

City News Service September 16, 1996, Monday

September 16, 1996, Monday

LENGTH: 788 words

HEADLINE: L.A. Officials Back Union Effort to Organize Strawberry Pickers

DATELINE: LOS ANGELES

BODY:

Several Los Angeles officials pledged support today to United Farm Workers efforts to unionize strawberry pickers nationwide.

Every time that we have won an election (to organize), (ranchers) have retaliated by plowing under the berries," the UFW's Dolores Huerta said at a City Hall news conference and rally.

Yesterday, in the Watsonville-Salinas area, about 6,000 field workers marched to show support for the organizing effort, Huerta said.

But Karen Miller, a Watsonville grower under contract to one of the state's largest strawberry operations, said just as many berry pickers protested on Aug. 10 against the union organizing efforts.

City News Service September 16, 1996, Monday

People have to remember unions are big business, too," she said.

Huerta, introduced by Los Angeles County AFL-CIO leader Miguel Contreras as the first lady of the Latina labor movement," said some berry pickers are denied clean drinking water and access to toilets.

A rancher near Oxnard, she said, destroyed crops when workers struck to protest sexual harassment that was going on in that field."

They are saying to workers if you vote for the union, you'll be out of a job," Huerta said.

The growers have got to understand that when a strawberry worker is fired in the field, somebody in Canada is going to know about it. Somebody in St. Louis, Missouri, is going to know about it. Somebody in New York is going to know about it."

Similar rallies were held nationwide, as union organizers asked supermarket managers to support the movement.

Miller said she and her husband Clint have a loyal, happy workforce on about 230 acres of strawberries.

City News Service September 16, 1996, Monday

"We're fighting the ghost of Cesar Chavez," she said, and for 30 years people have only heard one side of the story."

Miller said that at the height of the season most of her field hands make more than \$9 per hour.

"No one, even those just hired, makes less than \$6.80," she said. Half our workers are buying homes in the area."

According to a University of California, Davis, study, Huerta said, doubling the \$8,000 a year salary that most berry pickers earn would add a nickel to the cost of a pint of strawberries.

About 65 percent of all strawberries are grown in California, she said, and are picked by about 12,000 migrant workers.

"The union seeks a living wage," clean drinking water, toilets in the fields, job security, health insurance and enforcement of sexual harassment and child labor laws, she said.

She said state agriculture officials do not have the resources to enforce working conditions provided for under the Agricultural Labor

City News Service September 16, 1996, Monday

Relations Act. But a spokesman for Driscoll Strawberry Corp. Inc. disputed that.

"The state vigorously enforces all the labor laws throughout the area," said Phil Adrian, marketing manager for the Watsonville-based operation. "We also have a third-party auditor that checks on our growers to make sure they're complying."

Ken Morena, president of Driscoll, said many of the assertions UFW organizers make are simply inaccurate."

We know for a fact that none of these conditions alleged by the union exist(s) in any of our growers' fields," Morena said.

Council members Richard Alatorre, Mike Hernandez, Ruth Galanter and Jackie Goldberg signed a pledge to support the movement, as did City Attorney James Hahn and Controller Rick Tuttle.

Alatorre said he will ask the City Council tomorrow to endorse a resolution of support for the field workers.

City News Service September 16, 1996, Monday

Then-Assemblyman Alatorre authored a bill in 1975 that helped workers choose their unions. He praised the tenacity of the UFW and cautioned ranchers that, It's better to (negotiate) than to do it the hard way."

Hahn said it is a family tradition" to support field workers. He said his now-retired father, 10-term Los Angeles County Supervisor Kenneth Hahn, backed Chavez in his struggle to unionize farm workers three decades ago.

Goldberg said the conditions field workers endured in the past were horrifying."

Today it's shameful," she said, adding that she used to show students the CBS documentary Harvest of Shame" when she was a teacher in Compton.

Boycott or no, we've eaten our last strawberry," Goldberg said.

But Huerta said the union is not advocating a boycott.

The strawberry harvest, which begins in early spring, runs through the summer, and some growers harvest frozen quality" berries as late as November.

City News Service September 16, 1996, Monday

About 100 striking Teamsters protesting conditions for truckers, who transport Mission tortillas, joined the UFW and the AFL-CIO at the rally.

HEADLINE: Farm Workers Call on the United Farm Workers Union to Obey California Law and Stop Pursuing Illegal Sweetheart Deals With Farmers.

DATELINE: WATSONVILLE, Calif., Sept. 15

BODY:

The following is being issued by the Pro Workers Committee:

Following a summer of union harassment by AFL-CIO sponsored organizers in the fields and at their homes, workers from California's strawberry fields have called on their friends to support them in their effort to prevent the UFW's pursuit of illegal sweetheart deals with growers.

PR Newswire, September 15, 1996

"We are aware that UFW Secretary-Treasurer Dolores Huerta has attempted to arrange meetings with growers through state legislators even though this would violate California's Agriculture Labor Relations Act. That is worse than illegal. It is morally wrong. The UFW wants to bully their way into our pocket book. The UFW does not want us to have freedom to choose our own destiny. We call on all people of good conscience to tell them they are wrong," stated Jose Oscar Ortega of the Pro Worker Committee, an organization of strawberry workers opposed to the UFW actions.

The UFW plans to hold a march in Watsonville on Sunday September 15, which is Mexican Independence Day. They have promoted it with flyers and radio announcements as an Independence Day festival, but in a media advisory the AFL-CIO and the UFW have revealed that the real purpose of the event has been switched to now promote their campaign against farm workers in the strawberry fields.

"They are so deceitful and dishonest. Why do they mislead the very workers they hope to represent? I am proud of my Mexican heritage, but I am angry that they want to exploit workers for their purposes. Over 5,000 (five thousand) strawberry workers made history when they marched in protest against the UFW just a few weeks ago. They require UFW members who work in other industries to march or they will be declared not in good standing and fired. We oppose that," said Sergio Soto, a former UFW member and a spokesperson

PR Newswire, September 15, 1996

for
the Pro Worker Committee.

The UFW has poured money and manpower into their attempt to organize the strawberry industry, but has not effected a single election. At one point UFW

Vice President Efren Barajas was reported to say the union did not care about gaining elections certified by California's Agriculture Labor Relations Board. Barajas stated that the union wanted to be granted industry-wide representation free of worker elections. State Agriculture Labor Relations Board officials responded that the union desire was not possible under state law.

The goals which the UFW promises workers in the strawberry industry include such things as \$7.50 an hour, clean drinking water, bathrooms in the fields, respect and freedom from sexual harassment generally are already met or exceeded in California's strawberry fields. In fact many farm workers would receive significantly less pay under the UFW proposal than they currently earn.

"The UFW also wants the public to think workers carry disease and contaminate the berries. They call our berries the fruit of the devil. They say nasty things in letters they mail across the country and then deny it. They are not nice people and cannot earn the respect of workers," stated Soto.

The Pro Workers Committee is also communicating with supermarket managers

PR Newswire, September 15, 1996

across the country to explain why they should not respond to the UFW efforts to disrupt the strawberry industry.

The Fresno Bee

September 2, 1996 Monday, HOME EDITION

HEADLINE: National speakers stoke labor organizing fires; Fresno events focus on UFW efforts, VMC issue.

BYLINE: Charles McCarthy, The Fresno Bee

BODY:

Current events fueled the intensity of this year's Labor Day gatherings, as two of the nation's top officials spoke in Fresno and local hospital workers braced for layoffs.

The nation's top labor organizer, AFL-CIO President John J. Sweeney, and U.S.

Housing and Urban Development chief Henry Cisneros brought simple advice to

Valley farmworkers: organize and keep organizing.
The Fresno Bee, September 4, 1996

The two officials gave rousing talks Sunday to an estimated 2,000 people who flocked to the Fresno Convention Center for an event sponsored by the United Farm Workers of America.

Across town, at the annual Labor Day picnic at Fresno State, opponents of the pending merger of Valley Medical Center with Community Hospitals of Central California circulated petitions aimed at blocking the move.

Bob Yates of the Service Employees International Union said 624 unionized licensed vocational nurses, dietary, clerical and janitorial workers expect to receive pink slips this week.

He said the termination notices could come out as early as Tuesday, and weren't given out earlier because management didn't want to issue them just before the Labor Day weekend.

Cisneros gave his speech entirely in Spanish, while Sweeney spoke in English. Headsets were available for simultaneous translation of the messages.

Both cited the UFW's renewed organizing energy, chanting "Si Se puede! -- Yes it can be done!" with flag-waving and clapping workers.

The Fresno Bee, September 4, 1996

"We must organize more workers as you in the Farm Workers union are doing," Sweeney said. "Whatever we do, we must ask how does this help us grow and give workers more power? Because if we don't grow in big numbers, we cannot survive."

In a speech that drew frequent applause, Cisneros talked about several things, including President Clinton's signing of the controversial welfare reform package. He noted that Clinton realized that much in the bill needed to be "fixed."

Cisneros urged all eligible immigrants to become U.S. citizens, and estimated that 70 percent of those who would lose benefits under the federal welfare reforms are eligible for U.S. citizenship.

"If you don't have a vote, you don't have a voice," Cisneros said. "With the vote, we can take our children to the future. I want to see a Latino as governor of California."

Politicians listen to those who vote, Cisneros told the enthusiastic crowd, most of them farmworkers in jeans and work shirts. He told the UFW members that they are on "a march, a sacred march, the march toward the future."

The Fresno Bee, September 4, 1996

The message resembled talks by the late Cesar Chavez, who founded the UFW and began his organizing efforts in the vineyards around Delano in 1962. When growers asked Chavez why he was out to ruin San Joaquin Valley agriculture, the union organizer retorted that he wanted growers to prosper so their workers could share a part of that prosperity.

The farm union joined the national AFL-CIO in 1966.

UFW spokesman Marc Grossman said since the union began a renewed organizing campaign in May 1994, it has won 13 straight worker elections. The UFW is currently locked in an organizing battle with California strawberry growers.

The issues, Grossman said, are decent pay, clean drinking water, toilets, job security and health care.

There will be a September strawberry boycott in 50 cities around the nation, Sweeney said. The nation's 13 million union members are standing behind the campaign to improve conditions for an estimated 20,000 strawberry fieldworkers.

"We have accomplished things no one thought we could do, like get a minimum wage increase in a Newt Gingrich Congress," Sweeney said. "We have beat back the

extreme right-wing agenda which they called their 'Contract With America.'
"

The Fresno Bee, September 4, 1996

Afterward, Sweeney said: "There's no greater union to start Labor Day with than the (United) Farm Workers."

Sacramento Bee

September 1, 1996, METRO FINAL

SECTION: MAIN NEWS; Pg. A1

LENGTH: 2574 words

HEADLINE: FARM UNION PICKS A BIG FIGHT

BYLINE: Edgar Sanchez, Bee Staff Writer

DATELINE: WATSONVILLE

BODY:

Arturo Rodriguez, son-in-law of the late Cesar Chavez and heir to his legacy, strode onto a vast strawberry field. His boots kicked up a cloud of dust.

Wearing a bright blue shirt and jeans, Rodriguez looked like another field hand as he drifted toward 75 Latino berry pickers who were on lunch break, sitting between rows of tiny red-dotted plants. They seemed not to notice him
Sacramento Bee, September 1, 1996

until an aide announced that the president of the United Farm Workers had arrived.

"Companeros, if you want better working conditions, if you want to be treated with dignity, you must be part of the union," Rodriguez told the workers in Spanish.

"You have the right to join the UFW . . . but it will only happen when you want to do it," he shouted, underlining his words with arm gestures. "Are there any questions from any of you? Don't be afraid."

Only one worker raised a hand. The rest silently stared at the ground.

Later -- after the crew returned to work and Rodriguez returned to his car -- he declared another small win for the UFW. "They may not have asked many questions, but now that they're back to work, they're thinking about what I told them," he said. "So I'm very happy. In the end, we'll win."

Three years after he succeeded the legendary Chavez as UFW chief, Rodriguez is trying to pump new blood into his union from the ranches where the reddest fruit grows. In seeking to unionize 15,000 strawberry pickers in the Salinas/Watsonville Valley, he also is sending a message to California's
Sacramento Bee, September 1, 1996

agribusiness: The UFW didn't die with Cesar Chavez.

Already some gains have been made. Since Chavez died in his sleep in 1993, at age 66, the UFW has boosted its membership from 21,000 to 26,000. But those numbers pale compared with the 80,000 members it had in 1970.

Now, a quarter-century after its glory days, the UFW has undertaken its most significant endeavor of the '90s by trying to organize the strawberry workers. At stake is the opportunity to boost its membership by as much as 58 percent, and even more importantly, boost the union's reputation as a statewide -- perhaps national -- force in organized labor.

To that end, Rodriguez has returned to the time-tested strategy that made the UFW strong -- field organizing. Like a field general, Rodriguez is on the front lines, as he was at the Watsonville farm owned by Gargiulo Limited Partnership, one of the area's top growers.

Rodriguez, 47, faces a mammoth task in the Salinas Valley: None of the strawberry pickers is unionized, but he expressed confidence that thousands soon will be, despite strong opposition from the \$ 600-million-a-year industry.

Sacramento Bee, September 1, 1996

Most of the valley's big growers are reluctant to comment on the UFW's organizing push. The few who do say their workers are treated so well that they are not interested in going union.

"Our company leads the industry in terms of wages and benefits," said Michael Saqui, an attorney representing the Watsonville-based Gargiulo LP, which has about 1,200 strawberry workers in the valley.

He would not provide specifics, but added, "We respect our employees' right to freedom of choice. . . . And our employees have made a resounding showing against unionization."

During Rodriguez's visit, most of the Gargiulo laborers seemed hesitant to speak to a reporter.

"We have no problems here," whispered one worker, holding a taco with his red-stained hands. "I'm treated well here. I don't think we need a union."

Two other workers also whispered that no union was necessary.

Only one laborer revealed his name -- Jesus Palomares, 32, who said, "The union is in favor of the workers. It wants to help us."

Sacramento Bee, September 1, 1996

Growers and the UFW are standing their ground. Yet one fact is undisputed: Picking strawberries is a back-breaking ordeal. No mechanical device is able to do it; the delicate job can only be done by human fingers. Because the plants are only 2-feet tall, pickers must stoop for hours.

The pickers earn an average of \$ 8,000 for a season that lasts roughly from March to October. While the Salinas Valley is California's top strawberry producer, the berries also grow in other parts of the state.

"This is our No. 1 campaign," Rodriguez said of the drive to recruit the strawberry workers in the central coast.

Other unions across the nation are carefully monitoring the strawberry campaign as they try to rebound from the lean 1980s, said Richard Bensinger, organizing director for the AFL-CIO, a federation of 17 million workers.

"Rodriguez is a model for other unions to look at," Bensinger said. "Under his leadership, the UFW has grown by about 20 percent. If the whole labor

movement had done what he's done, we'd have millions of more members today."

The UFW story began in 1962, when Chavez, an Arizona-born migrant worker, rose from obscurity to establish the union.

Sacramento Bee, September 1, 1996

Using work stoppages, a grape boycott and picket lines at supermarkets, Chavez turned the laborers' plight into a cause celebre. In 1970, more than half of the UFW's 80,000 members were table-grape pickers.

By the time Chavez died on April 23, 1993, only about 21,000 laborers remained under UFW contracts -- fewer than 3 percent of the state's 1 million farm workers. Yet, the union's clout has always extended beyond mere numbers, as reflected, for example, in its successful efforts to pressure lawmakers to outlaw certain pesticides from California's fields.

Before his death, Chavez blamed the UFW's decline partly on a changing political climate in Sacramento -- two successive Republican administrations that crippled the Agricultural Labor Relations Board. Established in 1975 under Democratic Gov. Jerry Brown, the ALRB was an objective arbiter of farm worker grievances -- until the Republicans took over in 1983, Chavez charged.

The UFW comeback began in March 1994, when 80 farm workers walked from Delano to Sacramento, reenacting a similar trek Chavez had completed in 1966.

During the march, something remarkable occurred, said Don Villarejo, executive director of the California Institute for Rural Studies in Davis.

Sacramento Bee, September 1, 1996

"When Rodriguez and the other marchers entered the agricultural towns where the workers live, they received a tremendous outpouring of support," Villarejo said. "Farm workers who hadn't seen the union for many years had a chance to tell firsthand what was going on in the fields and express their grievances.

"It's my opinion this touched the UFW leaders," he said. Soon after, the union announced it would return to field organizing as its primary activity and away from tactics Chavez had favored in his final years, such as boycotts.

The switch in strategies bore immediate fruits, Villarejo said.

Within two months came the first of 13 straight election victories for the UFW on farms in California and Washington state -- producing 5,000 new members.

In the same two-year span, the UFW renegotiated 24 existing contracts.

Some observers, including a high-ranking official in the UFW, attribute this success partly to what they call Rodriguez's willingness to give and take when negotiating, something they said Chavez seldom did.

"I respect Cesar for the many sacrifices he made to get this union going. But Cesar was much more volatile and confrontational than Arturo is," said
Sacramento Bee, September 1, 1996

Douglas L. Blaylock, who has headed the UFW's medical plan since April 1990.

"With Cesar, I got the impression it was all or nothing," said Blaylock, who came to the union from the corporate world. "Either the employer accepted all of the (UFW) demands, or the negotiations fell apart. Arturo is more willing to compromise on the bargaining issues.

"When Cesar died, the union wasn't dead, but it was struggling to survive. The change in leadership is responsible for the new growth."

Rodriguez denied doing anything new.

"I've been with the UFW for 23 years and I can't remember a day when Cesar didn't talk to us about organizing," said Rodriguez, who spent 20 years as an organizer. "The lifeblood of this organization has always been organizing."

In the current drive, Rodriguez suggested, it's just a matter of time before some growers stop resisting unionization.

To Rodriguez, the scenario is not at all farfetched. He said the precedent has been set by "progressive" growers across the state, such as Bear Creek

Production Co. of Wasco, north of Bakersfield.
Sacramento Bee, September 1, 1996

At Bear Creek, one of the nation's largest rose producers, 1,400 non-union workers voted in December to join the UFW. Rather than challenge the election results, Bear Creek's management announced it would bargain in good faith.

The result was a three-year pact signed by both parties in March. It provides the workers with pay raises, along with medical and pension plans.

The signers recognize the need for both the company and the workers to prosper, said Kyle R. Burdick, a Bear Creek official. "We're both trying to go in the same direction," he said. "We're not trying to pull each other apart."

If history is any indicator, victory in the strawberry fields will take time, said Dolores Huerta, UFW's secretary-treasurer.

"It might take us a year, it might take us two years," she said. "When we went after the California table-grape industry, it took us five years, from 1965 to 1970," to sign up 80 percent of the growers.

"We're not going after one grower. We're going after the whole strawberry industry."

Cesar Chavez, the founder of the United Farm Workers Union, believed organizers of the poor could only be effective by sharing in their plight.

So Chavez, who died three years ago and is buried at the UFW's La Paz headquarters 35 miles east of Bakersfield, never made more than \$ 5,000 a year.

Sacramento Bee, September 1, 1996

Arturo Rodriguez, Chavez' son-in-law and the new president of the UFW, earns a little more. In 1995, according to tax records, he earned \$ 6,362 -- an amount that included a biweekly paycheck of about \$ 34, the rent for his union-provided housing and family assistance.

"Cesar insisted that UFW leaders and staff receive only subsistence pay," said Rodriguez, who said his real pay is in the satisfaction he derives from his work.

Rodriguez, 47, lives with his wife, Linda, and their three children at La

Paz, the UFW compound in the Tehachapi Mountains. He married Chavez's second daughter in 1974, a year after he became an organizer for the UFW.

The son of a San Antonio, Texas, sheet metal worker, Rodriguez attended Catholic schools through college. He holds a master's degree in social work from the University of Michigan.

Unlike Chavez, Rodriguez has never done farm labor. But as a teenager in San Antonio, he came to know people's indifference toward field hands.

"One day in 1966, a priest from my parish went down to the Rio Grande Valley to participate in a march led by Cesar," who was calling attention to the
Sacramento Bee, September 1, 1996

hardships endured by melon pickers, Rodriguez recalled. "When the priest came back, he was excited. He said it was about time something was done to bring equality to farm workers."

When other parishioners learned of the priest's trip, they complained to church leaders that he had been out of line. The socially minded priest was banished to a tiny church in the Texas desert.

"That incident had a lasting impression on me," Rodriguez said. "This was a priest I really respected, someone I had a lot of faith in. And suddenly, he was sent away for protesting the inhumane treatment of workers."

The exiled priest was eventually returned to San Antonio.

Now, at the UFW headquarters, Rodriguez is surrounded by the spirit of Chavez, the man Rodriguez admired most. Not only is Chavez buried at the entrance of the compound, in the garden he used to tend -- his face stares down from hundreds of posters and photos in the buildings.

"When I'm here in La Paz, not a day goes by when I don't go by Cesar's grave," Rodriguez said. "Cesar is constantly in my spirit."

Sacramento Bee, September 1, 1996

"If you get to feeling tired, if you get to feeling sorry for yourself, or

you get to feeling complacent, you just have to sit back and think about Cesar for a few moments," he said, his eyes moistening. "Think about what he did in his lifetime. Cesar did every possible thing he could to build and create this movement to bring dignity and respect to farm workers.

"Now, he's left it for us to continue that work. I've dedicated my life to this work. So has my family. . . . How long do I want to continue as UFW president? As long as the workers keep voting me in to this position."

Rodriguez has spent most of this summer in the Salinas Valley, leading the drive to unionize 15,000 strawberry workers.

