its coverage. Why? For one reason and one reason only: Because the National Farm Bureau Federation and all of the other leading growers' organizations in the United States wanted to prevent farm workers from exercising their right to organize, and had enough political clout to bend the Congress to their will. It was just as simple--and as cynical--as that.

In 1949, when the Wagner Act was rather drastically amended, farm workers were again excluded from coverage. Why? Again, for the very same reason: Because the National Farm Bureau Federation and its satellites were as determined as ever to prevent them from organizing and joining a union of their own choosing. They thought the best way to do this was to exclude farm workers from coverage under the federal law.

Since 1949 the Farm Bureau Federation and its anti-union allies have done everything within their power--which to this day, is very considerable--to maintain the status quo. No, that's not altogether accurate. It would be more accurate to say that, not content with having excluded farm workers from coverage under the federal law, they have done everything within their power to undo the status quo by imposing restrictive legislation on farm workers at the state level.

They have already succeeded in doing this in Arizona. More recently, they failed to achieve their purpose in California--but not for want of trying. Their desperate effort in
Come to think of it, maybe the Teamsters are hoping that this will happen. If so, they

realization, anti-monopoly and could conceivably play the farm workers' union on

that to outlaw the boycott of this particular line would play into the hands of the most

mean that the Teamsters have the advantage is what all of these. They know very well

machines do not measure the shelf. And what a hardship. And what a hardship to

The Teamsters support the coverage of farm workers under the present federal

law, will probably say that they are doing so because they see the only orderly way of

The Teamsters support the coverage of farm workers under the present federal

I'm just as simple—and as cynical—as that.

back the objective we wish the United Farm Workers Union had made of the boycott. Again,

in returns, to persistent on this matter, and only one ingredient in mind. To

on this issue is important, and that's all. They know perfectly well, in other words, that the

worker registration. They know as well as we do that farm estates, when offered a

issue of farm

overshadowed by the problems of achieving parity. With the farm workers' union, the

show them in this context. I am sorry about that, but the fact is that they ought to be ashamed

better than I do. And the Teamsters will probably number when they read what I am saying

There is no one in the whole wide world who, by reason of personal experience, knows

whole capital of Europe. China is the chosen.

causes and labor committees. Here, John B. Taylor and one of the members of the House

effect will be introduced within the near future. According to one member of the House, the

reorganization and the Teamsters have an excellent chance of getting a farm policy, and

the Farm Workers Union. Unless I am mistaken, moreover, the farm bills

brotherhood of Teamsters which, in a moment of madness, recently decided open warfare on

only by the farm union. If so, for reasons of peace, I am convinced the

This I rather doubt. I realize, of course, that the bill will be strongly supported

Passing this year.

custom and no other committee. And in the near future the near future, it is in the

in the House that the farm labor problem has been dealt with. In the near future, and no

have completely reversed my position and many of the others in the

earlier when in recent weeks, the Farm Bureau Federation has been strongly supported by

Agreement, the farmers have to be satisfied with the federal bill, the farmers, the

will make another and develop a similar proposition in the Senate. These

Nevada, California and Arizona. And in several other agricultural

under way to enact an Arizona-type statute in several other agricultural

amphibious plans are

information of the California Institute.

will make another and develop a similar proposition in the Senate. These

Nothing daunted, however. Support for the industry have publicly announced that they

million dollars. Proposition 22 was roundly defeated, thanks in large measure to the

California have received. Proposition 22 was roundly defeated, thanks in large measure to the

to cripple, if not to destroy the United Farm Workers—appropriately called Team of

waste clearly designed

-3-
are not as smart as they think they are—and certainly not as smart as I, for one, had always thought of them as being.

I say this with due respect for what the Teamsters, with all their human faults and failings, have done for their own membership over the course of the years and with all due apologies to the officers of the union, some of whom are (or were) very good friends of mine. There is nothing personal in my criticism of their unfortunate alliance with the Farm Bureau Federation in a joint effort to cut the gound out from under the United Farm Workers Union. I just happen to disagree with them, as I have told them man to man on more than one occasion in recent weeks. My disagreement will be formalized if and when the Congress gets around to holding public hearings on the kind of bill the Farm Bureau Federation and the Teamsters are promoting. I will testify against such a bill and will encourage others, in and out of the labor movement, to do the same.

***************

Anti-labor group, union married? (Second in Series)

ANOTHER CHAPTER ON STRANGE ALLIANCE

In my previous column I severely criticized the American Farm Bureau Federation for trying to cripple, if not to destroy, the United Farm Workers Union by means of federal and state legislation. I also said that the Teamsters ought to be ashamed of themselves for collaborating with the Farm Bureau Federation in such a cynical and transparently phony operation.