"These workers have been coming to us for a long time, asking us to unionize them," Rodriguez said. "For whatever reason, we couldn't give them the attention or the resources they needed until this year." Now the union is in the valley and, Rodriguez said, it is not going away.

The Fresno Bee

August 4, 1996 Sunday, HOME EDITION

HEADLINE: Growers, advocates at odds on how to safeguard farmworkers;
Liability: Contractors say workers should obtain licenses, insurance.

BYLINE: Russell Clemings, The Fresno Bee

BODY:

Seven multiple-fatality accidents, 29 deaths, all farmworkers, all since 1994, all in Fresno or Madera counties.

Enough's enough, says Don Bennett, who runs an agricultural safety program at California State University, Fresno.

The Fresno Bee, August 3, 1996

"Why isn't the community up in arms over this?" Bennett wonders. "Who's going to stand up here and say we want to do something about this?"

Bennett is not alone. In the aftermath of Tuesday's head-on crash of a car

and a van carrying farmworkers south of Firebaugh, in which five were killed, calls for action are growing louder.

Exactly what type of action remains in dispute.

Farmworker advocates say it is time to hold growers responsible for the vehicles that bring them their workers. But grower representatives say the answer lies in better driver education and better enforcement of traffic laws.

And farm-labor contractors, who often act as middlemen between growers and workers, say workers should be responsible for obtaining a license and insurance just the same as everyone else.

In most of the accidents in the last two years, authorities have determined that the farmworker van's driver was at fault.

Last week's accident appears to be an exception: The California Highway Patrol, based on witness accounts, believes another car strayed into the
The Fresno Bee, August 3, 1996

opposing lane and hit the van head-on.

In any case, Bennett said, the scale of the carnage demands action.

"The only place this seems to be a problem is in the Fresno area, and I don't know why," Bennett said.

Don Villarejo, executive director of the Davis-based California Institute for Rural Studies, thinks he has the answer.

He blames the informal farm-labor contracting system, which brings together workers, jobs and rides -- usually without the grower's direct involvement.

Villarejo says that system diverts responsibility from the sole person -- the grower -- who has the power and the money to make things better.

As evidence, he recalls a recent scene at dawn on a rural road in Fresno County, where Villarejo took notes as a state enforcement team inspected farmworker vehicles under the multiagency TIPP, Targeted Industries Partnership Program.

The Fresno Bee, August 3, 1996

CHP officers were issuing citations to the unlicensed driver of a faulty farmworker vehicle -- one whose seating consisted simply of benches and chairs crammed into the back of the van, not even bolted to the floor.

They asked the driver who owned the vehicle. At first the driver said he did not know. But pressed, he admitted the owner was the foreman, or crew chief, who had given the workers their jobs for the day.

The foreman had been there the whole time, next to the driver, but saying nothing.

"You could see the chain of command," Villarejo said. "The spinning off of responsibility starts at the top with the farmer and goes right down."

Arturo Rivas, an Exeter farm-labor contractor, does not dispute Villarejo's basic point: Neither contractor nor grower wants liability for drivers, sometimes known in Spanish slang as *reiteros*.

"When I got into this business, the first thing I learned was not to hire *reiteros*," he said. "I don't want to be liable for something. They get drunk over the weekend . . . you never know."

The Fresno Bee, August 3, 1996

What Rivas does know is that his business is to hire people. And how they get to the job is their own business. Those people should obtain their own insurance, he says, just as he pays workers compensation insurance that covers laborers injured or killed while driving to and from the job.

Besides better enforcement of traffic laws and farmworker vehicle registration and inspection requirements, farmworker advocates say making growers legally responsible for their workers' transportation would help ensure safer conditions.

Grower groups oppose such legislation, preferring to place emphasis on driver training along with enforcement.

"There just needs to be a greater awareness of safety," said Bob Krauter, a California Farm Bureau Federation spokesman.

THE ARIZONA REPUBLIC

September 9, 1993 Thursday, Final Chaser

HEADLINE: FARM UNION CLAIMING SABOTAGE ;
LAWYER, JUDGE MISHANDLED YUMA CASE, SUIT SAYS

BYLINE: By Brent Whiting, The Arizona Republic

BODY:

The United Farm Workers, which was slapped earlier this year with a \$2.9 million verdict in a Yuma court, filed a lawsuit Wednesday in California claiming that the union's case was sabotaged by its own lawyer, with the knowledge of the judge.

Union President Arturo Rodriguez issued a statement in Los Angeles saying that the union was thrust into "a legal nightmare" in the Yuma suit and was
THE ARIZONA REPUBLIC, September 9, 1993

betrayed by attorney Carlos R. Castro "with the knowledge and cooperation" of Judge Joseph Howe of Maricopa County Superior Court, who presided at the Yuma trial.

"Justice has been a foreign notion in Arizona, so we are seeking justice in California," Rodriguez said.

Castro, who practices in Phoenix, said the claims in the California suit are "definitely without merit" and demonstrate the leadership void left in the union when its founder, Cesar Chavez, died two days after the Yuma trial began.

Howe said the canons of judicial ethics prevent him from commenting on the suit's allegations.

Dolores Huerta, a Phoenix spokeswoman for the union, said Wednesday's lawsuit was filed in Los Angeles County Superior Court because most of the union's assets are in southern California.

The action claims that Castro withdrew from the Yuma lawsuit before the start of trial after failing to inform the union that he had a mental disorder, depression, that prevented him from trying the case.

THE ARIZONA REPUBLIC, September 9, 1993

Before pulling out and being replaced by two other Phoenix lawyers, Frank Benton and Judith Praker, Castro conceded several crucial legal issues to a California lettuce grower, the suit says.

Castro replied that the claim is "outrageous." He said that everything was done with the knowledge and concurrence of Marcos Camacho of Keene, Calif., UFW general counsel.

Bruce Church Inc., a Salinas, Calif.-based farm company that has lettuce farms in California and Arizona, won the \$2.9 million verdict against the union in a jury trial in Yuma County Superior Court over a multistate lettuce boycott.

During the trial, union supporters kept a vigil outside the courthouse, contending that a verdict for the farm company could destroy the union, which is believed to have only \$2 million in assets.

Chavez was in southwestern Arizona testifying in the trial when he died in his sleep in April.

The suit stemmed from a boycott Chavez launched in 1979 with mailings to consumers and grocers accusing BCI Inc. of sexual harassment, hiring minors and endangering its workers with toxic chemicals.

THE ARIZONA REPUBLIC, September 9, 1993

It was the second trial of the lawsuit. The grower won a \$5.4 million verdict in 1988, but the Arizona Court of Appeals overturned the decision in 1991.

Los Angeles Times

July 21, 1993, Wednesday, Home Edition

SECTION: Part A; Page 3; Column 2; Metro Desk

HEADLINE: UFW APPEALS VERDICT, CHARGES BAILIFF MISCONDUCT;

LAWSUIT: UNION SEEKS TO UPSET \$2.9-MILLION AWARD TO LETTUCE GROWER OVER SECONDARY BOYCOTT. IT CLAIMS THAT COURT OFFICIAL PEPPERED JURORS WITH NEGATIVE COMMENTS.

BYLINE: By TONY PERRY, TIMES STAFF WRITER

DATELINE: SAN DIEGO

BODY:

The United Farm Workers union has appealed a \$2.9-million verdict in favor of a major lettuce grower on the grounds that a bailiff peppered the jurors with negative comments about the UFW and its supporters.

Los Angeles Times, July 21, 1993

"It was a trial without the attributes of constitutional due process," said UFW attorney Michael Aguirre of San Diego.

During the recent Yuma, Ariz., trial, Aguirre clashed repeatedly with Judge Joseph D. Howe over rulings that he alleged were biased against the UFW, including Howe's decision to continue the trial despite the death of Cesar Chavez on the opening day. Aguirre is seeking either a directed verdict in favor of the UFW or a new trial.

In the appeal, filed Monday in Yuma County Superior Court, a former FBI agent hired by Aguirre to interview jurors says that bailiff Hank Green showed disdain for UFW supporters who camped on the courthouse lawn, called them rabble-rousers, and indicated to jurors that the supporters could pose a danger.

The monetary award, meant to compensate Bruce Church Inc. for losses due to a UFW boycott, came on a 9-3 jury vote, the minimum needed. UFW leaders believe that without the bailiff's comments, one or more jurors might have sided with the UFW, preventing a verdict in favor of Church.

Green and Presiding Judge H. Stewart Bradshaw, who is Green's supervisor, declined to comment on the appeal. The appeal also includes a host of legal issues about inadmissibility of evidence and whether the Yuma court had

Los Angeles Times, July 21, 1993

jurisdiction.

Former FBI Agent Ken Oliver, who is a private investigator, said jurors reported that Green had told them that the judge, while the jury was not present, had chastised and fined Aguirre and threatened to put him in jail if he persisted.

One juror allegedly told Oliver that Green said of the UFW supporters: "They don't work, these are the rabble-rousers, the main strikers, the ones who go into the fields and get the workers all riled up."

Several jurors, according to Oliver, said Green warned them to park behind the courthouse to avoid any confrontations with the UFW supporters who conducted a peaceful 24-hour vigil outside the courthouse during the trial's final week.

The verdict, returned June 10, came in the retrial of a damage suit brought by Church over the UFW's "high-tech" boycott of grocery stores in the 1980s that was intended to force Church into signing a contract. Jurors found that the union had violated an Arizona law, in effect, protecting businesses from secondary boycotts.

Los Angeles Times, July 21, 1993

UFW backers have long complained that Church, which is based in Salinas, filed the suit in Arizona to take advantage of that state's political climate, which is more conservative and anti-union than California's. Church attorneys replied that much of the lettuce that was boycotted was grown in Arizona.

"The bailiff was just a projection of what was going on in that court," UFW official David Martinez said. "We believe the bailiff felt he had the court's implicit approval to carry out his outrageous conduct."

Attorneys for Church in Yuma and Phoenix could not be reached for comment.

June 27, 1993, Sunday, Final Edition

SECTION: FIRST SECTION; PAGE A19

**HEADLINE: UFW Struggle Will Continue, Hispanic Officials Told;
After Death of Founder Chavez, Union Could Be Bankrupted by Legal
Damage Award**

BYLINE: Lou Cannon, Washington Post Staff Writer

DATELINE: LAS VEGAS, June 26, 1993

BODY:

Leaders of the United Farm Workers vowed today at a national conference of Hispanic leaders to continue their struggle despite the death of founder Cesar Chavez, declining membership and a damaging legal judgment that threatens to

The Washington Post, June 27, 1993

bankrupt the militant union.

"Cesar's left us physically, but he's very much with us in spirit," said UFW President Arturo Rodriguez. "He did not die in vain."

Rodriguez's speech Friday was the emotional highlight of the annual conference of the National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials (NALEO), which largely was devoted to practical political advice from a growing number of Hispanic officeholders and scholarly reports on various issues.

Many in the audience wept as they viewed a videotape of Chavez's funeral and heard Rodriguez pledge to continue organizing farmworkers. UFW leaders also called for a nationwide boycott of California table grapes they contend are contaminated by pesticides.

Chavez, an apostle of nonviolence who organized thousands of poorly paid California farm workers in the 1960s and 1970s, died in his sleep April 23 in a small Arizona farming town near his native Yuma. On June 10 the union was dealt another heavy blow when a Yuma jury on a 9 to 3 decision awarded the Bruce Church Inc. lettuce -growing firm \$ 2.9 million in civil damages for inaccurate statements made by UFW representatives during a consumer boycott.

The Washington Post, June 27, 1993

The judgment is more than the UFW has in its treasury, and it was widely predicted that it would bankrupt a union now down to about 10,000 members from a peak of 70,000. But UFW leaders said today they were confident of winning on appeal in federal court, where First Amendment issues can be raised.

"They will never get a penny of that money," UFW Secretary David Martinez said in an interview. He reiterated UFW charges that the Salinas, Calif.-based Church firm mistreated workers.

Some UFW leaders compare holding the civil trial in what Martinez described as a "conservative corner of Arizona before . . . an anti-union jury" to the first Rodney G. King beating trial in suburban Simi Valley before a jury with no blacks. Four Los Angeles police officers were acquitted of using excessive force in beating King but two were subsequently convicted by a racially mixed jury in a federal civil rights trial held in Los Angeles.

"Let us be tried by a jury of our peers in East Los Angeles," said Martinez, referring to an area in which the majority is Mexican American.

Union leaders are optimistic because the award included only \$ 1,000 in punitive damages and was far less than the \$ 9.7 million Church sought or the \$ 5.4 million award, later overturned, made by a 1988 jury. After the recent

The Washington Post, June 27, 1993

decision some jurors were quoted anonymously as saying they had kept punitive damages negligible because the grower had mistreated union members though not to the extent the UFW alleged.

The response to the UFW report here demonstrated the continuing appeal of Chavez among Hispanics.

"Most Latinos are urban, and they have divisions on urban issues," said NALEO director Harry Pachon, a professor at Claremont College in California. "But Chavez represented farm workers, the poorest of the poor, and he remains an

enduring hero to Latinos throughout the Southwest."

The success of the conference here, attended by 600 Hispanics from throughout the nation, mirrored the rapid population growth and rising political clout of the Hispanic minority. Hispanics now hold 5,000 offices, and many at this conference pledged support for a drive to make U.S. citizens of 5 million Hispanic non-citizens, about half the nation's total non-citizen population.

Among recently elected Hispanic officials is Los Angeles County District Attorney Gil Garcetti, who was applauded when he pledged to be "more than a prosecutor" and support early intervention programs aimed at keeping young Hispanics in school. Hispanics have the highest dropout rate of any ethnic group in the nation.

The Washington Post, June 27, 1993

group in the nation.

Garcetti said teachers can identify potential dropouts as early as third grade and added that keeping children in school is related to crime prevention because dropouts account for 80 percent of the prison population.

Differences among Latino groups were reflected on some issues, notably the North American Free Trade Agreement, which is widely backed by Mexican Americans in California but opposed by Puerto Ricans in New York who view it as a threat to jobs.

Los Angeles Times

June 11, 1993, Friday, Home Edition

SECTION: Part A; Page 3; Column 5; Metro Desk

HEADLINE: GROWER WINS DAMAGE SUIT AGAINST UFW;
FARM LABOR: JURY AWARDS LETTUCE PRODUCER ONLY ONE-THIRD
OF THE MONETARY AMOUNT
IT SOUGHT FOR UNION'S TACTICS IN BOYCOTT. OFFICIAL PREDICTS
GROUP WILL PREVAIL
IN FEDERAL APPEALS COURT.

BYLINE: By TONY PERRY, TIMES STAFF WRITER

DATELINE: YUMA, Ariz.

BODY:

In a trial permeated by the memory of Cesar Chavez, a jury found the United Farm Workers Union guilty Thursday of outrageous conduct during a lettuce boycott but awarded the grower less than a third of the monetary damages it
Los Angeles Times, June 11, 1993

wanted.

An official with Salinas-based Bruce Church Inc. said the verdict vindicated the company's view that the union engaged in illegal and malicious conduct in persuading grocery chains to drop Church lettuce in the 1980s.

"We were damaged unfairly and wrongfully," said company Vice President Vic Lanini. "I think the truth came out finally, even if the damages aren't what we wanted."

But UFW supporters and attorneys, gathered at a rally outside the Yuma County courthouse, were buoyed by the jury's nearly \$2.9-million judgment, which was far below the \$9.7 million requested by Church and the \$5.4 million awarded by a 1988 jury before that decision was overturned and the case returned here for retrial.

Arturo Rodriguez, the union president, predicted that the union will prevail "once the case is taken out of Yuma" and into federal appeals court in Los Angeles, where 1st Amendment arguments can be made.

"We have a duty to Cesar Chavez's memory and to BCI workers to continue the fight," Rodriguez said.

Los Angeles Times, June 11, 1993

Chavez died April 22, just hours after finishing his second day of being grilled by attorneys for Bruce Church. Chavez's death added to the emotion of the trial, with UFW supporters packing the courtroom in recent weeks and conducting a 24-hour vigil outside the courthouse.

After five hours of deliberation, the jury returned a 9-3 verdict in favor of Church, setting compensatory damages at \$2,898,280 and punitive damages at \$1,000. In 1988, a jury took three hours for a unanimous verdict of \$4.9 million in compensatory and \$500,000 in punitive damages.

Judge Joseph D. Howe ordered the names of the jurors sealed. Jurors were whisked from the courthouse while spectators were ordered to remain in their seats, watched by two armed Yuma County deputies.

Later the rally outside the courthouse took on the tones of a victory with cheers of "Cesar Chavez Presente!" translated as "Cesar Chavez Is With Us."

Lanini said the company brought the lawsuit only to recover damages, not to change history's evaluation of Chavez, who made the decision to begin a hardball "hi-tech boycott" against Church.

Los Angeles Times, June 11, 1993

"The other side tried to play on emotions, but all we wanted was to recover the losses we sustained because of illegal conduct," he said. "History will judge Cesar Chavez. I doubt that this court case will change that."

One juror who voted with the majority said the jury put punitive damages at only \$1,000 as a signal to Bruce Church to treat workers better.

"The union was wrong in what it did, but Bruce Church has done some bad things to workers and should care for them better," said the juror, who requested anonymity.

Harley Shaiken, a labor issues expert at UC San Diego, said in a telephone interview that the verdict would put a further chill on the use of secondary boycotts by labor unions and other activist groups, even in states like California where such boycotts are legal.

"If you can mount an effective legal campaign against the secondary boycott, the cost and disruption is such that the group attempting the boycott is defeated even if the law is ultimately on its side," he said.

Michael Bailey, the Phoenix attorney representing Bruce Church, had told jurors that the union's tactics during the boycott were like a protection

Los Angeles Times, June 11, 1993

scheme and extortion plot. He said the union lied about Bruce Church in an effort to scare grocery stores into dropping Church lettuce. Bailey said that the union's claims about Bruce Church engaging in child abuse, sexual harassment and misuse of toxics were malicious and reckless.

"The union was lying," he said. "The union was threatening."

San Diego attorney Michael Aguirre, representing the union, argued that the boycott was covered by the 1st Amendment. He told jurors to remember Chavez's dedication to nonviolence.

"You are being asked to judge history," Aguirre told the jurors. "I hope you don't find that Cesar Chavez and the United Farm Workers are a bunch of extortionists who were just out lying to people."

The jury was required to decide whether the union had violated an Arizona law prohibiting a union from interfering with "the beneficial business relationships" between Bruce Church and the grocery stores.

The union had begun a boycott of Church lettuce in 1979 and by 1984 had helped persuade Lucky Stores and nine other chains to drop Church Red Coach lettuce.

Los Angeles Times

June 9, 1993, Wednesday, Home Edition

SECTION: Part A; Page 3; Column 1; Metro Desk

LENGTH: 1031 words

HEADLINE: DECISION IN SUIT AGAINST UFW NEARS;
COURTS: CESAR CHAVEZ TESTIFIED IN \$9.7-MILLION DAMAGE CLAIM
ONLY HOURS BEFORE HE
DIED. JURY DELIBERATIONS ARE SCHEDULED TO BEGIN TODAY.

BYLINE: By TONY PERRY, TIMES STAFF WRITER

DATELINE: YUMA, Ariz.

BODY:

The \$9.7-million damage suit against the United Farm Workers that consumed Cesar Chavez's final days is nearing a decision, with the union that he built facing possible bankruptcy and disarray if a jury sides with a major lettuce grower.

Los Angeles Times, June 9, 1993

Union loyalists awaiting a verdict have held rallies outside the courthouse where Chavez completed a second day of grueling testimony just hours before he died April 22. Many are bitter that the suit by agribusiness giant Bruce Church Inc. went to trial at all and has gone forward despite Chavez's death.

"Cesar died defending our rights," Arturo Rodriguez, Chavez's son-in-law and successor as president of the union, said at a rally. "He only had to be here because of the false accusations against us. Cesar's spirit is here with us. We won't let him down."

A Yuma County Superior Court jury is set to begin deliberations today in the retrial of the lawsuit brought by Church, a Salinas-based grower with massive acreage in California and Arizona, over a UFW boycott of the company's Red Coach brand lettuce.

The company alleges that in pursuit of the boycott the union illegally threatened to link grocery chains that sold the lettuce with sexual harassment, child abuse and misuse of toxic chemicals.

An earlier Yuma jury, after hearing almost identical evidence, found in favor of the grower in 1988 and set damages against the union at \$5.4 million. But an appellate court ordered a retrial after invalidating one of two pro-business

Los Angeles Times, June 9, 1993

Arizona laws that formed the original basis of the grower's allegations.

The trial resumed two weeks after Chavez's death. The judge denied a motion for a mistrial from UFW attorneys who said they were unable to question Chavez.

Sensing that the case was being lost, and with it the union's chance to

regain some of the membership, contracts and influence it lost during the 1980s,
the union changed tactics in recent weeks.

Michael Aguirre, a former federal prosecutor and now a high-profile litigator from San Diego, was brought in to finish the case and make closing arguments to the jury.

The media, sympathetic priests and celebrity friends of the union were encouraged to attend the trial. Actors Martin Sheen and Susan Anspach came to show support, and a television station sought permission to bring a camera to court, a request that Judge Joseph D. Howe denied.

Howe has voiced displeasure with the UFW stratagem of packing the 128-seat courtroom with supporters, many of them wearing T-shirts and buttons extolling Chavez and the union.

Los Angeles Times, June 9, 1993

One T-shirt shows a picture of Chavez and the words: "Cesar Estrada Chavez: March 31, 1927-April 22, 1993. Si Se Puede," which translates to, "Yes, You Can," a Chavez motto.

Howe said that packing the courtroom was an example of "extrinsic pressure on the jury" to influence the verdict. "There are pressures and it is my job to prevent them," Howe said. "This case should not be decided on sympathy."

On Monday, Presiding Judge H. Stewart Bradshaw, who heard the first trial and was roundly criticized by the UFW for directing a verdict in favor of Church, ordered the retrial's final days moved from the larger courtroom to one with only 32 seats.

Aguirre, who has had a number of sharp exchanges with Howe and unsuccessfully sought his removal for alleged bias, argued in court that sending the trial to a smaller courtroom could influence the jury in favor of Bruce Church Inc.

"If you do this," Aguirre said, "you will send a message to the jury that the

UFW has done something wrong" by bringing supporters to watch the trial.

Howe, who supported the move to a smaller room, responded that "there is a need for crowd control. We have had trouble getting our jury in and out."
Los Angeles Times, June 9, 1993

On Tuesday afternoon, Howe ruled that today's closing arguments would return to the larger courtroom and that a TV camera would be allowed to tape the session. But he barred the crowd from mingling with jurors in the courthouse.

Some of the emotion swirling about the case involves land 15 miles outside Yuma where the Chavez family had lived when he was a child. Lost through foreclosure during the Depression, the land is owned by Church.

Since Monday night, a 24-hour vigil has been under way on the lawn outside the courtroom, featuring a Mass and rosary by a Roman Catholic priest, folk songs, large portraits of Chavez and appearances by elected officials from throughout Arizona.

"This trial isn't about justice," said Los Angeles attorney Rees Lloyd, one of several attorneys working pro bono for the union. "This is an attempt to crush Cesar Chavez's union and make sure it never recovers."

UFW supporters worry that a new jury award in favor of Church would force the union to direct its time and efforts into filing exhaustive appeals, just when it hopes to revive its organizing efforts. The union has assets of about \$2 million and could be devastated, UFW officials said.

Los Angeles Times, June 9, 1993

Chavez, sensing that growers were unmovable in the 1980s, turned from field organizing and adopted the tactic of "high-tech boycotts" against grocery chains -- using targeted mail to consumers, demographic studies, focus groups and fund raising by mail -- hoping to force large growers such as Church to sign UFW contracts.

The UFW campaign sought to persuade grocery stores that by dropping Church

lettuce they could avoid the negative publicity of being associated with mistreatment the UFW alleges that Church inflicted on its workers, including sexual harassment, exposure to toxics and hiring minors.

Faced with picketing and letters to their customers, 10 grocery chains dumped Church lettuce, including the Lucky Stores Inc. chain in early 1984. In the years since Church filed suit, all but Lucky have resumed buying Church lettuce.

By suing in Arizona, the company was able to invoke an Arizona law that prohibits a "secondary boycott" launched against the grocery chains by the UFW in an effort to bring Church to the bargaining table. California law allows such boycotts.

In overturning the 1988 verdict, the state appeals court rejected the use of Arizona's law banning secondary boycotts for cases where the boycott did not
Los Angeles Times, June 9, 1993

occur in Arizona.

National Catholic Reporter

May 7, 1993

SECTION: Vol. 29 ; No. 27 ; Pg. 5; ISSN: 0027-8939

LENGTH: 2569 words

HEADLINE: Millions reaped what Cesar Chavez sowed; Obituary; Cover Story

BYLINE: Jones, Arthur

BODY:

DELANO, Calif. - They came by car, pickup truck, van and school bus, tens of thousands of people pouring into the 87-degree heat of the San Joaquin Valley to pay last respects to United Farm Workers President Cesar Chavez.

Their license plates said California, Oregon, New Mexico, Arizona - people like elderly UFW members Guadalupe Benito Arvizos, who only a few days earlier

National Catholic Reporter, May 7, 1993

in Yuma had taken Chavez for a haircut.

The mourners were arriving for the funeral of an icon to Mexican-Americans, Mexicans and the broader Latino communities of the United States who died April 23 of an apparent heart attack.

They had driven hundreds of miles past fields where they and their families before them had picked grapes, lettuce, tomatoes, oranges - farm workers who knew the soil of the Kern County flatlands around Delano and their equivalent nationwide.

Long lines of dusty vehicles waited to park here at Forty Acres, the regional UFW center where the farm workers movement was born. Here was Chavez's body in the plain pine box fashioned by his brother, Richard.

Attending were figures in politics, entertainment and activism: Ethel Kennedy and Joe Kennedy, Jerry Brown, and Secretary of Housing and Urban Development Henry Cisneros, apparently representing President Clinton. Actors Ricardo Montalban and Martin Sheen were there, as well as activists such as Msgr. George Higgins, the labor priest, and religious women such as Notre Dame de Namur Sister Ann Kendrick.

National Catholic Reporter, May 7, 1993

The rosary began at 7 p.m. April 28 and lasted all night, interspersed with tributes such as Aztec dancing. People slept in their cars and on the ground. There was no room in the few inns, such as the Sundance Motel, where people slept six and eight to a room, two and three to a bed.

The next morning, the vast crowds gathered for the symbolic two-hour march to the funeral Mass at Forty Acres, where Los Angeles Cardinal Roger Mahony was celebrant.

The family - Chavez's wife, Helen, their eight children and their spouses, and numerous grandchildren - had already had private moments at the coffin. As

Chavez's son Paul told NCR?, "Now is the time to share him with everyone else."

Thousands of people with only a handful of local and state police to help with the traffic - this was the funeral of a nonviolent Christian.

Desert origins

His Christian life began, as it ended, in a small desert town. He was born March 31, 1927, and baptized in the Immaculate Conception Church of Yuma. It was

a modest area where small farmers once battled dust and drought but where agribusiness now rules. That church was destroyed by fire in 1960.

National Catholic Reporter, May 7, 1993

Death came during the early hours of Friday, April 23, in San Luis, barely 30 miles from Immaculate Conception Church. But in the 66 years between, Chavez had made history.

A few men and women have engraved their names in the annals of change through nonviolence, but none have experienced the grinding childhood poverty that Chavez did after the Depression-struck family farm on the Gila River was foreclosed in 1937.

Chavez was 10. His parents and the five children took to the picking fields as migrant workers.

Chavez's faith sustained him, but it is likely that it was both knowing and witnessing poverty and the sheer drudgery and helplessness of the migrant life that drove him.

He never lost the outreach that he had learned from his mother, who, despite the family's poverty, told her children to invite any hungry people in the area home to share what rice, beans and tortillas the family had.

He left school to work. He would say later that he attended 65 elementary schools but never graduated from high school: Always moving on with the
National Catholic Reporter, May 7, 1993

season, his extended family fought to survive - fought hunger, fatigue and illness and fought the excruciating pain that can come from hours of

backbreaking tasks.

Migrant field work still means a short life, poor, unhealthy life. Hypertension, diabetes, a higher infectious disease rate than the general population, and a per capita income level 50 percent less than the average are still standard, according to the Migrant Clinicians Network.

Killing fields

In recent years, Chavez's belief that pesticides had made the picking fields into killing fields had become one of his main concerns, and national attention is focusing that way, too. Toxicologist Dr. Marion Moses of the San Francisco-based Pesticide Education Center said that groups once teaching migrants about their health are now teaching them about their rights concerning pesticides.

In praising Chavez's work, Sister of Notre Dame de Namur Catherine Gorman, coordinator of the farm worker ministry in the Orlando, Fla., diocese, also said Florida farm worker pacts now mandate that workers be told what pesticides are used in the fields, superseding a Florida state law that specifically excludes National Catholic Reporter, May 7, 1993

farm workers from an act providing for a right to know about chemical use.

It was in the fields, in the 1950s, that Chavez met his wife, Helen. The couple and their eight children gave much to "La Huelga," the strike call that became the UFW trademark, from their eventual permanent home near Bakersfield.

Chavez did not even own the home until a decade ago but paid rent out of his \$900 a month as a union official.

Yet, in the fields in the 1930s, something happened that changed Chavez's life. He was 12 when a Congress of Industrial Organizations union began organizing dried-fruit industry workers, including his father and uncle. The young boy learned about strikes, pickets and organizing.

For two years during World War II, Chavez served in the U.S. Navy, then it was back to the fields and organizing. There were other movements gaining strength in the United States during those years, including community

organizing.

From 1952 to 1962, Chavez was active outside the fields, in voter registration drives and in challenging police and immigration abuse of Mexicans and Mexican-Americans.

National Catholic Reporter, May 7, 1993

At first, in the 1960s, only one movement had a noticeable symbol: the peace movement. By the time the decade ended, the United Farm Workers, originally established as the National Farm Workers Association, gave history a second flag: the black Aztec eagle on the red background.

In eight years, a migrant worker son of migrants helped change a nation's perception through nonviolent resistance. It took courage, imagination, the ability to withstand physical and other abuse.

The simple facts are well-known now. During the famous 1968 grape boycott, farmers and growers fought him, but Chavez stood firm. A nation of shoppers hesitated, then pushed their carts past the grape counters without buying.

The growers were forced to negotiate.

It was a very Catholic fight, priests and brothers and women religious, Catholic laypeople by the hundreds, were much to the fore in Chavez's work. In 1975, the California Agricultural Labor Relations Board came into being. A young monsignor, Roger Mahony - a Chavez ally through Mahony's work as the Catholic bishops' Ad Hoc Committee on Farm Labor field secretary - was appointed to the board.

National Catholic Reporter, May 7, 1993

It organized hundreds of farm worker elections. The union peaked in the 1970s and (80s, but what Chavez and the UFW had actually accomplished, even as the numbers of UFW members and UFW contracts dropped, was possibly more

significant.

The UFW as a Mexican-American civil rights movement in time might outweigh the achievements of the UFW as a labor movement, for Chavez also represented something equally powerful to urban Mexican-Americans and immigrants - a nonviolent leader who had achieved great change from the most humble beginnings.

Yet, through the UFW, Chavez and his colleagues brought Americans face-to-face with the true costs, the human costs, of the food on their tables and brought Mexican-Americans into the political arena and helped keep them there.

Ground has been lost in the fields. Latinos are still at the bottom of most of the socioeconomic indexes, but that once invisible segment of America is present and growing. In the past decade, some criticized Chavez for moving away from organizing and civil disobedience into boycotts and fasts, others for letting the UFW's power and prestige slide.

National Catholic Reporter, May 7, 1993

Also, lawsuits against the union were taking both time and money during the period the UFW was slipping financially. It was a lawsuit that had preoccupied Chavez in the days immediately before his death.

Chavez - who watched the union lose a \$ 2.4 million suit two years ago - was in Yuma contesting a \$ 5.4 million judgment against the UFW that had gone to Bruce Church Inc., a multimillion-dollar agribusiness with vast land holdings in Arizona and California.

Bruce Church Inc. had sued for damage done by a UFW boycott and won, and the UFW was appealing the case. Chavez gave testimony for two days and, when not in court, reportedly spent the time driving through Yuma's poor streets, the

playground of his brief childhood.

Often hungry as a boy, Chavez would fight hunger as a married man when -
trying to bring a union to life - he would have to beg for food for his family from the workers he was attempting to organize.

Later, he would embrace hunger through fasts to further the cause. He was on
a seven- or eight-day water-only fast until the evening before his death.

National Catholic Reporter, May 7, 1993

He was staying in the small, brick home of a disabled former migrant worker,
family friend Dona Maria Hau, in San Luis, a half-hour south of Yuma. Hau had
given Chavez her bed because she and UFW officials were concerned about his
health. The previous evening, they had persuaded him to break his fast and have
a vegetarian meal.

On Friday morning, April 23, Chavez did not appear for breakfast. David Martinez, UFW secretary-treasurer and a 20-year UFW loyalist, found him
lying on
the bed, dressed, union documents and court papers around him. But dead.

He had died young; his father lived to 101, his mother to 99.

Word of Chavez's death spread to the union halls decorated with the Virgin
of Guadalupe and UFW flag, to the fields, to the small towns and larger cities.
And stories about the short, compact man with the ready smile, the iron
determination, the genuine humility and the deep faith were being told amid the
tears.

In a way, Chavez had died fighting for what his mother and father had lost.
The holdings of Bruce Church Inc. today include land that once was the Chavez
family farm, land that Chavez, until the end of his life, believed had been
unjustly taken from them.

National Catholic Reporter, May 7, 1993

Humble "tough cookie"

The tributes came from ordinary people and from at least two presidents - U.S. President Bill Clinton and Mexico President Carlos Salinas de Gortari.

They came from UFW colleagues such as feisty former Vice President Dolores Huerta, a possible successor, and indirectly from one or two growers - though other growers were quick to downplay Chavez's and the UFW's importance.

Baldemar Valesquez, leader of the Farm Labor Organizing Committee in Toledo, Ohio, cited Chavez as an inspiration. "The most important legacy he leaves is the legacy of self-help, not leaving it to advocates, do-gooders and others to struggle for us."

Pat Henning, chief of staff of the California Assembly's Labor Committee, said he fasted with Chavez for several days during his water-only fast in 1988 to call attention to the harm allegedly caused by pesticides in the fields.

"There's a whole generation of Catholic activists in social justice from the (60s that owe their origins of who they are today to Cesar Chavez and the UFW," said Henning, a permanent deacon.

National Catholic Reporter, May 7, 1993

Henning dwelt on Chavez's deep Catholic faith, saying Chavez was "the only one" who was "able to unify the social justice issue with a cultural and religious emphasis. No other organizer was quite able to do that."

Henning said, "He was a devout Catholic. I'm not sugarcoating that at all. He was a tough cookie. But he went almost daily to Mass. He spent an hour each day in prayer."

Even though unionized farm workers are a minority, Chavez and the UFW raised the standards across the board as growers at unorganized farms raised workers' pay to keep them from forming a union, Henning said.

But while Chavez occupied a unique spot in time, history will not regard him as unique, say those who knew him.

Valesquez said, "We, of course, are beneficiaries of the struggle. We rode in on his coattails."

As for the future, he predicted, "we have a lot of talented intelligent people, who will come after Cesar and come after me, who are going to do things bigger and better, as long as we hold together the organization."

National Catholic Reporter, May 7, 1993

Bishops' involvement

Chavez was one of the first recipients of a Campaign for Human Development grant, said Jesuit Father Joseph Hacala, director of CHD, the U.S. bishops' domestic antipoverty program.

In 1969, Msgr. George Higgins, then director of the U.S. bishops' social action department, drafted a statement on the farm labor problem, with supportive references to the grape boycott, for the bishops to consider at their November meeting.

At that meeting, two California bishops suggested the bishops might have more effect if they offered their services in some way to mediate the dispute instead of issuing a resolution endorsing the boycott. Higgins had reservations but withdrew the boycott resolution and quickly arranged a private meeting between Bishop Hugh Donohoe of Fresno and William Kirchner, AFL-CIO director of organizing.

Chavez's union had merged with the AFL-CIO Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee in 1966, becoming the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee, or UFWOC.

National Catholic Reporter, May 7, 1993

They came up with a proposal to form the bishops' Ad Hoc Committee on Farm Labor as a mediation panel. By the end of the bishops' meeting, the committee was established with Auxiliary Bishop Joseph Donnelly of Hartford, Conn., as chairman.

Chavez, the committee and growers held hundreds of intense meetings over the next couple of years. A young priest of the Fresno diocese, Msgr. Roger Mahony, was named the committee's field secretary in California and worked almost constantly with Chavez and the growers. He is now Cardinal Mahony of Los Angeles.

In May 1970, when grower after grower was finally signing contracts with UFWOC, Chavez told Catholic News Service that the bishops' committee had set the stage for settlement by dispelling the growers' claims that the workers did not want union representation.

"The bishops' involvement in the negotiations placed a tremendous strain on the growers' line (of argument)," he said. "Without the bishops' help, it would have been very difficult."

In 1973, UFWOC changed its name to United Farm Workers of America. But the Chavez-led union faced new setbacks as the three-year contracts it signed in
National Catholic Reporter, May 7, 1993

1970 came up for renewal. The Teamsters moved in to scoop up many of the contracts, taking advantage of backing from growers who saw the Teamsters as an opportunity to weaken or break the UFWA.

That Chavez remained constant was obvious in many ways. Jerry Brown, former California governor, caught that continuity when he told the Los Angeles Times:
"The first time I saw him, when he walked into my father's house, he was dressed the same way as when I saw him a month ago. He never lost his modesty and simplicity."

April 23, 1993, Friday, BC cycle

LENGTH: 1492 words

HEADLINE: UFW founder Cesar Chavez dead at 66

DATELINE: SAN LUIS, Ariz.

BODY:

United Farm Workers founder Cesar Chavez, who for decades led battles for the rights of millions of migrant workers, was found dead Friday at the home of a former union official, apparently of natural causes. He was 66.

Police said Chavez died some time during the night in the San Luis home of Maria Hau. His body was found by UFW Secretary Treasurer David Martinez, one of eight union officials staying at Hau's house.

United Press International April 23, 1993, Friday, BC cycle

According to a statement released by the UFW headquarters in Bakersfield, Calif., Chavez was to attend the Yuma trial of a suit brought against the union by Bruce Church Inc., a large Salinas, Calif., agribusiness firm.

Tony Reyes, mayor of San Luis and a longtime friend of Chavez, said Chavez was trying some yoga exercises Thursday night for the first time, but he said they did not appear to be strenuous.

Martinez discovered Chavez's body after he failed to get up for breakfast.

Chavez apparently died of natural causes around 11 p.m. Thursday.

"He still had a magazine in his hands when he died, an Indian artifact magazine," Reyes said. "He seemed like he just went to sleep and passed away."

Dolores Huerta, the co-founder of the UFW with Chavez, was in Salinas organizing a local boycott against Church. She immediately issued a call for calm.

"We are concerned about getting the word out to the workers," she said. "We want them to remember Cesar and not do anything violent to mar his memory."
United Press International April 23, 1993, Friday, BC cycle

memory."

Former California Gov. Jerry Brown called Chavez's death the passage of a "great union leader."

"It's a shock," he said. "I'm very sad. He was one of the most important

labor leaders since World War II....He stood apart from the rest. He stressed the need for cooperation (within the union)....He wanted to give power to the powerless."

President Clinton called Chavez a "great leader and "inspiring fighter" who was "an authentic hero to millions of people throughout the world."

"We can be proud of his enormous accomplishments and the dignity and comfort he brought to the lives of so many of our country's least powerful and most dispossessed workers," Clinton said. "He had a profound impact upon the people of the United States."

California Gov. Pete Wilson ordered the flags in the state Capitol lowered to half staff in honor of the labor leader.

United Press International April 23, 1993, Friday, BC cycle

"He will always be remembered for his strong union leadership and his commitment to nonviolence," Wilson said in a statement. "His place in California history is secure."

In Washington, AFL-CIO President Lane Kirkland released a prepared statement calling Chavez "an inspiration to generations of activists; to us trade unionists and countless others."

Chavez founded the UFW, the nation's first viable agricultural union, in 1966, becoming a figurehead fighting the battles of migrant crop workers in California's San Joaquin Valley and elsewhere.

In recent years he organized boycotts of California-grown seedless grapes, contending growers have endangered the health of farmworkers by using chemical pesticides.

The life of Chavez, a tough-minded pacifist, was dominated by struggle and faith.

He battled stubborn growers, the rival Teamsters Union, the violent passions his movement provoked and the fears of the downtrodden field hands who had little hope.

United Press International April 23, 1993, Friday, BC cycle

During his nearly 30 years as a union activist, Chavez believed his cause was just and supported by the American public, and that his unionizing efforts must be accomplished with a minimum of bloodshed and ill will.

Chavez forged a union that grew from a dirt poor, loosely organized entity into a high-tech organization with a pension plan, medical benefits, a retirement village for aging farm workers, and a high-tech headquarters.

Cesar Estrada Chavez was born March 31, 1927, on a ranch outside Yuma, Ariz., one of five children of Librado and Juana Chavez.

The family lost its 100-acre ranch during the Depression and became migrant workers, following the harvest around the Southwest with thousands of other Mexican-American families.

Chavez began working in the fields at age 10 and remembered attending nearly 70 different schools in his haphazard formal education that ended after the seventh grade.

He joined the Navy in 1944 and returned to farm labor work in the fields of California after World War II.

United Press International April 23, 1993, Friday, BC cycle

He met Helen Fabela in the grape fields around Delano, Calif., which was to become the base of his union organizing operations in the 1960s, and married her in 1948. She bore their eight children and worked beside him in the fields and later on the picket lines.

Chavez began forming the National Farm Workers Association about 1962 and within two years had 1,000 members and \$25,000 in its credit union.

In September 1965, another small farm workers' union, the Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee, which was made up of mostly Filipino farm workers, struck DiGiorgio Corp. and Schenley Corp., two of the largest corporate farming operations in California.

Yielding to pressure from impatient NFWA members, Chavez called for a strike vote and the membership voted overwhelmingly to join the walkout.

Chavez scored his first big victory six months later when his strikers staged a 300-mile march from Delano to Sacramento, the state capital, to publicize their plight.

When the march ended on Easter 1966, Schenley announced it would sign an agreement allowing the NFWA to represent its field workers. Chavez's union had

United Press International April 23, 1993, Friday, BC cycle

established a strong foothold.

It was at that point that the Western Conference of Teamsters moved into the fields of Central California to begin organizing in direct competition with Chavez's union.

This forced Chavez to strengthen his position by merging with the AFL-CIO to become the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee.