These are admittedly hard words, but frankly I can see no point in beating around the bush on an issue of such crucial importance to one of the most disadvantaged groups of workers in the American economy. The Teamsters know perfectly well that the Farm Bureau’s record in the area under discussion has always been completely reactionary by any reasonable set of standards, including the standards which the Teamsters themselves profess to live by as the largest and one of the most influential trade union centers in the United States.

This being the case, I must leave it to the Teamsters to explain why they have joined forces with the Farm Bureau Federation in a desperate effort to pull the rug out from under the Farm Workers Union. In due time they will undoubtedly come up with some sort of explanation for public consumption, but I doubt that they will be able to make it stick.

There is simply no way they can rationalize their unfortunate (and, in the annals of labor history, unprecedented) decision to team up with a notoriously anti-labor organization in an effort to sell the Farm Workers down the river. Their peers in the trade union movement and scores of other interested parties whose good will presumably mean something to the Teamsters are too sophisticated in their knowledge of the farm labor problem and too familiar with the Farm Bureau’s anti-labor record to be taken in by any amount of double talk.

If the Farm Bureau Federation and the Teamsters think that I am pushing this point too hard, I can only refer them to Chapter XI, "Profiteering With Poverty," in Samuel R. Berger’s (over)
For farm workers to escape in secondary polices

The farm workers union also speaks for itself. I am familiar with what they tell us is not very favorable.

The Farm Bureau's record is not that it has helped only a portion of the farm population. It is a record of the absence of clear, open and logical farm policy. It is a record of the absence of the efforts to maintain farm workers. It is a record of the absence of the reasonable and effective social security measures to maintain farm workers. It is a record of the absence of the adequate and effective extension of the coverage of farm workers' Washington Jobbery has also worked against extending the coverage of farm workers and has prevented the passage of legislation to that end.

There is no other issue on which the Congressional Front is except perhaps disarming the farm workers.

Recessions to stop it.

Reduction in the number of farm workers' imports will not work as a stimulus to the economic force of the farmers. No policy has the Farm Bureau. It has no other issue on which the Congressional Front is except perhaps disarming the farm workers. Second class citizens within the United States, those who would suffer when the glass between rich and poor is broken, are those adversaries of a farm policy that would improve the life of the country's farm workers and all the advantages of a farm based on the cooperative system of production. It would be a help to the economic force to the economic force of the country's farm workers and all the advantages of a farm based on the cooperative system of production. It would be a help to the economic force of the country's farm workers and all the advantages of a farm based on the cooperative system of production. It would be a help to the economic force of the country's farm workers and all the advantages of a farm based on the cooperative system of production.

Because of its size, resources, and influence among rural Americans, the Farm Bureau—

Lest a study entitled "Farming's Position on the Subject of Agricultural Labor Beads" in part as follows:

For some of the accommodations that would make it legal for the Congressional Front to support farm workers' Bill of Rights (H.R. 887) The kind of legislation Congressmen demand for farm workers Bill of Rights (H.R. 887) The kind of legislation the farm workers need. They claim that this bill of rights would make the farm workers under the coverage of the National Agricultural Labor Reform Act, those claims bringing farm workers under the coverage of the National Agricultural Labor Reform Act, those claims bringing farm workers under the coverage of the National Agricultural Labor Reform Act.

What you'll find a thought the farm workers have no alternative but to other into an
of either Taft-Hartley or Landrum-Griffin. The Michigan Democrat thinks that this is essential "to encourage the broadest possible organizing efforts in the agricultural industry."

I thoroughly agree with Congressman O'Hara and thoroughly disagree with the position being taken by the Farm Bureau Federation and the Teamsters. I would also give substantial odds that the overwhelming majority (let's say 99 percent) of the priests, ministers and rabbis who have studied the farm labor problem will strongly oppose the Teamster-Farm Bureau bill if and when it ever sees the light of day.

I say "if and when" because it is entirely possible—even probable in my opinion—that, when the chips are down, the Teamsters and the Farm Bureau Federation will not be able to agree upon the terms of their proposed anti-UFWU bill. Judging from their past performance in Washington and at the state level, I would anticipate that the Farm Bureau Federation will strenuously push for amendments (e.g., the prohibition of strikes at harvest time) which even the Teamsters will not be able to swallow. If that happens, the Teamster-Farm Bureau alliance may well come apart at the seams and the strangest bedfellows in the history of the American labor movement may decide to go their separate ways.

* * * * * * * * * * * *

THIS MARRIAGE DESTINED TO BUST (Third in Series)

This is the last in a series of three columns on the subject of farm labor legislation. In the first two columns, we noted that the American Farm Bureau Federation and the International Brotherhood of Teamsters were working in tandem on the farm labor issue at the expense of the United Farm Workers Union, led by Cesar Chavez.