Following a bitter campaign, an election was held for field workers at DiGiorgio in September 1966 with Chavez's union beating the Teamsters so badly that they withdrew from farm worker organizing temporarily.

Following the DiGorgio victory, Chavez picked up contracts with several wine grape growers but the majority of table grape growers in the central valley remained vociferously non-union.

The steadfast refusal of growers to hold union representation elections, coupled with the increasing threat of violence on picket lines, convinced Chavez of the need to switch tactics to a total boycott.

United Press International April 23, 1993, Friday, BC cycle

In mid-1969 Chavez sent union representatives to major cities throughout the

United States to urge consumers not to buy non-union harvested California table grapes and not to patronize retail stores that carried non-union grapes.

It worked.

By 1970, growers were being hurt badly by the nationwide boycott, and 26 Delano growers who produced half of California's table grape crop signed three-year contracts with Chavez covering some 8,000 workers.

About the same time, the Teamsters Union re-entered the Central California fields, signing 30 lettuce, carrot, celery and strawberry growers in the Salinas Valley. In 1973, when Chavez's original contracts with most of the table grape growers expired, the growers refused to renew contracts with Chavez and signed what Chavez called "sweetheart contracts" with the Teamsters.

Chavez, a wily and shrewd tactician, went back to the boycott, his greatest weapon in previous battles. The union leader's strength and the boycott were too much for the Teamsters, who pulled out once again when their grower contracts expired.

United Press International April 23, 1993, Friday, BC cycle

Meanwhile, Chavez and the UFW expanded their operations to farm workers in other crops in California, Arizona, Texas and Florida.

Some heralded Chavez as the Mexican-American Martin Luther King Jr. Clergymen and civil rights advocates, including Robert F. Kennedy, flocked to California from around the nation to join Chavez on the picket lines.

He once said of his unionizing efforts, "I suppose if I wanted to be fair I could say that I'm trying to settle a personal score. I could dramatize it by saying that I want to bring social justice to farm workers, but in truth I went through a bit of hell as did a lot of people and I see the union movement as evening the score a little bit for all of us."

In 1983, 21 years after he began his unionizing efforts, Chavez saw two projects he visualized from the start become realities.

In May the union's first radio station went on the air, broadcasting news,

music and union items in Spanish throughout the central San Joaquin Valley.

A month later, the union's pension plan was put into place. He traveled throughout Central California handing out the union's first pension checks to

retiring farmworkers, telling the recipients their checks represented "the United Press International April 23, 1993, Friday, BC cycle

realization of one of my fondest dreams."

He is survived by his wife and children. Funeral arrangements are pending.

The San Diego Union-Tribune

February 20, 1991, Wednesday

SECTION: NEWS; Ed. 1,2,3,4,5,6; Pg. A-3

LENGTH: 748 words

HEADLINE: Judgment won by grower against UFW is affirmed

BYLINE: Lorie Hearn; Staff Writer

BODY:

A state appeals court has affirmed a \$1.7 million judgment won by Maggio Inc.

-- once one of the largest agricultural operations in the Imperial Valley -- against the United Farm Workers of America (UFW) for damages caused by a violent strike in 1979.

In a unanimous 55-page decision filed Friday, three judges of the 4th District Court of Appeal upheld rulings made by a judge in 11 months of trial and ratified all but \$1,011.26 of a \$1,679,453 judgment in favor of grower

The San Diego Union-Tribune, February 20, 1991

Carl Joe Maggio.

UFW attorney, Dianna Lyons, yesterday said she believed her client would appeal the decision, first to the California Supreme Court and possibly to the U.S. Supreme Court.

If the decision is not stricken on appeal, Lyons said, "It will be absolutely

devastating financially to the UFW and UFW members, and it will be absolutely devastating to their statutory and constitutional rights."

Maggio, meanwhile, said yesterday he felt good about the court decision, but lamented that "the strike was personal for me and my family. It became more than a legal issue."

Worse than damage to his crops and business were the intimidation and threats suffered by his wife and four young children, Maggio said.

"I thought they should have to answer for their lawlessness," he said of the UFW. "I know one thing: I wouldn't have gotten away with it."

The San Diego decision was issued less than a month after an Arizona appeals court handed the UFW a significant victory, reversing a \$5.4 million judgment

The San Diego Union-Tribune, February 20, 1991

awarded to Bruce Church Inc., another California grower who claimed damage to his business during the lettuce boycott.

Church, reportedly one of the nation's largest lettuce growers, three years ago won his suit over secondary lettuce boycotts, which discouraged people in 1979 from patronizing stores in a range of areas that sold Bruce Church Inc. lettuce.

The Arizona Court of Appeals returned the case -- which Lyons said basically deals with union members' free speech rights -- for a new trial after ruling that Arizona law had been misapplied.

Although the facts and legal issues are different in the Maggio and Church cases, Lyons said both hit at the heart of farmworkers' rights in strikes or other concerted activities.

She predicted both would end up in appeals to the nation's high court.

The UFW was required to post a bond of \$2.5 million to cover the Maggio judgment and interest during appeal, and Maggio attorneys, Jay Jeffcoat and Marcelle Mihaila, said they would attempt collection as soon as legally possible. Lyons said the union posted a \$275,000 bond in the Arizona case.

The San Diego Union-Tribune, February 20, 1991

Although the UFW reported more than \$4.4 million in assets to the U.S. Department of Labor in 1986, Lyons said yesterday she could not be specific about the union's current financial condition, except to say, "Definitely between the two (lawsuits) they're trying to put us out of business."

Both cases grew out of the bloody five-month strike in the summer of 1979 when workers walked out of the fields to pressure growers into paying them higher wages. Lettuce prices soared during the dispute and one UFW member, Rufino Contreras, was shot dead in the conflict.

In the non-jury trial of the Maggio case, which was heard intermittently over nearly two years, Imperial County Superior Court Judge William E. Lehnhardt decided that the UFW essentially authorized unlawful acts of its pickets during the strike, and that the union was liable for specific losses caused by those acts.

Using formulas to gauge yields and values, Lehnhardt concluded that Maggio lost more than \$1.5 million in harvesting carrots, broccoli and lettuce, and he had incurred expenses of about \$117,000 in damage to equipment, in hiring security guards and in paying for special housing for replacement workers.

The San Diego Union-Tribune, February 20, 1991

In the opinion, issued last Friday, the appellate court rejected virtually every UFW argument, except to modify by \$1,011 expenses for housing costs and property damage.

Presiding Justice Daniel Kremer, who wrote the opinion, explained that unions have a right to picket peacefully, but he noted that state courts may stop unions from engaging in violence or obstruction and may award damages for acts during a strike even if the acts are not approved by top union officials.

Citing rock-throwing, vandalism and threats, Kremer said, "There was substantial evidence showing UFW leadership ...were actively involved in instigating violence and other illegal conduct."

The National Law Journal

January 28, 1991

SECTION: FOR THE RECORD; Legal News Briefs; Arizona; Pg. 6

LENGTH: 86 words

HEADLINE: Union Off Hook

BYLINE: Compiled from staff, correspondent and Associated Press reports

DATELINE: PHOENIX

BODY:

Saying a state law against secondary boycotts could not extend beyond Arizona's border, the state Court of Appeals Jan. 15 threw out a \$ 5.4 million judgment won by lettuce grower Bruce Church Inc. against the United Farm

Workers of America. The 3-0 ruling said Church could still seek a new trial on

a related claim, however, and it did not reach a decision on whether the ban on

secondary boycotts inside the state violates freedom-of-speech protections.

1991 The National Law Journal, January 28, 1991

Lawyers for Church had no comment on the ruling.

The San Diego Union-Tribune

May 26, 1987, Tuesday

SECTION: NEWS; Ed. 1,2,3,4,5,6; Pg. A-1

LENGTH: 2013 words

HEADLINE: Chavez won the battle but left the battlefield

SERIES: Fields of unrest;California's farm workers. Last in a series.

BYLINE: Diane Lindquist And S. Lynne Walker; Staff Writers

BODY:

Twenty-five years after raising the plight of California's farmworkers to an international concern, Cesar Chavez has all but left the fields.

Having fought so fervently to win collective-bargaining rights and the nation's first agricultural labor law, Chavez' United Farm Workers union now is nearly dormant, with past victories in wages and improvements in working conditions rapidly fading.
The San Diego Union-Tribune, May 26, 1987

conditions rapidly fading.

Despite a membership drop of at least 65 percent in the past decade, however, Chavez remains undaunted.

Reviving the historic boycott that powered his earlier success, the union leader said he is taking on one of the greatest threats to farmworkers: five pesticides commonly used in the table-grape industry. He predicted that when the campaign is successful, the UFW will be able again to hold elections among field workers and win contracts with growers.

"They're fools, they're playing into our hands," he said of growers during a recent interview in San Diego. "Now that we're not there, they're lowering the wages and the conditions. It will all work to our advantage."

Chavez, who marked his 60th birthday last Saturday, said that while the UFW might not be holding elections, it still is organizing. "The time comes and we can have elections all over the state," Chavez said. "Wherever there are workers who want us, we're there."

If any organizing is currently taking place, however, no evidence of it was seen in a sampling of farmworkers in major agricultural areas around the state.
The San Diego Union-Tribune, May 26, 1987

state.

Workers from Salinas to the Central Valley to San Diego and Imperial counties said they would welcome contact with the UFW, but its representatives have been absent in recent years while wages remained static or declined and benefits have all but disappeared.

"I've never seen a union official in the four years I've been here," said Asau Bonilla, 45, an accountant from Mexico who earns about \$5 an hour at a nursery in North County. "I know they exist, but they never come here."

Miguel Mendoza, who joins hundreds of workers lining Calexico's Imperial Avenue each morning in hopes of finding work, said the UFW appears to have retreated totally from the Imperial Valley since its violent lettuce strike in 1979.

In a peach grove near Parlier in the San Joaquin Valley, members of a thinning crew lamented that the union has not made contact with them. They were, however, familiar with the organization, which is developing a fashionable complex of apartments and Mediterranean-style homes priced at \$59,000 on the edge of the town.

The San Diego Union-Tribune, May 26, 1987

The Salinas office of California Rural Legal Assistance is holding seminars to inform workers about the minimum wage and their legal right to overtime pay, bathroom facilities and work breaks, said staff attorney Lydia Villareal.

"The fact that we're having to do the bare minimum indicates how bad things are," she said. "There's a tremendous need out there, but I don't think anyone is putting forth the resources to address the issues."

In the early and mid-1970s, the UFW had a peak membership ranging between 70,000 and 100,000. By Chavez' own count, it has since fallen to 35,000 -- and in recent court documents, he puts the number at an even lower 21,000.

The UFW has 20 organizers, compared to 200 just after passage of the state Agricultural Labor Relations Act in 1975. year of the boycott campaign.

The union has about 100 contracts with growers, Chavez said. About 24 contracts have been lost since 1982 as a result of decertification votes by members, according to state Agriculture Labor Relations Board (ALRB) data.

From January 1983 through March 1987, 83 union elections were certified by the ALRB. Of those, workers chose the UFW at 39 farms and rejected it at 44.

The San Diego Union-Tribune, May 26, 1987

For all the skill Chavez used in rallying workers and emerging victorious from his boycotts, today growers and their bargaining representatives assert he could not carry through in negotiating contracts.

"It was more of a social movement," said Imperial Valley grower Jon Vessey.

"It wasn't a true labor union like most unions we know today."

Lawyer Mike Hogan, who represents several Imperial Valley growers, complained the UFW insisted that growers not only increase wages and benefits, but also contribute to the union's legal defense fund and pay wages for one Sunday a month that would go to the Citizens Participation Day Fund, the UFW's political action fund.

"I would prefer to negotiate with any other union than them because of the things they want to get into the contract," Hogan said.

Even some of Chavez' staunchest supporters among the farmworkers complained about the terms of his contracts.

"The Teamsters were much better organized," said Manuel Lopez, an Imperial Valley field hand who helped organize the UFW's 1979 lettuce strike. "The Teamsters had better programs and they gave insurance for everything.

The San Diego Union-Tribune, May 26, 1987

"If you were sick they paid 75 percent of your wages. If you had an accident, they paid 100 percent. And Chavez, nothing."

In the few contracts now being negotiated, Chavez insists on a clause banning the targeted pesticides. Despite an offer of wage and benefit increases, he recently turned down a contract proposal from Coachella-based Freedman Corp. because it did not address the pesticide issue.

Chavez rejected suggestions that he give on the pesticide issue to regain contracts with the table-grape industry and to secure gains in wages and benefits.

"Hell, no," he said, his voice rising above its well-modulated level. "Pesticides for me is the single most important issue. If we don't deal with that, higher wages isn't going to make it for us. No way."

In negotiating with another grower, Imperial Valley-based Abatti Farms Inc., the UFW has been accused of accepting a lower wage than one it previously rejected, a contention Chavez denies.

Abatti attorney Merrill Storms said that under the new contract, workers' pay remained unchanged, but it was reduced by dues payments to the UFW, in effect

The San Diego Union-Tribune, May 26, 1987

meaning less pay.

While Chavez is preoccupied with his boycott, other unions are considering forays into field organizing. About 14 percent of California's estimated 300,000 farmworkers are covered by union contracts, leaving the fields wide open to organizing efforts.

About 400 of the state's 60,000 farm operations are under contract with the UFW or one of the 13 other unions representing farmworkers in California, according to research by Philip L. Martin, professor of agricultural economics at UC Davis.

The UFW has the largest membership, followed by the Teamsters and Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Workers. Two other unions, the Independent Union of Agricultural Workers and International Union of Agricultural Workers, each represent about 3,500 field workers.

Teamsters' representatives say that with the expiration last year of the 1977 agreement relinquishing field organizing to the UFW, they might renew efforts

with field workers. In that case, Chavez might again have to contend with his

fiercest foes. Hispanic workers at a Yurosek & Sons packing shed in the tiny Imperial County community of Holtville. Teamster officials see that as a

The San Diego Union-Tribune, May 26, 1987

jumping-off point for an organizing drive in the valley that will include field workers.

"The UFW raises a lot of hell, but they can't seem to follow through," said Louis Cotarelo, Local 542's secretary-treasurer. "We're sure going to give it a good shot down there because these people really need it."

Officials of the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Workers (FFVW) said they also are considering expansion. The union, a United Food and Commercial Workers union offshoot that has won representation in Salinas and Imperial Valley area packing sheds, might stretch the advantage of a National Labor Relations Board ruling last year that certain work in the fields is within the packing jurisdictions, FFVW leaders said.

"Once we're out there in the fields, we just might start looking around," said Mike Lyons, secretary-treasure of FFVW Local 78B in El Centro, who brought the case before the board.

The UFW, however, has been very effective in taking on competitors in what has been its turf, said Ricardo Garcia, president of Campesinos Independientes, a union that is organizing just beyond the California border in vegetable fields surrounding Yuma, Ariz.

The San Diego Union-Tribune, May 26, 1987

Garcia, seated outside his Yuma home, said experience has taught him that Chavez thinks that if the UFW isn't organizing, no one else should.

"This is something the UFW doesn't understand -- or maybe it understands but doesn't admit," Garcia said. "So long as there is only one union, they can be defeated. The employer can take them on and destroy them."

Last year, he said, with the UFW making a minimal effort at contract renewal talks with Bruce Church, Campesinos Independientes began an organizing drive among the workers.

"When we filed a petition for representation, the next day the UFW arrived and began passing out information," Garcia said. "It was a 24-hour-a-day

campaign with Delores Huerta making speeches, (handing out) flags and bumper stickers. They were giving away vests and jackets and coolers with the UFW emblem. It was a tremendous campaign."

And it was won by the UFW. We just don't want the wages and benefits of workers to be reduced," he said. "If it takes us pushing Cesar, then that's what we'll do.

The San Diego Union-Tribune, May 26, 1987

"If Cesar was really concerned about the employees, why wasn't he here when Bruce Church took buses away from harvest and pre-harvest workers and reduced wages on the pre-harvest work? He always waits until he sees he's going to lose then he gets concerned about the people."

In the Central Valley, where Chavez founded the union, the UFW's greatest outreach flows from its Woodlake-based radio station KUFW-FM, which airs a lively mix of Norteno music and Mexican ballads.

Because some bosses allow radios in the fields to speed the pace of work, KUFW messages reach a large number of farmworkers who have never been approached by union representatives in person.

"Organize yourselves!" the station exhorted its listeners recently in a transmission aimed at those suffering disabilities believed linked to pesticides.

Another recent announcement offering information on the new immigration law drew the interest of so many listeners that they overwhelmed the union's one-operator switchboard at its La Paz headquarters 30 miles from Bakersfield.

o o o
The center of Chavez' operations, a bucolic collection of white, wooden
The San Diego Union-Tribune, May 26, 1987

structures converted from a former tuberculosis clinic that once treated his wife, seems far above the heat and smog of the flat valley and its unending pattern of green and tan fields.

An abbreviated glimpse into the complex revealed remnants of the union's dramatic past -- a painting in a hallway depicting Chavez' first marches with farmworkers and a mural in the chapel of struggling strikers that eerily predicted by a few days the death of a member in Salinas clashes.

In the past few years, the union leader has suffered setbacks that took him back to those early challenges.

The most recent setback was a ruling by an Imperial County judge in January ordering the UFW to pay \$1.7 million to the grower Maggio Inc. for damages sustained during the area's 1979 lettuce strike.

"It really was a moral victory," said Carl Maggio, whose operations are now headquartered in San Diego's Mission Valley. "It was a matter of principle. It was a matter of economics." contending a lack of damages suffered by Maggio and bias on the part of Judge William Lehnhardt, whose wife was among a cadre of local volunteers who helped harvest the crop during the strike.

The San Diego Union-Tribune, May 26, 1987

To pursue the case, however, the union must post a \$3.3 million bond, which Chavez said will ravage the UFW's ability to operate. He declared that will not bring down the organization.

"We have very, very good support from the public, which means money," he said. "With the consumers' support, we can survive for a long time."

HEADLINE: The Imperial Valley was Cesar Chavez' Waterloo, some say

SERIES: Fields of unrest. Sidebar.

BYLINE: Diane Lindquist; Staff Writer

BODY:

During the 1979 winter lettuce harvest, the United Farm Workers struck Imperial Valley growers in what many observers contend was the union's turning point and eventual undoing.

Buoyed by a similar successful campaign for higher wages in the Salinas area, the union decided to launch what became its last assertive effort to

The San Diego Union-Tribune, May 26, 1987

substantially improve farmworker conditions -- break the \$5-an-hour wage barrier.

"We were pretty strong," UFW president Cesar Chavez said in an interview. "We had 75, 80 percent of the lettuce workers organized. There was no way we could lose a strike, we thought. Even if we did lose the strike, we could force the ALRB (Agricultural Labor Relations Board) to come in and force a settlement.

"Neither happened."

Chavez began his walkout against 11 of the 28 major vegetable-growers negotiating contracts on Jan. 20, 1979, just as the harvest was beginning. At the time, the valley's growers supplied the nation with 90 percent of its iceberg lettuce, a crop that earned them more than \$76 million the year before.

Initially, Chavez virtually shut down the farms he struck. Sun Harvest, one of the nation's top three lettuce producers, simply abandoned 2,000 acres of ripe lettuce in the fields. Another of the top three growers, Bruce Church, shifted its base of operations across the border to Arizona.

The other growers were forced to band together -- but they waged an opposition stronger than any the union had previously faced. It resulted in

The San Diego Union-Tribune, May 26, 1987

the fatal shooting of one person, injuries to dozens more and the arrest of more than 100. It also resulted in shattered hopes, broken spirits and a marred union image.

"The Imperial Valley growers were of a different ilk. It was more of a personal fight for them," said former UFW official Marshall Ganz, who led the strike action. "It was like the frontier -- those covered sidewalks in El Centro -- and there was the old sort of land-baron mentality to match." thinking they were too independent to band together against the UFW, said Jon Vessey, one of the few growers still operating in the valley.

"The biggest mistake he made was not signing the contracts. He had every opportunity to sign a contract if he'd been reasonable," Vessey said. "It wasn't that we didn't want unions. That wasn't it. We'd never dealt with a union like this."

The owners refused to bend to union demands for pay increases that, for common labor, would have pushed wages from \$3.70 an hour to \$5.25. Initially they offered a straight 7 percent increase and then, as the strike progressed, raised it to 11.5 percent in the minimum-hourly-wage category.

The San Diego Union-Tribune, May 26, 1987

A total of 4,300 workers abandoned the harvest. The greatest production was a harvest of anger.

Lines in the valley were clearly drawn. Calexico, the dusty suburb just across the border from Mexicali, was farmworker territory. It was where the UFW had its headquarters and where Chavez addressed his followers when he visited.

El Centro was growers' territory, with private security guards filling the hotels and the industry's headquarters at the Chamber of Commerce office.

Throughout the valley, growers and foremen carried rifles in their pickups. The Imperial County sheriff, with 85 deputies and local police on call, heard continuous reports of strikers shooting marbles at growers with slingshots, of rocks being thrown, of threats being exchanged between the opposing sides.

The strike ignored the border. "Viva la Huelga" graffiti was scrawled throughout Mexicali, where many of the workers lived. Workers were subject to attack from strikers trying to make them support la Causa or from people trying to make them abandon the strike. The growers and their foremen were said to have roamed the area to recruit undocumented workers to pick their rotting crops.

The San Diego Union-Tribune, May 26, 1987

On Jan. 21 -- Bloody Monday -- a melee broke out between strikers and several hundred strikebreakers, mostly high school students and relatives of growers. Buses were overturned and firebombs were lobbed. Scores were injured. mourners at the mariachi funeral Mass.

In stores across the country, iceberg lettuce soared from an average of 30 cents a head to 80 and 90 cents a head.

At the end of February, the strike was estimated to have cost the 11 growers between \$6 million and \$10 million, while the remaining 17 accumulated sizable profits. The more than 4,000 UFW members on the picket lines were said to have lost \$6 million in wages.

The growers eventually weathered the action, however. "When the strike failed, the union skedaddled and the workers were left with nothing," said Merrill Storms, an attorney who represents a number of Imperial Valley growers.

"They've never said it officially is over. They just faded away. They gained nothing."

Manuel Lopez, a UFW supporter who went to work for a small non-union farm when his Mexicali home was pelted with stones, defended the union. "We hurt

ourselves," he said. "Chavez didn't betray the workers. It was the workers.

The San Diego Union-Tribune, May 26, 1987

They didn't stay together."

Now, a decade later, the union has been assessed \$1.7 million in damages alleged to have been suffered by the grower Maggio Inc. as a result of the strike. Chavez, who plans to appeal the decision, acknowledges the fine will cripple his organization's operations.

"The strike changed the union," Carl Maggio said. "At that point in 1979, they found out they could not dictate terms for California agriculture. It was a fight for all of California agriculture."

Said strike-organizer Ganz, "I think essentially the union abandoned the turf. It's a tragedy. One farmworker told me that if Cesar would just come back and march around a bit the wages would go back up."

Maclean's

September 9, 1985

SECTION: FOLLOW-UP; Pg. T2

LENGTH: 1275 words

HEADLINE: Cesar Chavez fights again

BYLINE: PAM MORRISON in Los Angeles

BODY:

The signs were a familiar sight on campuses, in churches and in union halls across the continent a decade ago. In bold letters the posters urged consumers to boycott California grapes and lettuce. Their proliferation signalled widespread support for the United Farm Workers, a union seeking better wages and working conditions for California's 300,000 agricultural fieldworkers. In those days the name and weatherbeaten face of the UFW's diminutive leader, Cesar Chavez, was almost as familiar. Indeed, Robert Kennedy once called him "one of the heroic figures of our time." Then, in 1975 California passed the Maclean's, September 9, 1985

Agricultural Labor Relations Act, the United States' first collective bargaining law for farm workers. Chavez called off the boycott, and California produce reappeared on the tables of the estimated 17 million North Americans who had observed the boycott. Now Chavez, 58, still at the UFW's helm, has had to battle both internal dissension and attempts by the powerful fruit and vegetable growers to weaken that law. As a result, last summer Chavez launched a new grape boycott against the growers which, he says, "is going to be our salvation."

He faces formidable opposition. With \$3.5 billion in annual sales, the agriculture industry has traditionally been a strong political power in California. And when a sympathetic state governor, Republican George Deukmejian, replaced the more pro-union Democrat Jerry Brown, growers gained an important ally. Deukmejian swiftly announced that he intended to amend the Agricultural Labor Relations Act, which he said was too favorable to the UFW. Since then, he has slashed more than a quarter of the \$9-million budget of the Agricultural

Labor Relations Board, which was established by the act to mediate grower-worker disputes. Chavez told Maclean's: "With this Deukmejian team in power, it's terrible. It's worse than having no law at all." For their part, the growers say that they are finally getting equal time. Accusing Chavez of sour grapes, Barbara Buck, spokesman for the 2,400-member Western Growers Association, declared, "The ALRB is now simply more fair and less union-oriented."

Maclean's, September 9, 1985

Chavez is also under attack from former allies and other unions. The International Brotherhood of Teamsters, once bitter rivals with the UFW for members, signed a peace treaty with the farm workers in 1977 which gave the Teamsters the right to organize the packing plants and left the UFW a monopoly on organizing in the fields. The treaty ended last year, and negotiations to renew it have broken down.

The UFW's internal problems have been another major concern for Chavez. In 1981 he fired some senior officials, and others, including UFW co-founder Gilbert Padilla, resigned. After four years of discreet silence Padilla recently explained his departure in The Los Angeles Times. "Cesar suspected Communists were out to destroy the union," he declared. "He engaged in the worst sort of Red-baiting."

Even Chavez's old allies in parts of the liberal press have turned a critical eye on yesterday's hero. The Village Voice printed two particularly unfavorable articles in its Aug. 14 and Aug. 21, 1984, editions, linking Chavez to Charles Dederich, the founder of the controversial drug treatment centre Synanon; Dederich was convicted of conspiracy to commit murder in 1978. But Chavez insists that he only knew Dederich professionally and he is suing the Voice for libel.

Maclean's, September 9, 1985

The union's problems in maintaining its heroic image are exemplified by the fate of a lawsuit stemming from the murder of a UFW worker, Rufino Contreras, during a 1979 strike. The union claimed that three employees of a struck lettuce

grower were responsible, but the case was thrown out of court for insufficient evidence. Still, Contreras became a martyr. Then, Carl Maggio, another grower touched by the same violent strike, sued the UFW, charging it with trespass, property damage and negligence in supervising its members. The case is currently before the Imperial County Superior Court and is expected to resume later this month. But if the court decides that the union, which once modelled its nonviolent tactics on those of Mahatma Gandhi, is guilty of "violent and illegal" tactics, Maggio's lawyer, Jay Jeffcoat, said that it would be "a significant setback" for the UFW.

Yet, the powerful reputation that Chavez acquired during two decades of organizing migrant fieldworkers is still strong. He is still a figure of moral authority, particularly in the Hispanic and labor communities, and over the years he has burnished that image by frequent exposure. He has marched with casino workers on Las Vegas picket lines, spoken on behalf of gay rights activists at Hollywood dance spots, and he has been arrested in anti-apartheid demonstrations on campuses.

Maclean's, September 9, 1985

Indeed, Chavez's life has been dedicated to protest. The son of farmworkers, he grew up in work camps. Then, in 1962, with \$1,200 of his own savings, he launched what was to be the first successful attempt to organize the underpaid migrant workers. At the time, West Coast fieldworkers earned \$1.40 an hour; now they earn five times more with benefits. A 1984 study by Indiana and Perdue universities found that 83 per cent of San Joaquin Valley farm workers believed that the UFW had improved their lives -- an opinion shared even by those who did not belong to it.

As well, since the struggles of the 1970s the UFW has added two new weapons to its arsenal. One is money. Although the union pays Chavez and other top organizers a spartan \$15 a week, as well as living and other expenses, it has become a major political contributor in state politics and it has donated almost \$1 million over the past four years to chosen candidates and causes. The money appears to have been well spent. The Democrats, who still control the state

assembly and Senate and whose ranks contain several beneficiaries of UFW contributions, have so far blocked Deukmejian's allies' efforts to weaken the agricultural law. As well, the UFW computer has access to demographic data and laser printers that make it possible for the union to mail personalized letters every three months to win new public support.

Maclean's, September 9, 1985

California growers estimate that currently only about three per cent of North American consumers are complying with the boycott, compared with 12 per cent the last time. But Chavez said that he is optimistic: the smaller boycotts that the union organized recently against specific growers accused of unfair labor practices have been successful. Last year, after the union targeted Bruce Church, Inc., one of California's largest lettuce producers, three large chains -- Lucky Stores, A&P and the McDonald's hamburger chain -- stopped buying Church lettuce, and the company was forced to lay off 10 per cent of its work force.

The new grape boycott, which Chavez plans to publicize on a visit to Canada this month, has become his all-consuming work. "It's not really a job," he said. "It's a way of life." It is also one which absorbs his family: his wife, Helen, runs the UFW's credit union, and one of his three sons, Paul, handles the UFW's ultramodern printing facility. Chavez himself is suffering from back problems that he developed from years of working with "El Cortito," the short-handled hoe which California outlawed, under pressure from the UFW a decade ago. But the energetic union leader often points out that his father was more than 100 years old when he died. "If I don't get bitten by a dog or run over by a train," said the man who turned the table grape into a potent political symbol, "I'll be around for a while."

Chicago Tribune

August 16, 1985 Friday, MIDWEST EDITION

SECTION: CHICAGOLAND; Pg. 7; ZONE: C

LENGTH: 651 words

HEADLINE: LETTUCE BOYCOTTERS PICK NEW TACTIC

BYLINE: By Kerry Luft.

BODY:

More than 10 years after they first boycotted lettuce, the United Farm Workers are putting down their picket signs--and picking up computer surveys.

Times have changed, said Frank Ortiz, second vice president of the union, founded in 1962 by Cesar Chavez. Though the UFW continues to boycott lettuce, "it's different now. It's high tech," Ortiz said.

Ortiz doesn't even call it "boycotting" anymore. He would rather call it "social marketing."

Chicago Tribune, August 16, 1985

In Chicago, the union is stepping up its social marketing. Its target is Jewel Food Stores, which have been boycotted since spring because they sell lettuce picked by nonunion workers.

The UFW, which has 100,000 seasonal members, is boycotting Red Coach lettuce, produced by Bruce Church Inc. of Salinas, Calif., and sold by Jewel.

The Church company does not want to use union workers to pick its lettuce, and

the UFW has boycotted its lettuce since 1979.

In April the union began boycotting stores that sold Red Coach, including about 55 Jewel stores in the Chicago area.

This time around the picket signs and leaflets have been largely replaced by demographic studies, laser-printed, personalized letters and television advertisements. It's just a way of keeping up with the times, said Ortiz, 52, who directs UFW boycotts nationwide.

"We still do some picketing, just to keep it interesting," he said.

"We want to keep the pressure on them."

In March he began plans for the Jewel boycott. First he plotted all Chicago area Jewel stores on a map in the UFW office at 1300 S. Wabash Ave., and then 30 Jewel stores were picketed. Chavez came to Chicago to picket one store in late March, attracting some publicity.

Later, Ortiz got census figures and voter polls and picked areas most likely to support the union position. People who live in those areas then were

Chicago Tribune, August 16, 1985

sent letters, Ortiz said. The letters, signed by Chavez, included the endorsement of several well-known Chicagoans, including Aldermen Martin Oberman (43d) and David Orr (49th).

"The best way of marketing is by the mail," Ortiz said. "A person gets a letter, he opens it up and all his attention is devoted to that letter.

"It's the only way to do it. We used to sit out in front of the stores and picket and pass out leaflets, but how many stores can you cover that way? Five? Ten?

"It only takes two or three people to do the demographics, and look how many people we reach. Instead of 5 or 10 stores, we hit 30. That's 90,000 people, 3,000 a store. This way, we'll get to all of them."

Despite such tactics, the boycott may be accomplishing little.

Labor experts say a successful boycott is nearly impossible to pull off. It demands extensive preparation, and the boycotter must convince consumers

that the workers are right in their fight against the employer.

The Red Coach boycott also is hampered because lettuce brands are not readily identified. One company's lettuce is displayed the same as another's. The only difference is the wrapper when it is shipped to the store.

Michael Miller, senior vice president of Jewel's parent company, American Stores Inc. of Salt Lake City, said the boycott "had no impact" on Jewel. The company has said it will buy Red Coach whenever it is the best lettuce at the best price.

Chicago Tribune, August 16, 1985

In 1973, when the UFW was enjoying its greatest consumer support, the dues-paying membership numbered 20,000. Ten years later the reported dues-paying membership dropped to 12,000.

The union's main foe, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the nation's largest farm organization, has gone on the counterattack, leveling its pressure on state legislatures in an effort to dim the political impact of the UFW.

The original lettuce boycott lasted five years.

Los Angeles Times

July 25, 1985, Thursday, Home Edition

SECTION: Part 1; Page 1; Column 1; Metro Desk

LENGTH: 3641 words

HEADLINE: TARGET IS GOVERNOR;
THE BOYCOTT: CHAVEZ GETS A SLOW START

BYLINE: By HARRY BERNSTEIN, Times Labor Writer

BODY:

In a print shop at United Farmworkers Union headquarters near Bakersfield, computerized mailing equipment is spewing out thousands of letters daily, each carrying the simple message: "Boycott California table grapes."

This direct-mail campaign is the centerpiece of UFW leader Cesar Chavez's latest crusade, aimed at the Administration of Republican Gov. George Deukmejian and using the boycott strategy that once served Chavez and the cause of farm
Los Angeles Times, July 25, 1985

workers so well.

Two decades ago, millions of Americans supported the first grape boycott, stirred by prayer vigils, mass demonstrations and long fasts by Chavez that focused attention on farm workers' poverty. The boycott's success helped him create the nation's first viable farm labor union.

Dormant Until Recently

Much is different about Chavez's newest boycott, announced a year ago but dormant until the last few months.

Its heavy reliance on direct mail (20 million to 30 million letters to potential supporters) seems to recognize that this is a new, more conservative era, that the union would have difficulty winning today with the tactics it employed in the 1960s and '70s.

Moreover, Chavez and the union must explain that the grape growers are not, in fact, the primary target. They were chosen to help revive memories of the earlier, successful boycott.

Los Angeles Times, July 25, 1985

This time, the union leader said, the prime target is Deukmejian. Chavez declared that Deukmejian's Administration is out to help growers destroy his union and halt enforcement of the state's farm labor law. He calls the governor "that enemy of farm workers."

Vigorous Enforcement

Chavez said he expects his boycott to put such pressure on growers that they not only will sign new UFW contracts but that they will also demand that Deukmejian, their political ally, more vigorously enforce the farm labor law.

Most growers express outward confidence that Chavez cannot succeed this time.

Ed Thomas, head of a committee representing grape growers in the Delano area,

said that although Chavez "is still something of a folk hero, his quarrel is with the governor, not growers, and the public will not go along with that."

Even some of Chavez's most ardent followers wonder if a boycott makes sense.

Organizations like the Catholic Church that were important allies two decades

ago have not rushed to join Chavez in this campaign, and some political figures

who might be expected to help have been similarly slow to declare their support.

Los Angeles Times, July 25, 1985

The first boycott went five years before it could be called a success, however, and Chavez said he is prepared to go that distance again if necessary.

He said he senses victory once more.

If he is wrong, the still-struggling UFW, stung in recent years by a decline in membership and bitter internal disputes, could be further weakened. And the

long-range goal of Chavez and his supporters, the development of a nationwide

union of farm workers, could be severely damaged.

Chavez admitted this possibility. "It is a risk," he said, "but the moment you stop taking risks, you are dead."

Almost gone are the memories of those dramatic scenes in the mid-1960s and early '70s:

Chavez, weakened by weeks of fasting, lying on a cot in a small house in Delano, pleading for support of the farm workers. Chavez leading his followers

on long protest marches along hot, dusty farm roads -- marches that sometimes ended in violent confrontation with growers or the Teamsters, then the growers' allies.

Los Angeles Times, July 25, 1985

Often, the Chavistas were photographed kneeling in the dirt in prayer, in vivid contrast to their fist-waving foes standing muscularly tall across the road and cursing. Their prayers quite likely were sincere. But it was also excellent showmanship, and it won them increasing public support.

Growers complained that the Chavistas were more social crusaders than unionists. That was, in a real sense, true. After all, Chavez and his staff acted then, and still act, as if they have taken personal vows of poverty. And back then, they seemed to know little about the business of negotiating labor contracts.

Chavez was 38 when that began. Now he is 58. His brown face, which resembles that of an American Indian, is still almost unlined even though his black hair is streaked with gray and his paunch is slightly larger.

Refuses to Wear a Tie

He wears work clothes almost like a uniform, refusing to put on a tie even for the most elaborate occasions. His clothing makes him stand out clearly in all but a crowd of farm workers.

Los Angeles Times, July 25, 1985

He lives with his wife, Helen, in a small cottage in La Paz, the union's isolated headquarters in the community of Keene, about 30 miles from Bakersfield in the Tehachapi mountains. La Paz consists of a few buildings, house trailers for staffers and their families and some small cottages like the one used by Chavez and his wife.

Neither Chavez nor his staffers receive regular salaries, although the union provides their basic needs in clothing, housing, food and travel expenses.

Chavez still sleeps only about four hours a day, meditates an hour or more

almost daily and attends Mass regularly. He remains a vegetarian, an admirer of the late Mahatma Gandhi and an energetic, charismatic figure.

His great personal appeal was demonstrated earlier this year, when Chavez stopped off in Boston on a trip East to promote his latest boycott.

Franciscan Support

He stayed at a Franciscan monastery, where he explained over breakfast why he thinks the boycott is necessary; many of the sympathetic friars gave the UFW donations ranging up to \$500 and pledged their support.

Los Angeles Times, July 25, 1985

He visited with Boston Mayor Raymond L. Flynn, who embraced Chavez and also promised support, as did the City Council. Flynn's aides, not usually impressed by celebrities, left their inner offices to see Chavez and praise him. Later, he was guest of honor at a reception given by Massachusetts state senators who support the boycott. Television and newspaper reporters flocked to interview him.

On the streets, ordinary citizens smiled broadly when they recognized Chavez and many, like Joe Mitchell, stopped to say hello.

Mitchell, smartly dressed in a blue, well-pressed business suit and brightly shined shoes, is a one-time college activist -- just the sort of person Chavez thinks will provide critical support for the new boycott.

'A Wonderful Person'

Thrusting out his hand to clasp Chavez's, Mitchell said, "You don't know me, Mr. Chavez, but I know you and I want to say you are a wonderful person and I'm honored just to be able to shake your hand."

Chavez was pleased.

Los Angeles Times, July 25, 1985

"You see," he said, grinning as Mitchell hurried away, "the people who

supported us before are still there. Some of them have now grown up, and we won't ask them to join our picket lines this time, but they will respond to our call for the boycott."

(The Boston trip was not the only illustration of Chavez's continuing personal appeal. A Mervin Field California poll in February gave Chavez a 53% favorable rating against 21% unfavorable, better than most politicians score in such surveys.)

But personal appeal does not always work for Chavez, particularly among those who see a deep-rooted, almost sinister reason behind his call for a new boycott. They argue that it is Chavez himself who is in trouble and that his complaint that Deukmejian is scuttling the farm labor law is a smoke screen to hide the UFW's many problems.

That such skepticism exists is not surprising, considering all that has happened to the UFW since the mid-1970s.

Immediately after the growers bowed to the first boycott in 1970 and recognized the UFW, the union's active membership soared to almost 80,000 and it had contracts with practically every table grape grower in California.
Los Angeles Times, July 25, 1985

In 1973, however, the grape growers formed what Chavez called "an unholy alliance" with the Teamsters. The growers said they would no longer deal with the UFW; instead, they unilaterally ended their contracts with the UFW and recognized the Teamsters as bargaining agent for the workers in their fields.

The move, legal at the time, sent UFW membership plunging below 3,000. Many thought the union was finished. Chavez's followers retaliated with picket lines and mass demonstrations.

These sometimes bloody encounters between the Chavistas and the grower-Teamsters won renewed public sympathy for the UFW. And they helped prod the Legislature into passing in 1975 the historic farm labor law, the first in the nation.

The law requires government-conducted elections in which the workers, not the growers, decide which union represents them. It also prohibits growers from firing workers who are union sympathizers.

The UFW won most of the early elections, and the Teamsters eventually bowed out of the contest.

Los Angeles Times, July 25, 1985

Even with the fields all to itself, however, the UFW today can claim no more than 30,000 to 40,000 active members -- about 10% of all farm workers in the state and fewer than 3% of the grape workers. It has fewer than 200 contracts with growers statewide and only three with grape growers. In contrast, at its peak the union counted more than 50 grape growers under contract and more than 400 contracts overall.

Grower's Criticism

(Most of the remaining union grape workers are employed by one company, the Coachella-based Freedman Corp. headed by Lionel Steinberg, first grape grower to sign a UFW contract in 1970. The length of that relationship might seem a good omen for grower-union harmony. In fact, however, Steinberg is a union critic who complains that although he makes a profit, he has higher labor costs than his non-union competitors. The difference, he said, is not only in wages but also work rules and grievance procedures that hurt productivity.)

At the same time, the UFW has been racked by internal disputes that have seen some of its best and brightest -- Jerry Cohen, a labor attorney; Marshal Ganz, the union's dynamic chief organizer, and Gilbert Padilla, one of its founders -- leave the union.

Los Angeles Times, July 25, 1985

Chavez said they left the union of their own accord. Padilla, now selling insurance in Fresno, said, "That's bunk. We did resign, but Chavez forced us out. I was in tears when I left.

"Cesar doesn't know how to delegate authority and became almost paranoid when others exercised some leadership. He suspected Communists were out to destroy the union and drove out some of our best people, who were surely not Communists. He engaged in the worst sort of Red-baiting."

Argument Taken to Court

Adding to Chavez's problems is a bitter struggle between some dissident local union leaders and top UFW officers. The dissidents say Chavez deprived them of their rights in a union election in 1981, and there is no end in sight to that argument, still going on in the courts.

While the UFW infighting has raged, the growers have been adopting more sophisticated tactics, hiring legal experts who stymie union actions by their maneuvering before the farm labor board or in the courts.

Finally, said Don Curlee, a grower spokesman, the UFW is not doing well these days because "it is doing a lousy organizing job among workers."
Los Angeles Times, July 25, 1985

To Chavez, however, there is another explanation: the Deukmejian Administration.

Deukmejian's allies say Chavez is upset simply because farm labor officials are no longer giving workers an unfair edge in disputes with growers, which they say was the case when Democratic Gov. Edmund G. Brown Jr. was in office.

"All we are doing is to make the law a neutral one and not biased in favor of either growers or farm workers," David Stirling, the farm labor board's general counsel, has insisted.

Stirling is at the center of the dispute. Although the five-member farm labor board is still controlled by a majority of Brown appointees serving out their terms, Stirling is a Deukmejian appointee, named to the important post of general counsel in 1983.