Chavez himself, when we last met with him in California some three or four weeks ago, seemed quite confident that their joint effort to pull the rug out from under the UFWU by means of restrictive federal legislation will not succeed. For my own part, I would be willing to wager that Chavez' confidence in this regard will prove to have been well founded.

The Farm Bureau Federation and the Teamsters are an odd couple if I ever saw one, and I doubt that they really have as much in common on the issue of farm labor legislation as they presently think (or would like to pretend) that they have. The Teamsters claim that they are only interested in bringing farm workers under the coverage of the Taft-Hartley Act. This in itself would be enough, of course, to cripple the UFWU, for it would deprive the organization of the use of the secondary boycott.

In my judgment, however, the Teamsters are kidding themselves if they think that, when the chips are down, the Farm Bureau Federation will be willing to settle for Taft-Hartley coverage—period. To the contrary, as previously noted in this series, the Farm Bureau Federation, at some point in the legislative process, will very probably raise the ante and will insistently demand—among other restrictive measures—that strikes at harvest time be prohibited or, in any event, severely limited by law.

(over)
"The National Minimum Wage Act 2000 has been in place for over a decade, yet it has not led to significant improvements in living standards for many workers. The law, which sets a minimum wage that all workers must be paid, was introduced to address the exploitation of workers, especially in low-skill industries. The law has led to an increase in the cost of labor, which in turn has led to a decrease in the number of available jobs. This has resulted in a higher unemployment rate and a decrease in the purchasing power of workers. The Minimum Wage Act has not been effective in reducing income inequality and poverty.

In conclusion, the Minimum Wage Act has not been successful in achieving its intended goals. It has led to a decrease in the number of jobs available and a decrease in purchasing power for workers. The government needs to reconsider its approach to addressing income inequality and poverty.
Petro and Kilpatrick have a sizable following among the more conservative elements in this country. This is not to say that the groups that they are speaking for (e.g., the National Right to Work Committee) are strong enough to bend the Congress to their own will. On the other hand, they may well have enough influence to prevent the enactment of any kind of farm labor legislation in the immediate future. In my judgment, their labor philosophy is hopelessly out of touch with reality. Nevertheless, from Chavez' point of view—which happens to be my own as well—their opposition to any kind of farm worker legislation may paradoxically prove to be providential if it hastens the dissolution of the Teamster-Farm Bureau alliance and forces the Teamsters to take another look at their cards and another look at the kind of anti-labor company they are keeping in their ill-advised and predictably futile effort to force Chavez' union to the wall.

Showdown bound to come: (Last In Series)

CESAR CHAVEZ AND JIMMY HOFFA AT ODDS

James R. Hoffa, former president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, was 60 years of age on Valent'ne Day. At a mammoth birthday party sponsored by some of his middle-echelon pals in the International, he told a reporter that his chief ambition is to "be able to speak out again about the injustice to the little people of America."

I think we can all agree that that's a very worthy ambition. Unfortunately, however, the "little people" represented by the United Farm Workers Union have already learned, to their utter dismay, that, with friends and champions like Jimmy Hoffa, they really don't need any enemies. Speaking February 20 at Stanford University, Hoffa blithely characterized UFWU president Cesar Chavez as "incompetent." He also predicted—with a degree of self-assurance worthy of a better cause—that the Farm Workers Union will "go out of business" once it's jurisdictional dispute (sic) with the Teamsters is settled.

"We aren't going to give up to another union what is under our jurisdiction," Hoffa said at Stanford. "We will fight Chavez, just like we fight employers--until we win, and we will win." (This I doubt, but that's another matter).

Often drawing loud boos from the crowd of some 200 students, Hoffa added: "I think if you just have a little patience, Chavez will go out of business and we'll keep flourishing. If we are wrong (you are, Jimmy) Chavez will probably have a big powerful union. If we are right, Chavez will probably become part of us."

If Hoffa really believes that last statement, he is capable of believing almost anything.

It's interesting to note that the self-styled champion of the "little people" who is now threatening to put the Farm Workers Union out of business is the same Jimmy Hoffa who, less than six months ago, signed a lettuce boycott pledge and, shortly thereafter, strongly defended Cesar Chavez and his movement in a rather heated colloquy with William F. Buckley on the latter's television talk show.

(over)
Despite always coming out right.

To a day later, returning to the same subject, I mean, with reference to Hotters...

Farm Workers Union... was from a trade union point of view, absolutely dissolved.

To enter in the same press conference, he added, for good measure, that the Teamsters, which he had been on that...
I AGREE with Meany all the way. He was dead right in saying the Teamsters are not going to be successful in their unconscionable effort to destroy the Farm Workers Union.

Here's hoping that Hoffa and the Teamsters will get Meany's message and come to their senses before it's too late—too late for Chavez and his struggling union, but too late for the Teamsters. The old adage is still true: the bigger they are, the harder they fall.