As such, Stirling must decide which of the workers' complaints filed against growers are worth submitting to the farm labor board for a ruling. It is a critical point in the process, and the UFW does not like Stirling's record thus far: He has submitted about 10% of all worker charges to the full board. Under the Brown Administration, about 35% of workers' charges against growers were deemed sufficiently valid to be submitted to the full board for a decision.

Los Angeles Times, July 25, 1985

\$40 Million in Back Pay

The union also is infuriated by the pace at which growers are paying back wages and other penalties awarded to workers who win cases brought before the farm labor board. Growers owe farm workers an estimated \$40 million in such payments, but less than \$2 million has been paid. Legal appeals have caused much of the delay, and the problem predates the Deukmejian Administration, but the union argues that Stirling is doing nothing to speed up the process.

A particularly angry battle has been waged over Stirling's decision to allow attorneys for growers to examine the files of farm labor board investigators. The UFW said it feared that complaining workers, who often speak to investigators on a confidential basis, might suffer retaliation if their names are taken from the files and given to growers.

Stirling said the attorneys have a legal right to the files and have assured him that they are doing routine legal research on pending cases and will not copy or make use of any confidential statements made by workers.

Stirling's action drew criticism from some farm labor board members and from

Democratic legislators, who threatened financial retaliation if Stirling did

Los Angeles Times, July 25, 1985

not take a tougher stance on behalf of farm workers. Democratic Floor Leader Mike Roos of Los Angeles charged that Stirling is "not upholding the law."

'Risk Punitive Actions'

Stirling also has come under attack from some of his own staff, including several aides he hired.

Nine of 11 professional employees in the farm labor board's Salinas regional office, for example, signed a petition saying, among other things, that they were being punished for their "efforts to carry out the law. We know as long as we continue to do our job in a diligent manner, we risk punitive actions for disloyalty (to the Deukmejian Administration)."

Besides appointing Stirling, Deukmejian has angered the UFW by cutting the farm labor board's budget by a third, leaving fewer agents to investigate complaints filed by workers.

And by next year, the Brown appointees will be gone, giving Deukmejian full control over the board. Then, as the UFW sees it, the few workers' complaints that manage to get past the general counsel will come up against a board far more conservative and far less inclined to rule in favor of the workers.

Los Angeles Times, July 25, 1985

The letter, attributed to farm worker Manuel Amaya, begins:

"Dear Friend:

"You know how it is. You give the company the best years of your life. And when you are in need they do not listen. My oldest child writes this letter to you because I cannot. My right hand was lost to infection from the poisons in the fields where I worked. . . ."

It ends by asking the recipient to "please mail to Cesar Chavez the post card (offering support to farm workers) I have sent to you. It lets us know that people in America care."

Paul Chavez, head of the UFW's print shop and son of Cesar Chavez, said the union has mailed more than 4.5 million letters like this, asking support for its grape boycott. The return mail has brought about \$700,000 in donations, all of it to pay for more mailings, he said.

It is the kind of massive direct-mail campaign that seems to work so well for many enterprising businesses, conservative causes and fundamentalist religious leaders. The elder Chavez expressed confidence that it will do the same for his grape boycott and calls it "using the miracles of high tech."

Los Angeles Times, July 25, 1985

'Smoke and Mirrors'

Yet skeptics abound, and one of them is Marshall Ganz, a UFW founder and veteran of the first grape boycott, who left the union three years ago.

"The earlier boycott was made to work by people profoundly committed to it,"

Ganz said. "There were real people working on it full time in cities around the world, and it wasn't a PR (public relations) trick.

"It was not some mystical power of Chavez behind it, but dedicated people, including him, working their butts off because it was a cause they believed in. Now they are trying to create the boycott with smoke and mirrors, with words, not substance."

The first grape boycott took on an almost religious aura because of the heavy support from so many major religious groups. Two decades later, that kind of support is proving slow to develop.

'Very Good Person'

Los Angeles Times, July 25, 1985

New Los Angeles Archbishop Roger Mahony, one of the many Catholic church officials who worked closely with the union in its early days, praised Chavez as "a very good person, very dedicated," but said he does not "subscribe to the boycott strategy" today.

Mahony, the former bishop of Stockton, said the original boycott gained support because farm workers were without legal protection. "Now," he said, "they have such a law in California and the issue is its effectiveness, not its existence."

Msgr. George Higgins, another Catholic leader and longtime union supporter, gave yet another indication of the problem facing the union when he said in response to a question: "I did see something about the new boycott, but I don't hear about it much and haven't seen any articles on the union for several months."

Higgins was an active participant from the start in that first grower-union fight, and his lack of intimate involvement by now, nearly a year after the start of the new boycott, helps define the distance that the UFW campaign has yet to cover.

Los Angeles Times, July 25, 1985

Although formal support from religious groups has been relatively slow in coming, a number of religious organizations and leaders have given their blessings to the new boycott.

The 1,500-member Central Conference of American Rabbis, which represents rabbinical leaders of congregations with more than more than 1.2 million reform Jewish members throughout the United States and Canada, has called on all Jews to stop buying non-union California table grapes.

The National Council of Churches has met at least once with Chavez but as yet has said nothing official about its intentions of supporting the boycott.

That may change in the coming weeks. The United Church of Christ recently urged its 1.7 million members to join the boycott, taking the action at the church's general synod in Ames, Iowa. Chavez predicts that more large church groups will soon take similar action.

Meanwhile, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors has joined city officials in Boston, Detroit, Cleveland and other large communities in endorsing the union's boycott.

Less Political Support

Los Angeles Times, July 25, 1985

Politicians provided important support two decades ago, but despite some initial successes, such support seems a less promising prospect for Chavez today.

Sen. Robert F. Kennedy, who marched with Chavez in massive demonstrations, has been dead for more than 17 years, slain by an assassin.

Former Gov. Brown, a firm ally of the Chavistas during his eight years in office, was replaced in Sacramento in 1983 by Deukmejian.

President Ronald Reagan left no doubt about his sympathies when he made a public point of eating California table grapes during the last boycott.

Even state Senate Pro Tem President David A. Roberti (D-Los Angeles), still one of the strongest supporters of the farm workers, said that although he "may well end up backing the boycott, I am not sure about it yet."

Chavez said he realizes that the UFW will not get the same massive support it won during the first boycott: A Lou Harris poll then showed that nearly 17 million Americans joined, plus an unknown number in other countries.

Los Angeles Times, July 25, 1985

He also said, however, that he does not need those numbers, that if just 3 million consumers among what he calls his "natural constituency" stop purchasing grapes, the growers will give in. This, he said, is because grape growers, operating on a tight profit margin and aware of the boycott's potential strength, will react more quickly than in the past.

Most growers scoff at such calculations. Ed Thomas, the grower representative in Delano, said that the boycott has not made even a slight dent in table grape sales so far and that he doubts that it ever will.

Not all growers are so sanguine.

In 1979, the UFW mounted a successful boycott against a lettuce grower, the Bruce Church Co. UFW officials said their key weapon was a direct-mail campaign similar to that now being used in the grape boycott. Union computers, they said, have the ability to direct mailings into areas where residents are most likely to support the boycott, thus assuring that individual supermarkets will feel the effect.

'High-Tech Boycott'

Los Angeles Times, July 25, 1985

Growers denounced the 1979 lettuce boycott tactics as "extortion." One Bruce Church official said in a trade magazine, however, that more than a dozen major retailers had stopped buying his company's product because of the "threat of the commencement of a so-called high-tech boycott."

It is too early to tell what success Chavez will have this time around, and even he admits that.

Nor will he leave it all to direct mail. He will visit every major American city, and he is planning a trip to Western Europe later this year to seek support for the boycott. Chavez and his union followers have started holding demonstrations and marches across California's farmlands.

And at least one former aide cautioned against prematurely counting Chavez out.

Mark Grossman, who was press secretary for Chavez, said: "One reason he is one of the few surviving leaders of the social movements of the 1960s is that he has never been afraid to discard or modify old concepts, old ways of doing things, whether or not they were his own ideas."

Chicago Tribune

March 28, 1985 Thursday, SPORTS FINAL EDITION

SECTION: CHICAGOLAND; Pg. 1; ZONE: C

LENGTH: 733 words

HEADLINE: GRAPES OF WRATH NOW BEING TOSSED AT SALAD BOWL

BYLINE: By Barbara Brotman

BODY:

Cesar Chavez was standing beneath an umbrella in a heavy morning rainstorm Wednesday outside the Jewel Food Store at Clark and Division Streets.

A stream of water poured off the umbrella onto Chavez's head. Soaked, Chavez expressed confidence.

"Seventeen million people boycotted grapes in the early '60s and '70s. These people haven't changed," he said. "They sacrificed, they picketed,

they didn't eat grapes. Many students' social-action lives began on our picket
Chicago Tribune, March 28, 1985

lines.

"They may be driving around in Volvos and BMWs," he said, "but our message still reaches them."

The message concerns lettuce, as it has before. Chavez is picketing the Jewel store as part of a nationwide boycott campaign against stores that buy lettuce from a California-based company embroiled in a labor dispute.

In the late 1960s, Chavez asked the nation's consumers to boycott California table grapes. They did, in numbers so great that the state's growers eventually signed contracts with Chavez's union, the United Farm Workers. In 1975, California passed a law allowing farm workers to decide by secret ballot whether to join a union.

But Chavez says California Gov. George Deukmejian has sharply reduced the state Agricultural Labor Relations Board's enforcement of collective-bargaining laws.

"We are boycotting again, and back on the streets again," said Chavez, 57, as about 75 pickets marched in a circle, the lettering on their signs running in the rain.

-- -- --

Inside the store's foyer, Julie Thompson, 32, a customer, said the only criteria she would use in choosing where to buy lettuce was its freshness.

"If I were a farm worker, I would be protesting too," she said, "but
Chicago Tribune, March 28, 1985

right now, this doesn't pertain to me.

"Boycotts are a lot of trouble sometimes if they are not police-supervised. People could get angry if they see people going into the store."

Betty Monahan, 68, a retired secretary who was not to boycott lettuce or the Jewel this day, said, "I did boycott grapes (in earlier protests); I did boycott lettuce.

"I think they had the right to unionize. Now I think the stores have a hard enough time with all the problems. To picket the whole Jewel organization is a little inappropriate."

Jeff Walters, 33, a podiatrist who said he was present "back in the days of revolution in college," promised "I won't buy lettuce. The lettuce is small this year anyway."

-- -- --

For the United Farm Workers, these are days of protest by direct mail, of demographic profiles of customers at various stores and of personalized laser-printed letters detailing the union's boycott position.

Chavez said the union has targeted 30 Chicago-area Jewels for picketing

and is urging inner-city consumers who don't have access to other stores to boycott the Red Coach brand of lettuce.

Red Coach is the brand name of Bruce Church Inc. of Salinas, Calif., which uses nonunion labor. California's Agricultural Labor Relations Board has

ruled that the company had bargained with the workers in bad faith. The
Chicago Tribune, March 28, 1985

company has appealed the ruling to a state court.

Michael Payne, vice president and general manager of Bruce Church, said conceding to the union's demands would place serious economic constraints on the company.

The dispute has prompted several chains to drop the lettuce, including Los Angeles-based Lucky Stores Inc. McDonald's Corp. also stopped buying Bruce

Church lettuce, but it cited business factors rather than the labor dispute in its decision.

Jewel Food Stores issued a statement saying the store will buy Bruce Church lettuce whenever it is the best quality and price available.

--- --

On the picket line, Marcos Munoz caught sight of Chavez and embraced him.

Munoz was picking grapes near Bakersfield, Calif., when Chavez began his drive

to unionize migrant field workers. Munoz went on to organize grape boycotts in

Boston and New York.

"Those were the good old days," he said to Chavez, grinning. These days, Munoz and his family live in a home that he owns in the Little Village neighborhood on Chicago's West Side, for he has found a way for a migrant worker to better himself.

He became a crane operator.

The Nation

March 23, 1985

SECTION: Vol. 240 ; Pg. 330; ISSN: 0027-8378

LENGTH: 2782 words

HEADLINE: It's boycott time in California; attacks on the California Agricultural Labor Relations Board & the Agricultural Labor Relations Act - in & out of court

BYLINE: Street, Richard Steven

BODY:

California's Imperial Valley straddles the U.S.-Mexican border between Yuma, Arizona and San Diego. Its hothouse climate and abundant Colorado River water make it a prime supplier of produce during the winter months. The Mexican town of Mexicali, home to as many as 8,000 migrant "green card" farm workers, provides

The Nation, March 23, 1985

growers a source of cheap labor.

Each winter as the harvest shifts south to the valley, workers return from their migratory circuit to their homes in Mexicali. During their five-month stay, their days follow a numbing routine. They cross the border each morning between 1 A.M. and 3 A.M. Some of the workers have union contracts and assured employment, with decent wages and benefits. Most don't, and they must stand under the sodium-vapor lights along the main street in Calexico until they are selected by one of the dozens of labor contractors who park their buses in the gas stations and fast-food outlets that serve as pickup points. Those chosen wait in the buses or stand around on the sidewalk for hours, holding their places. Finally they are driven to the fields for a day's work. They return each afternoon between 2 P.M. and 4 P.M.; eat, sleep and get up the following morning--all for no more than \$ 3.70 an hour, without medical or vacation benefits. "Solamente trabajo y duermo," a worker told me. "All I do is work and sleep."

In December 1983, Ron Hull, manager of the Imperial Valley Vegetable Growers Association, wrote a blistering letter to his local newspaper, denouncing the Agricultural Labor Relations Act as a "cancer" that was ravaging the rural economy. "The A.L.R.B. California Agricultural Labor Relations Board, which administers the law may have been the prescription for 'peace in the fields'

The Nation, March 23, 1985

prescribed by former Governor Jerry Brown," he stated, "but I submit the cure is killing the patient organ by organ."

At that time, the A.L.R.B. had been in existence for eight years, and despite a rocky beginning, it was becoming an effective mechanism for resolving disputes between the growers and their workers. One year later, Hull and his fellow agribusinessmen largely succeeded in ridding themselves of the cancer. The assault they mounted on the board last year is a textbook example of the power of business interests to override labor laws they don't like and part of a nationwide trend of unionbusting. The campaign also exposed the transitory nature of California's farm labor policy, which shifts with the political winds and which has swung squarely in the growers' favor. Given the present conservative mood in the state, it will be years before the farm labor law regains the pro-worker momentum it acquired after it was passed in 1975.

Attacks on the act are nothing new. For years growers sought revisions so that it would be superseded by the National Labor Relations Act--a way of eliminating the secondary boycott, United Farm Workers head Cesar Chavez's weapon of last resort, which is forbidden by the Federal law. Failing that, they carried on an unremitting battle against the A.L.R.B.'s rulings through the board's appeals process and in the courts, routinely fighting all the way to the State Supreme Court. Invariably they lost, and accounts of the results were
The Nation, March 23, 1985

buried in the rural newspapers. But in early 1984, one of those long, drawn-out cases was finally decided and a cash award announced. Abatti Produce, a family-owned El Centro-based general farming company which employed 2,500 workers, was found guilty of illegally firing union activists, beginning in 1969, and also of engaging in unionbusting during contract negotiations in 1978.

Under the "make-whole" provision of the farm labor law, workers receive compensation when the company is found guilty of bad-faith bargaining. The award is based on the difference between what they earned and what they would have earned under the contract that was eventually signed. Initially small, the award grew as the company's appeals wended their way through the court. When the El Centro A.L.R.B. staff finally estimated the total, with accumulated interest

charges and contributions to pension funds, health insurance and holidays, it came to between \$ 8 million and \$ 10 million. (The A.L.R.B. estimate was based on a preliminary analysis of incomplete data. The final amount will be determined after the company produces its pay records.) This January, Abatti attorneys held a press conference and announced the company would shut down following the last of its 1984 harvests.

For agribusinessmen, the huge Abatti settlement was a glaring example of the A.L.R.B.'s pro-labor bias. They criticized it vehemently in interviews published in the Imperial Valley Press and other newspaper throughout Southern California. The Nation, March 23, 1985

They never mentioned the twenty instances in which Abatti Produce had violated the Agricultural Labor Relations Act; they insisted that the Abatti decision was symptomatic of the way the farm labor law had adversely affected growers. Look at Yuma, Arizona, only fifty miles to the east, they said. With no union activity, plenty of water, lots of land and no A.L.R.B., its total lettuce plantings jumped by 10,000 acres in five years; in the Imperial Valley, over the same period, it dropped by 18,000 acres. Look at the long list of produce firms that moved their operations elsewhere or quit farming altogether following judgments of unfair labor practices and massive penalties imposed by the board: Sun Harvest, Bruce Church, California Coastal, Hubbard Company, Martori Brothers and Colace Brothers. Add to the loss of those jobs the 2,500 Abatti jobs, in an area where seasonal unemployment reaches 42.3 percent, the highest in California.

The United Farm Workers offers a quite different reading of those facts. According to Chris Schneider of the union's legal staff, Abatti's shutdown was fraudulent. The company was following the example of firms like Continental Airlines, breaking labor contracts by filing for bankruptcy. Says Schneider:

We've got compelling proof that a lot of these companies, like Sun Harvest

and Growers Exchange and Bruce Church, are just changing their names,
firing
union workers, lowering wages and continuing operations with labor
contractors

The Nation, March 23, 1985

who hire workers from the shape-up at 4 A.M. along the main street in
Calexico,
and then truck them to the fields at rock-bottom wages. We send these
shutdown
companies letters, and they refuse to reply, saying they're not the same, so we
have to file new charges with the A.L.R.B. As for the decline in lettuce
acreage, that's because acreage jumped after the 1979 strike, when we shut
down
the valley. Growers made a killing at \$ 25 a carton, and they overplanted.
Now
they're readjusting. There's plenty of growers looking for land in the Imperial
Valley.

Chavez vows that the union will try to collect the millions of dollars owed
to farm workers, seizing the personal property of farmers if necessary. In the
state legislature, the U.F.W. is applying pressure to "soft" rural Democrats
who
have supported efforts to gut the farm labor board. In the supermarkets, it is
organizing a boycott of Chiquita bananas, allegedly sold by a successor of Sun
Harvest, the big Salinas Valley lettuce company. Chavez called the action
because Sun shut down in 1982 without negotiating a closure settlement with
its
workers, as required by law. And last fall in the Salinas Valley it staged a
one-day "sick-out" of 5,000 workers engaged in contract negotiations.

Meanwhile, the A.L.R.B. is barely functioning. Since January 1984, Gov.
George Deukmejian, who received nearly \$ 1 million in campaign
contributions
from growers for his 1982 race, has used his power of appointment to reshape
The Nation, March 23, 1985

the five-member board along more conservative lines. Last summer, he
transferred
its chair, former State Senator Alfred Song, to the Occupational Safety and
Health Appeals Board. Then he appointed Jyrl Ann James-Massengale, a labor
lawyer who had represented the growers, to replace him. Next year
Deukmejian may
replace Jerome Waldie, perhaps the U.F.W.'s strongest advocate on the board,
with a candidate sympathetic to the growers. After that, according to some
growers, it should take about two more years to reverse the policies the board

has implemented since 1975.

David Sterling, formerly a conservative Republican legislator, has been the Governor's most controversial and, from the union's perspective, disastrous appointment. Through his power to decide which cases the board will investigate and prosecute, Sterling wields the same discretionary authority as a district attorney does over criminal actions. Frequently critical of the farm labor board's alleged pro-U.F.W. orientation, he disputes claims that the legislature intended the law to be pro-worker, as many contend, and he has begun to unravel precedents established in the past eight years. Many disputes are now resolved without going to trial; the controversial make-whole provision of the farm labor law is under review; and a 27 percent cut in the board's budget has been accepted without protest.

The Nation, March 23, 1985

Probably the most significant of Sterling's policy decisions came last March, when he reduced the \$ 8 million-plus judgment against Abatti Produce to \$ 1.76 million. He arrived at the lower figure by pegging compensation to the U.F.W.'s 1982 going-out-of-business contract with Colace Brothers, a small firm in the Imperial Valley which paid \$ 5.45 an hour. In computing the larger award the El Centro A.L.R.B. office had used as a model the union's contract with Sun Harvest, which paid \$ 7 an hour and whose operations were similar to Abatti's. According to Sterling, the lower settlement would give farm workers their money sooner than if they waited the five or six years it would take Abatti to exhaust its appeals. Chavez called the revised award a "sellout at 10 cents on the dollar."

Sterling's ruling split the farm labor board. In hearings last summer to determine make-whole penalties against Mario Saikhon Inc., operator of the field where U.F.W. member Rufino Contreras was murdered during the 1979 lettuce strike (the case has never been solved), Sterling clashed with El Centro A.L.R.B. regional director David Arizmendi. In determining how much back pay Saikhon owed

a group of workers it refused to take back after the 1979 strike, Sterling proposed that the sum be computed according to methods that would have yielded far smaller awards than Arizmendi's calculations would have. The Abatti Produce case became even more confused when, in the space of two months, the A.L.R.B. rejected Sterling's \$ 1.76 million award as too small, and he overruled it and

The Nation, March 23, 1985

reduced the penalty to \$ 1.05 million.

In the wake of the Saikhon and Abatti decisions and the appointments of Sterling and James-Massengale, several high-level A.L.R.B. staff members resigned. The most widely publicized of those resignations was that of Arizmendi, last June. The Imperial Valley Press reported that Arizmendi had resigned after the Imperial Valley Farm Bureau revealed that he did not have a college degree, which is required for his job. Arizmendi said he left for personal reasons. His departure removed the most controversial of the farm labor board's administrators.

Since then a number of developments have shattered Chavez's faith in the board's ability to act fairly in the Abatti Produce case, or in any other. The State Supreme Court refused to review a lower court decision in Admiral Packing Company v. the A.L.R.B., which threw out the board's finding that twenty-eight Imperial Valley growers had bargained in bad faith during their 1979 contract talks with the union. While all but eight of the companies had already settled their disputes with the union, the appellate court's ruling enabled the remaining companies to engage in tough negotiations and to avoid paying penalties. Chavez estimates that the companies owe workers \$ 75 million in back wages.

The Nation, March 23, 1985

As a result of the upheavals at the A.L.R.B., Chavez has been forced to rethink his organizing strategy. Although his influence in Sacramento remains strong and is bolstered by \$ 656,000 in U.F.W. campaign contributions distributed to "friendly" Democratic legislators by Assembly Speaker Willie Brown and State Senate president David Roberti, Chavez no longer believes that

the board serves as a tool for achieving economic justice for farm workers. In a recent interview, he told San Francisco Examiner labor reporter Paul Shinoff: "We thought we could redress our grievances through the board, but that is not to be. That is definitely not to be. We have to change our tactics now."

The most dramatic example of this resumption of old tactics has been in the Salinas Valley, where since 1979 the union has been embroiled in a strike against Bruce Church, the nation's second-largest lettuce producer. Although the A.L.R.B. had found Bruce Church guilty of unfair labor practices and ordered it to rehire strikers and pay them retroactively, the company stalled in the courts, and the union has resorted to a boycott of Church's Red Coach lettuce. Last fall the U.F.W. persuaded McDonald's Lucky Stores and A & P to stop purchasing lettuce from Church.

So far this year this Imperial Valley has been the focal point of the U.F.W.'s new militancy. On Sunday, February 10, six years after Rufino Contreras's murder, Chavez led 3,000 workers on a six-mile memorial march from

The Nation, March 23, 1985

the town of Heber to Calexico. At a rally in Rockwood Plaza he told the marchers that Governor Deukmejian was conspiring with growers to undermine the farm labor law, that acting regional A.L.R.B. director Tim Foote (who had replaced David Arizmendi) was biased against them, that 4,000 farm workers had been fired for seeking to redress their grievances through the law and had lost \$ 80 million in wages. He called on the workers to protest against the shape-up system in Calexico by engaging in a one-day sick-out in honor of Contreras and what he had died trying to achieve.

The next morning about 5,000 farm workers refused to ride the buses to the fields. On Tuesday morning workers returning to the labor buses along the main drag in Calexico were fired, and at Mario Saikhon one hundred broccoli pickers were replaced. The following morning, when the workers came to get their

paychecks at the Saikhon pickup point, a former A.L.R.B. field examiner employed as a labor relations manager allegedly attacked the U.F.W.'s Chris Schneider.

At 8:30 Friday morning, after waiting three hours for their pay, the broccoli crew traveled by car caravan from their Calexico pickup point to Saikhon headquarters in Holtville. A tense confrontation developed inside the management office. Company employees refused to pay the workers until most of them agreed to leave the premises. When the police arrived, all but six or seven of the workers had gone. (While standing behind the workers at the counter, I
The Nation, March 23, 1985

was charged by an enraged management employee who tried to tear off my cameras and, failing at that, attempted to have me arrested on charges that I had attacked him. The police declined.)

Although Saikhon and U.F.W. representatives met in late February, with Foote acting as moderator, they failed to reach an agreement. The two sides argued vehemently on every point. Saikhon attorneys contended that the company hadn't fired the broccoli workers, merely "replaced" those who went out on strike. Union people said the workers had indeed been fired, and insisted that the one-day sick-out was not the same as a strike. According to Foote, an investigation into the incident will require about two weeks; the U.F.W. believes the Saikhon case will be stalled for several months, a delay the union says is too long. "By the time Foote issues a decision," said Schneider, "the vegetable season at Saikhon may be finished. What good is a decision then?"

There is little hope of a redress of grievances through the farm labor board. The union is therefore planning to boycott Saikhon's Jeff brand broccoli and Mario and Jeff brands lettuce. If the union's executive board O.K.s the boycott, the first target will be Safeway, which buys a lot of Saikhon produce, as well as other chain stores and local markets in the Imperial Valley and throughout California. As Schneider told me, the February 11 work stoppage was just a preview of the coming months. "We really have no other alternative," he

The Nation, March 23, 1985

said. "It's clear that the law isn't working. That means you're going to see a

lot of marches, more boycotts and economic action at the workplace. It's the only thing a lot of these growers understand."

THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

December 26, 1984, Wednesday

SECTION: National; Pg. 2

LENGTH: 1105 words

HEADLINE: New year brings new tests for farmworker leader Chavez; can lost vigor be regained?

BYLINE: By Marshall Ingwerson, Staff writer of The Christian Science Monitor

DATELINE: Los Angeles

BODY:

Cesar Chavez and his United Farm Workers - frustrated by years of stagnation and waning influence - are trying to recover the lost vigor of their salad days of more than a decade ago.

The Christian Science Monitor December 26, 1984

The union is a more sophisticated operation now.

Mr. Chavez has virtually given up trying to organize workers under California's Agricultural Labor Relations Act of 1975 - still his union's greatest victory, creating the nation's only body of farm labor laws.

Instead, he and the United Farm Workers are seeking out the same 17 million Americans that Chavez says supported the UFW's grape boycotts 15 years ago, asking them to boycott grapes again.

Chavez has recently traveled to Detroit, St. Louis, and Cleveland for meetings with "hard core" supporters and opinion leaders to stir up once again the coalition that rallied to the farmworker cause in another era. Soon, he plans to use television commercials that will include a toll-free UFW phone number where sympathizers can leave their names and addresses.

He is optimistic: "It looks like a repeat of the '60s," he says, summing up his recent meetings in the Midwest.

At the same time, the UFW has launched a new series of high-tech, direct-mail, demographically targeted boycotts aimed at its longstanding rival, Bruce Church Inc., the nation's second-largest lettuce grower.

The Christian Science Monitor December 26, 1984

The union has been trying to get food chains to quit buying lettuce from Bruce Church in Salinas, Calif., since 1979. It had little success for several years, and neither side has yet budged in contract negotiations. But in 1983, the UFW launched a "high-tech" boycott against large Bruce Church customers and succeeded in driving chains such as Lucky supermarkets, A&P supermarkets, and McDonald's elsewhere for their lettuce.

This month the union has taken the boycott a step further, targeting Alpha Beta supermarkets in California. Alpha Beta has not purchased Bruce Church lettuce for at least a year, but the parent company, American Stores, has. So this boycott campaign is actually three steps removed from its ultimate target.

The UFW boycott methods have all the sophistication of modern political and mass-marketing campaigns. The union identifies stores in neighborhoods where shoppers are likely to be Latino, liberal, or both. Boycott organizers profile the typical store customer and observe shopping patterns. They study the local census tract data for demographic information, and precinct records for voting patterns.

The union then sends out mailings to local residents, aiming especially at women who, Chavez says, respond more readily than men to appeals for social

justice. Mailers may stress the sexual harassment of women working in the

The Christian Science Monitor December 26, 1984

fields, or they may describe the dangers of the pesticides used on the vegetables. Whatever the argument, the message is not to shop at Alpha Beta. Pickets at the store back up the mailings.

The Alpha Beta campaign will then be used as a model for a boycott of the Acme chain in Philadelphia and the Jewel chain in Chicago.

All of this, says Bruce Church executive Michael Payne, "has nothing to do

with economic issues whatsoever." The company's field workers' wages averaged \$9.98 an hour in 1983, higher than the UFW average. A major sticking point for

Bruce Church in contract talks is that the UFW wants the right to take a worker "not in good standing" with the union out of his job.

"Chavez is demanding absolute control of our work force, and we're not willing to grant that to any union, Chavez or otherwise," Mr. Payne says.

The nationwide grape boycott is a larger attempt to recapture wide popular support around the country. Once again, as in the late 1960s, California's grape industry is almost entirely nonunion.

Citing a poll by Louis Harris, Chavez says, "There's a coalition out there in the country, 17 million adult Americans who participated in grape
The Christian Science Monitor December 26, 1984

boycotts" of a decade ago. "We're going back to those people."

To find this long lost constituency, the UFW will use mailing lists from peace groups, religious organizations, and labor unions; meetings and press conferences; and soon television commercials.

Is he worried that public values have shifted, that labor unions no longer have a hold on popular sentiment?

No, he says. In "large market areas," in the parlance of mass marketing, some 38 percent of the US population "supports us pretty strongly," Chavez says.

And unlike labor's presidential candidate, Walter Mondale, the UFW does not need a majority, he adds: "If we can get 5 percent of Americans to stop buying grapes, we can win."

The UFW's biggest problem these days, according to Chavez, is California Gov. George Deukmejian. A Republican elected with strong support from growers, Mr. Deukmejian changed the balance of power at the Agricultural Labor Relations Board.

The Christian Science Monitor December 26, 1984

Before Deukmejian, about 42 percent of the charges filed with the board (almost all of them by workers against employers) used to be heard as formal complaints.

Now fewer than 13 percent become complaints.

The system has bogged down, as well, as the backlog of pending charges has more than doubled.

"We've got to act now as if we don't have any law protecting us," says Chavez. "Every time we go to organize, all we do is jeopardize workers' safety and workers' (job) security. The law has been shut down and doesn't work any more."

Mr. Payne of Bruce Church has a different point of view.

"Chavez complains that the board no longer uses the law to harass growers with every paper they file." The UFW has filed 160 charges against Bruce Church since 1975, he says. "They all cost us time and money." But only three were decided against the grower, and one of those is under appeal.

The Christian Science Monitor December 26, 1984

Chavez has a lot of ground to make up to recover the glory his movement once had. In the late 1960s, the farm workers' cause was symbolic of whole Chicano movement, and Chavez was a sort of Martin Luther King figure to urban Mexican-Americans.

Now, says Richard Santillan, a professor of political science at Cal Poly, Pomona, liberals and Latinos both have a full slate of other issues that concern them.

Then, he says, urban Chicanos - and 90 percent of US Hispanics are urban - could still recall the hardships of the fields.

Now there is a growing Latino middle class, and most Latino college students have never picked fruit and vegetables.

There is also a schism left from Chavez's attempts to wield political influence by working against popular Latino Democrats in East Los Angeles. "He's still admired," says Dr. Santillan, "but there's a lot of

disappointment over Chavez."

December 23, 1984, Sunday, Late City Final Edition

SECTION: Section 4; Page 4, Column 3; Week in Review Desk

LENGTH: 996 words

HEADLINE: UNION'S FUTURE COULD HINGE ON BATTLE WITH
LETTUCE GROWER;
GLORY DAYS ARE FADING FOR CHAVEZ AND U.F.W.

BYLINE: By ROBERT LINDSEY

DATELINE: SALINAS, Calif.

BODY:

A figure that seemed out of the past appeared on the nightly news in California last week - Cesar Chavez, waving a picket sign and doing what he perhaps does best, attracting the attention of television cameramen as a spokesman for farm workers.

The New York Times, December 23, 1984

These have been rough times for Mr. Chavez. Twenty-two years ago, in the dusty vineyards of California's Central Valley, he launched his ultimately successful effort to organize a union of farm workers. Almost a decade ago, his work produced the nation's first collective bargaining law for field hands. The one-time migrant worker managed well as leader of a social movement. But the operating union he organized has been torn by internal dissent and complaints that Mr. Chavez refuses to share power.

Almost all of the inner circle of aides who helped Mr. Chavez achieve his dream of creating the United Farm Workers of America - Jerry Cohen, Marshall Ganz, Gilbert Padilla and Eliseo Medina - are gone now. Some were victims of purges from the top, others resigned in frustration or bitterness.

Mr. Chavez's best political friend, former Democratic Gov. Edmund G. Brown Jr., left Sacramento in 1982 to run a losing campaign for the United States Senate. The man who succeeded him, George Deukmejian, a Republican, has sought

to reduce the tight control granted Mr. Chavez and his union by Mr. Brown's appointees to the state board that administers the collective bargaining law.

Last summer, the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, the once bitter foe of Mr. Chavez that in 1977 gave him a monopoly to organize field hands, refused to renew an agreement not to compete with the U.F.W. Mr. Chavez, the teamsters

The New York Times, December 23, 1984

said, had failed to exploit the opportunity of the fields of California.

The liberal press seems also to have turned on Mr. Chavez. He has been the subject of a series of recent critical reports. Last month he sued The Village Voice, the New York weekly, for what he called a "corrupt and immoral attack" on the union and for "creating the false and defamatory impression" that he had become "ineffective, paranoid, incompetent, defensive, immoral, bitter, despotic and a close associate of criminals." The reference was apparently to Charles Dederich, founder of the Synanon organization.

But even Mr. Chavez's harshest critics, California growers, acknowledge that once-exploited farm workers as a group have benefited richly from his organizing efforts, and merely from the threat of them. Paid an average of less than \$2 an hour in the mid-1960's, California agricultural workers - a labor force of about 300,000 made up mostly of illegal aliens from Mexico - now earn an average of about \$5.30 an hour. Fewer than 25,000 of the total are covered by United Farm Workers contracts. Those who are covered average nearly \$7 an hour.

The 'Good Standing' Clause

Such gains notwithstanding, Mr. Chavez's union is at a pivotal moment. Its future, perhaps survival, is linked closely to the outcome of a bitter dispute

The New York Times, December 23, 1984

with a single large lettuce producer here in the Salinas Valley of Central California.

Bruce Church Inc. was among the first California growers to sign a contract with the United Farm Workers after the state's Agricultural Relations Act was

passed in 1975. That contract expired in 1979 and the two sides have been battling over terms of a new one since then. The company says that it pays about \$7 an hour to unskilled field hands and substantially more to other workers. The contract battle, it claims, is not over economic matters but over insistence by Mr. Chavez on a clause, accepted by some growers, that allows the

union to order the dismissal of members who are not in "good standing" with

the union. The clause allows the U.F.W. to deny work to members who disagree

with Mr. Chavez or refuse to give a day's pay annually to the union for distribution to political leaders in the state. Michael Payne, an executive of Bruce Church Inc., contends that the "good standing" clause and other contract

provisions demanded by the union "would give Chavez absolute control over our

work force, which we aren't going to give to anybody." For his part, Mr. Chavez

calls the good standing clause essential to his efforts to build a strong, permanent union in a business where workers tend to move often and where union

organizing successes are constantly under threat from an influx of immigrants

willing to work for lower pay. The State Agricultural Relations Board, which administers the farm labor law, has accused both parties of bad-faith

The New York Times, December 23, 1984

bargaining in the long dispute. To force Bruce Church Inc. to capitulate, the union for the past year has been conducting what it calls a "high tech" boycott - a direct-mail campaign against certain retailers that sell Church lettuce. A computer is used to select potential sympathizers, identified by the union as "white liberals, blacks, Jews and union families." Letters go out to them accusing the retailer of doing business with a company that exploits farm workers.

There is no evidence yet that consumers have reacted in large numbers by refusing to patronize the targeted retailers. But executives of three large chains targeted in the campaign - Lucky Stores, A.&P. and the McDonald's fast food chain - responded to threats of such a campaign by stopping their purchases

from Church. The lettuce company says that it recently had to lay off 100 workers, about 10 percent of its labor force, because of the boycott.

For Mr. Chavez, who was demonstrating last week in front of Alpha Beta Stores, the latest grocery chain targeted in the campaign, the boycott has

provided hope of a comeback for the union after his long series of setbacks. He announced recently that the U.F.W. would embark soon on a similar boycott against non-union producers of table grapes. "If this doesn't work," he said, "it's the end of the union."

The New York Times
SECTION: Section A; Page 12, Column 1; National Desk

LENGTH: 1087 words

HEADLINE: FARM WORKERS FACING NEW TEAMSTER CONTEST

BYLINE: By ROBERT LINDSEY

DATELINE: SALINAS, Calif., Oct. 6

BODY:

Even as the United Farm Workers won a significant victory with a new boycott tactic, forcing the McDonald's restaurant chain to stop buying one brand of lettuce, the union faces a serious new challenge from an old antagonist.

The New York Times, October 10, 1984

The International Brotherhood of Teamsters recently notified Cesar Chavez, founder of the farm workers' union, that it would not renew a 1977 agreement that ended competition between the unions in organizing agricultural workers.

The agreement ended more than four years of often bloody strife, set off when some growers acted to thwart Mr. Chavez by signing with the teamsters.

Borrowed From Fundamentalists

In the new boycott campaign against the Bruce Church lettuce company, Mr. Chavez has used sophisticated computer-generated direct-mail appeals to consumers, a technique that he calls a "high-tech boycott" that he says he borrowed from religious fundamentalists.

In addition to McDonald's, Mr. Chavez has persuaded two of the nation's

largest supermarket chains, A.&P. and Lucky Stores, and several smaller ones to stop buying lettuce from Bruce Church. These successes are part of the union's effort to revive its faltering drive to unionize American farm laborers.

The company, the valley's second largest lettuce producer, has refused since 1979 to meet contractual demands from Mr. Chavez that it asserts would force it out of business.

The New York Times, October 10, 1984

The Chavez union appears to have a promising new means to apply pressure on growers. But the teamsters' decision has dampened some of Mr. Chavez's optimism.

Public Optimism on Future

In recent interviews, officials of both unions said that they did not expect the expiration of the truce to revive the old hostilities.

"There's no problem," Armando Garcia of the United Farm Workers declared. "If they want to organize, fine; we'll continue to organize, and the workers will have a choice."

Roy Mendoza, an organizer for teamsters Local 890 here, said: "We're going to avoid a head-on confrontation."

Privately, however, some members in both unions, as well as many growers and others in the Salinas Valley, say that confrontation is inevitable.

An internal teamsters memorandum deplored the farm workers' failure to organize more and said that problems in the Chavez union made this an opportune time for the teamsters.

The New York Times, October 10, 1984

"Of approximately 350,000 farm workers in California," it states, "the U.F.W. has less than 15,000 under contract."

'Image' Problem Is Seen

The memorandum emphasizes that the union would have to work hard to discard an "image" as "the big, bad teamsters."

"The teamsters," it says, "should appear to be cooperative, reasonable and almost the underdog by allowing the U.F.W. to be the 'bad guy.' The teamsters will need to be on their best behavior and not allow Cesar to exploit the issues."

Mr. Chavez, 56 years old, burst into prominence in the mid-1960's while leading a strike of grape pickers.

With good publicity and generous financial aid from Eastern liberals, he led a boycott that, according to one opinion survey, persuaded 17 million Americans to stop buying table grapes. Growers eventually capitulated.

In 1977 came another big victory with the teamsters' agreement. Since then, however, big triumphs have been rare.

The New York Times, October 10, 1984

Agricultural labor researchers say that life for California farm laborers has been improved by the threat of union organization; those who now work under union contracts earn \$7 an hour or more while nonunionized workers earn more than \$5 hourly.

Here in the Salinas Valley, where the union has had its greatest strength, less than a dozen of nearly 150 vegetable producers have contracts.

Aliens Wait for Jobs

An ever-present pool of illegal aliens willing to work for low wages, and increasing mechanization have hampered organizing efforts. But critics in and out of the union more and more fault Mr. Chavez.

Former senior aides have accused him of paranoia, of poor administration, of refusing to share authority and of forcing them out if they dissent.

And, as the farm workers union has evolved from being a social cause into an everyday union, support has ebbed, often causing its appeals to go unheeded,

until its new boycott got going this year.

The New York Times, October 10, 1984

According to an internal U.F.W. document, the primary objective is not to persuade consumers to shun a supermarket or restaurant because it sells a grower's product, but to tarnish its "corporate image by associating something negative about the store in the minds of certain groups of consumers sympathetic to our cause."

Value of Pickets Diminishes

The document states that Americans generally no longer are moved by picketing, marches and rallies; instead, it said it should now attack growers on the basis of three issues with emotional appeal: consumerism, toxic wastes and sexual harassment.

According to union officials, if a retailer does not agree to drop a product, letters critical of the company are sent to certain consumers near its stores.

The recipients of the letters are selected by computers using demographic data to pinpoint people likely to be sympathetic to the union, including Hispanic consumers, "white liberals, blacks, Jews and union families."

Similar appeals are used by many political fund-raisers and church groups.

The New York Times, October 10, 1984

Company Denies Charges

The company says it has been accused of tolerating sexual harassment of its female employees, of requiring workers to use injurious chemicals and of other misdeeds. "None of it is true," Michael Payne, the company's general manager, said of the allegations. "It's corporate extortion."

He estimated that the company's business had been cut by as much as "15 to 20 percent" this year by the boycott.

Because of new customers, Mr. Payne said the company's sales had rebounded partly, and he added that it would not give in to the union.

Mr. Payne said that last year the company paid its more than 1,000 field workers an average of \$9.98 an hour, plus benefits, "probably the highest agricultural wage in the world."

Both sides agreed in interviews that the major sticking point in the impasse, which began in 1979, was Mr. Chavez's insistence on contractual provisions that would allow the union to determine which of its members work for the company and to dismiss any who do not adhere to union discipline.

The New York Times, October 10, 1984

"If you boil it all down," Mr. Payne said, "the differences we have are not economic, but who's going to control the work force."

Business Week

September 26, 1983

SECTION: LABOR; Pg. 86

LENGTH: 1217 words

HEADLINE: CALIFORNIA FARMWORKERS: BACK TO THE BARRICADES?

BODY:

Labor peace has generally reigned in California's verdant croplands since 1975, when the state enacted the nation's first and only law to govern organizing and bargaining among agricultural workers. But now the peace may be threatened. Since his election last fall, Republican Governor George Deukmejian has made staff changes and budget cuts at California's Agricultural Labor Relations Board (ALRB), resulting in what the United Farm Workers (UFW) contends is less favorable treatment for workers. No one expects a return to the physical warfare of the pre-ALRB years. But, says Paul Chavez, son of UFW founder Cesar Chavez and an official of the union: "One way or another we are going to organize farmworkers, and that means returning to boycotts and strikes."

1983 McGraw-Hill, Inc., Business Week, September 26, 1983

The ALRB was created during the administration of former Governor Edmund G. Brown Jr. to defuse the explosive atmosphere created by a decade of UFW organizing. In 1973, for example, 10,000 workers were jailed and three killed in farm labor disputes. In return for a UFW pledge to curtail strikes and boycotts, the law set up procedures similar to those provided in the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA), which excluded farmworkers because of fears that strikes at harvest time could ruin entire crops. "The act created a balance of power, says an ALRB insider, adding that a subsequent increase in farm wages from \$2 an hour to as much as \$7 has lowered the high school dropout rate among the children of farmworkers, who no longer have to supplement family incomes. But growers felt the pendulum had swung too far. So they rallied behind Deukmejian, contributing \$750,000, or 10% of the total, to his election campaign. STIFF PENALTIES. The growers' primary complaint is that California's legislation gives farmworkers even more rights than the NLRA gives nonfarm workers. The ALRB can issue "make-whole" remedies during bargaining that continue after a contract expires. If the board agrees with the union that an employer is not bargaining in "good faith" -- admittedly a subjective judgment -- it can assess stiff penalties against the grower based on the average wage that competing growers pay. By pressuring growers to settle, this "injects the ALRB into the bargaining process where it doesn't belong," argues Ed Thomas, executive manager of the South Central Farmers Committee. He adds: "If the union bargains in bad faith, there is no penalty."

1983 McGraw-Hill, Inc., Business Week, September 26, 1983

The employers also object to a clause in the act that permits union shop agreements, which require new hires to join the union within five days as a condition of employment. And they contend that Governor Brown's ALRB appointees have a pro-union bias. Of the thousands of unfair-labor-practice charges that the board has handled, 95% have been filed by workers. Some have resulted in decisions that are unusual by federal labor law standards. In a case decided

against grower Paul Bertuccio last December, the ALRB decreed that employers must bargain with the UFW, or any of five other unions that represent California farm laborers, before making decisions affecting the "economic health" of workers. This, in effect, obligated growers to bargain over planting decisions, since the type or size of a crop that is planted affects both wages and job security.

CASE BACKLOG. Since then, Deukmejian, on grounds of efficiency, has cut the ALRB's annual budget by 27% to \$7 million. This eliminated 33% of the administrative judges, attorneys, and field examiners who handle complaints, a cut that board member Jerome Waldie terms "draconian." By last July 1 the ALRB's backlog of cases stood at 904, compared with 392 a year earlier. Waldie, who like the other four ALRB members is a Brown appointee, says that "delays . . . accrue to the advantage of the employer. Employees begin to believe the union is ineffective, and you have effectively disparaged the union."

1983 McGraw-Hill, Inc., Business Week, September 26, 1983

Governor Deukmejian also appointed David Stirling, a former Republican state legislator, as the agency's general counsel, the lawyer who decides which cases come before the board for a decision. As a legislator, Stirling supported grower-backed bills aimed at watering down the law, and as general counsel he has vowed that the ALRB will "no longer be the tool of one side to disputes." Stirling says he will make the agency "impartial, efficient, and balanced." But the UFW, which is fighting Stirling's confirmation by the California Senate, contends that his actions belie his words. He has stripped the ALRB's four regional directors of their power to issue complaints. He is taking an average of 51 days to process cases vs. 31 days for his predecessor. And he has resolved 47 cases in the first four months of his tenure, compared with the 104 cases closed in the same period a year ago.

Stirling has already ordered a review of the formulas used to arrive at make-whole remedies. In a case involving a grower called Ranch No. 1, he tried to reduce a previously negotiated make-whole settlement of about \$400,000 to \$218,000 before the board rejected his recommendation. The changed political climate also is having a marked effect on ALRB decisions. The board gave up an

attempt in April to strip Stirling of most of his authority after Deukmejian threatened to veto the agency's entire budget for next year. In a move that insiders think reflects attempts to avoid more such pressure, the board recently

reversed the Bertuccio verdict, finding in a similar case that crop-planting
1983 McGraw-Hill, Inc., Business Week, September 26, 1983

plans "generally" are "not subject to the collective-bargaining process."

ELECTORAL WATERLOO. By increasing the leverage of growers, these changes will

make it harder for the UFW to win generous settlements. They could also make

organizing more difficult for the 104,000-member union. Mechanization, more

competition from Florida and Texas, last year's heavy winter rains, and influxes

of both illegal immigrants and unemployed workers from the Northeast have made

jobs scarce. At the UFW's Salinas office, 1,700 members are on a waiting list for jobs. The union has also been unable to organize 250,000 nonunion

California

farmworkers or to organize in other agricultural states.

The UFW is reacting by flexing its own muscle. It contributed about \$750,000 to state candidates last year. It has launched a \$1 million direct-mail campaign to strengthen its boycott of Lucky Stores Inc., which sells nonunion Bruce Church Inc. lettuce. And the union is making contingency plans for more boycotts as a means of organizing or winning contract gains if the ALRB is weakened further. Already, violence has erupted among striking members of other

unions in the carrot, tomato, and cantaloupe industries after they were replaced

by other workers.

Attempts by growers to further weaken the ALRB could get a boost if the state

supreme court permits a special reapportionment election in December.

Some

political analysts predict an electoral Waterloo for the Democrats if the

1983 McGraw-Hill, Inc., Business Week, September 26, 1983

Republican-drawn districts are approved. Even if the law remains unchanged, Deukmejian can name his first ALRB member in January, and by 1986 the majority

of the board will be his appointees. "It looks pretty bleak," says the

26-year-old Chavez, head of the UFW's legislative branch. "We're back to the

situation we were in the 60s and 70s."

July 31, 1983, Sunday, Late City Final Edition

SECTION: Section 1; Part 1; Page 20, Column 1; National Desk

LENGTH: 1309 words

HEADLINE: CHAVEZ AND FARM WORKERS ADAPT TACTICS TO THE TIMES

BYLINE: By ROBERT LINDSEY, Special to the New York Times

DATELINE: SALINAS, Calif., July 30

BODY:

More than 20 years after he began his struggle to unionize the fields of the Southwest, Cesar Chavez is trying to restore the momentum of the United Farm Workers.

Growers and California Republican leaders are trying to reduce the power of the union, which is suffering from internal dissent and a growth rate that has
The New York Times, July 31, 1983

leveled off. In the face of all this, Mr. Chavez is reverting to his earliest and most successful tactic, the consumer boycott, updated with tools of the modern political campaign. He is also seeking to consolidate the union's role as the most influential Hispanic political force in this state.

What union officers call their new "high-tech consumer boycott" is directed against Lucky Stores Inc., the nation's third-largest supermarket chain, in an effort to force it to stop selling a brand of lettuce produced in the Salinas Valley by nonunion workers employed by Bruce Church Inc.

Store Chain Resists Boycott

Officials of Lucky Stores say they have been resisting efforts by Mr. Chavez since November 1979 to persuade them to stop selling the lettuce, because they believe it is inappropriate to take sides in such a labor-management dispute.

"If you give in to one, you have to ask a serious question: where does it

end?" James W. Koerlin, an executive of the company, said in an interview. He said the boycott had had no appreciable effect on sales.

The boycott campaign is headed by Richard Ross, 33 years old, the son of migrant farm workers. Mr. Ross said in an interview that 13 years ago he was
The New York Times, July 31, 1983

dismissed as a field hand by Bruce Church Inc. After finishing college, he became a successful political consultant to Democrats in Sacramento.

"Cesar told me, 'I can't afford to pay you,' " Mr. Ross said in an interview. Remembering the day he was dismissed, Mr. Ross said he answered:
"You don't have to. I just want to be in the room on the day they sign a contract."

Computerized Analyses Used

Mr. Ross said the campaign was initially directed at 13 Lucky outlets but was being expanded to 45. The heart of the current campaign, he said, is the use of computerized demographic analyses to choose consumers whose ethnic background and other characteristics make them likely to participate in a boycott. They are sent carefully written appeals, and the mailings are followed by opinion polls to determine if they are having the desired effect. If necessary, the appeals are then rewritten.

"I told Cesar the old days of Xeroxed leaflets were over," Mr. Ross said. "The kids that used to march in parades against the Vietnam war are now driving BMW's and going out for Sunday brunch. You've got to do something different."

The New York Times, July 31, 1983

Grower Cites Union's Politics

Michael Payne, an executive at Bruce Church here, said his company's dispute "has nothing to do with economics - it's over who will control the work force."

He said his company paid field workers a minimum of \$6.69 an hour, based on

piecemeal rates, and an average of \$9.50 hourly. Along with other growers, he said the company objected to a standard provision in U.F.W. contracts allowing the union to take a job away from any worker not in "good standing" with the union. He said such workers in the past had refused to pay into the union's political action fund or otherwise opposed union directives.

"The U.F.W. is not a union," Mr. Payne said. "It's a political movement in which Chavez has latched on to the workers of the 'ag' community and confiscated their resources to get political power."

A Family With Power

Mr. Chavez denies such allegations, but he and his family remain a potent political force. Last weekend Mr. Chavez's eldest son, Fernando, a 33-year-old San Jose lawyer, was elected president of the Mexican-American Political Association. The defeated incumbents said his victory was engineered by the United Farm Workers. The incumbents had been seeking to reduce the association's traditional alliance with the Democratic Party and make it more bipartisan at a time when politicians were paying increasing attention to the state's growing Hispanic population.

The New York Times, July 31, 1983

Julio Calderon, who lost the presidency by 22 votes, said in an interview that a few weeks before the convention union checks were used to pay dues for more than 440 new members of the 2,200-member organization.

Fernando Chavez denied he was a "front man" for his father or the United Farm Workers. Friends confirmed that he had a reputation for being independent of his father.

21-Year Organizing Effort

21-Year Organizing Effort

Cesar Chavez claims credit for substantially improving the lot of farm workers since he began trying to organize them in 1962. He started out in this state, but he has also made efforts, with limited success, in Texas and Arizona. In 1975 the union was granted official sanction when the California Legislature

passed the country's first collective bargaining act for farm laborers.

The New York Times, July 31, 1983

Since then, the average hourly wage of those covered by U.F.W. contracts has increased to more than \$6 from about \$2. Last month, in the agricultural San Joaquin Valley, the union established the first of what it says will be a network of radio stations to carry its message to Spanish-speaking farm workers in the state and, if necessary, to arouse support for U.F.W. strikes and boycotts and for the candidates it favors.

Despite its gains, the union has failed to make inroads into the many parts of California's vast agricultural industry where workers barely average \$3.50 an hour, industry and union sources agree. The union has had other problems as well.

Asian Refugees Cause Tension

In the San Joaquin Valley, long an organizing goal of the union, refugees from Southeast Asia are causing new tensions by offering to work for less than the immigrants from Mexico who for years have worked in the California fields.

Many of the stronger leaders of the union from its early days have left after breaking with Mr. Chavez. Nine elected officials here have sued Mr. Chavez, charging he dismissed them unlawfully after they resisted his policies.

The New York Times, July 31, 1983

After the union responded by filing a slander and libel suit against these dissidents, 361 U.F.W. members filed a countersuit in Federal District Court, charging that the union had violated the officers' rights to free speech.

Meanwhile, the rising cost of farm labor that the union has brought about has accelerated development of mechanical harvesting equipment and caused the loss of hundreds of thousands of farm jobs over the last decade.

New Legislative Alliances

Since the departure from government last January of Gov. Edmund G. Brown Jr., a staunch supporter of the union, Mr. Chavez has formed an alliance with Democratic leaders of the State Legislature, to whom the union last year contributed more than \$700,000. The money came from a fund raised by deducting one day's pay annually from each of its 100,000 members, according to the union.

Fulfilling a campaign promise, Gov. George Deukmejian, the Republican who succeeded Mr. Brown, took 25 percent out of the budget of the board that enforces the agricultural collective bargaining act.

It was a setback for the union. But because of the alliance formed by Mr. Chavez with Democrats Willie Brown Jr., the Speaker of the Assembly, and David

The New York Times, July 31, 1983

Roberti, president pro tem of the Senate, few politicians expect legislation to be passed that would trim the union's power.

HEADLINE: Cesar Chavez takes on a supermarket chain

BYLINE: By TIMOTHY ELLEDGE

DATELINE: SAN FRANCISCO

BODY:

Cesar Chavez and his United Farm Workers are gearing up to do battle with the Lucky Stores supermarket chain in what he says will be the union's biggest boycott fight since the grape wars of the 1960s.

United Press International July 17, 1983, Sunday, BC cycle

The campaign against Lucky has three features that are seen by the company as particularly alarming.

-It is a highly sophisticated effort, with \$1 million to be spent on professional media services.

-Chavez is using it to determine to what extent he can mobilize the Hispanic community in California, a power that would have extensive political implications.

-The goal is not merely to get union lettuce into Lucky markets, but to "seriously damage" the company.

At issue is Lucky's refusal to stop buying lettuce from Bruce Church Co., a Salinas Valley producer that the UFW claims has refused to negotiate a contract with the union.

Lucky, which operates 1,600 stores in 29 states, says the boycott is "unfair."

Spokesman James Koerlin said only a few Lucky stores carry Church's "Red Coach" brand lettuce and it would "create chaos if the company agreed to United Press International July 17, 1983, Sunday, BC cycle

stop buying products from everybody Cesar Chavez disagrees with." In the late 1960s, Chavez led a nationwide grape boycott that forced major growers to recognize his union. Strikes and boycotts against lettuce growers in the 1970s resulted in successes and failures, as with the Bruce Church farms.

A Bruce Church spokesman defended the company's treatment of employees, noting their average wages are higher than UFW workers get and they have had a pension plan "since long before the union's went into effect."

Chavez, charismatic founder and longtime leader of the UFW, said the boycott will give the union its first crack at using sophisticated new tactics to win public support for its cause.

"In the past we always used real basic methods in our fights," Chavez said. "We'd go door-to-door. We'd hold rallies. We'd picket, leaflet, try to get media attention. All those things.

"This time we're trying something new. We've got demographics and statistics people and professional direct mail experts. There's a team of people specially trained over the last year and a half for this one."

United Press International July 17, 1983, Sunday, BC cycle

The boycott will go beyond trying to persuade shoppers not to buy lettuce from Lucky, Chavez said. "We want to seriously damage the company's image," he said.

Bruce Church spokesman Mike Payne said the company doesn't object to negotiating a union contract but "Chavez has been unreasonable. He's gone from trying to improve conditions to building an empire. He wants absolute hiring and firing control and he wants union control of all pension and benefit plans."

Lucky's Koerlin said that while the boycott is just beginning, the union has for nearly four years "harassed" the company and its customers in attempts to "coerce" them into refusing to buy Red Coach lettuce.

"But this is something different," he said. "This is a two-year program with \$1 million earmarked to discredit and impugn the company."

Some Chavez' supporters from previous campaigns are worried about the new tactics and goals.

A memo from the UFW president to the union's board was turned over to Lucky by a Catholic activist priest, who said he was giving Lucky the copy "in the interests of fair play," Koerlin said.

United Press International July 17, 1983, Sunday, BC cycle

In the memo Chavez said: "While some members of the Board have questioned the wisdom of allocating up to \$1 million directed at one supermarket, I want to remind you that this program is part of a campaign to mobilize the Hispanic community ... in a way that has never been tried before."

Chavez said the "primary purpose ... is to alter the store's corporate image by associating something negative with Lucky in the eyes of most Hispanic consumers (also among white liberals, Jews, blacks and union families)."

The \$1 million is necessary, he said, because "we cannot continue to battle our opponents in the 1980s with the strategies and technologies of the 1930s.

"While we will not abandon our time-honored tactics of picketing and leafletting, we must also incorporate the new technologies in our boycott campaigns."

Part of Chavez's plans went askew in June, however, when television stations throughout California refused to sell UFW time to air union-produced commercials.

"I don't know why they refused to sell us time," Chavez said. "They've never explained it to us. We went to every major station in the state. They
United Press International July 17, 1983, Sunday, BC cycle

all turned us down."

TV advertising spokesmen said the spots were refused because they attacked "a specific company" and were potentially libelous.

DATELINE: SACRAMENTO

BODY:

A state hearing officer said Monday that Bruce Church, Inc., one of the nation's largest lettuce growers, failed to bargain in good faith with the United Farm Workers Union during the 1979 lettuce strike.

Administrative law officer James Woltman said he advised the Agricultural Labor Relations Board to require the grower to compensate workers for as-yet-unspecified losses.

United Press International May 17, 1982, Monday, BC cycle

Mike Payne of Bruce Church, Inc., said it was "likely" the company would appeal the decision to the ALRB. Otherwise it would be final.

If Church does appeal, it could take the board eight months to a year before final action on Woltman's 128-page decision, which was reached after hearings from February to June 1981.

Chris Hartmire, an aide of UFW leader Cesar Chavez, said the union received notice Saturday of the decision.

"Bad faith means that in negotiation, once the union is certified, the company never really intended to reach an agreement," Hartmire said.

"In this case, the administrative law officer concluded the company never accepted the UFW as the representative of the workers and has essentially refused to bargain on key issues in the contract including security, the medical plan and pension plan."

If the ALRB upholds Woltman's findings, it could impose the "make-whole" remedy whereby the grower would be required to pay back wages and other economic lossess to all employees who would have been involved in a union contract.

United Press International May 17, 1982, Monday, BC cycle

That would amount to the difference between what workers earned at the time of the bad faith violation and at least until the beginning of the hearing process last year.

"Potentially millions of dollars are involved since this dispute goes back to 1979," Hartmire said.

The UFW won a union election in January 1976, but certification was delayed until December 1977. The UFW struck Bruce Church, Inc., in February 1979 as part of a lettuce strike in the Salinas and Imperial valleys that ended with renegotiated contracts with most growers. A boycott began against Church's Red Coach lettuce in September 1979.

Bruce Church farms in Arizona and throughout California, including the Imperial Valley, the central coast and the Salinas Valley.

Employment is about 1,200, with seasonal variations, but the ALRB will need to hold further hearings to determine the number affected if the grower is required to pay compensation. Church also may be ordered to reinstate workers whose jobs were taken by others while they were on strike, Woltman said.

HEADLINE: Settlement in 8-Month Lettuce Strike

BODY:

Cesar Chavez' United Farm Workers union and Sun Harvest Inc., the nation's

biggest producer of iceberg lettuce, reached a tentative contract agreement Aug. 31, ending an eight-month strike. [See p. 327A1]

The union immediately called off a national boycott of Chiquita bananas and other products made by United Brands, Sun Harvest's parent company.

The settlement called for an immediate increase in the hourly rate to \$5 from \$3.70, and an increase in the piece rate to 75 cents from 57 cents. The contract also provided additional increases of 70 cents in the hourly wage in the second and third years, as well as cost-of-living increases.

Sun Harvest was one of six growers in California's Salinas Valley that had been struck in January following a similar job action against 11 growers in the Imperial Valley in Southern California. (The Salinas Valley firms were selected because they were owned by six of the Imperial Valley growers.)

The Sun Harvest settlement came only weeks after Chavez had warned that the union was fighting for its survival because of the bitter, costly and violence-marred strike.

(Several persons had been hospitalized and 50 were arrested June 11 when 1,400 strikers clashed with nonunion harvest crews. Vandalism followed later that week after a further breakdown in negotiations.)

The growers, which were united in resisting the union's demands, had been able to harvest most of their spring and summer lettuce crops.

Ironically, the breakthrough came in late July when the Teamsters, the UFW's rival in organizing farm workers, signed a contract with another Salinas Valley lettuce grower.

That settlement, raising the hourly wage to about \$5, established a new going arte in the area and broke the growers' united stand against the strikers.

By mid-September, the UFW had reached similar contract agreements with four smaller vegetable growers in the Salinas Valley, but remained on strike against

most of the big lettuce growers in the Salinas and Imperial Valleys.

Brown Vetoes Anti-UFW Bill -- California's Gov. Edmund G. (Jerry) Brown Jr.

(D) September 7 vetoed a bill passed by the legislature that was aimed at

limiting the UFW's power. [See 1975, p. 398E3]

The bill, an amendment to state Farm Labor Relations Act of 1975, which had passed the state Senate the same day on a bare majority vote of 21-14, would have prevented the union from firing a member for any reason other than nonpayment of dues or initiation fees.

The UFW currently had the power to expel a member for failure to contribute to a political action fund or to donate an equal amount to charity, for crossing a picket line during a strike or for slandering the union.

Expulsion from the union could mean loss of a job for any worker employed at a farm with a union-shop contract.

The Washington Post

September 16, 1979, Sunday, Final Edition

First Section; A1

2768 words

Doubts Raised By Transcript of Dismissed Case;
Transcript Raises Doubts About Dismissal of Case

By Lou Cannon and Carl Cannon, Washington Post Staff Writers; Paula Kriner of the San Diego Union contributed to this article.

EL CENTRO, Calif.

BODY:

Last February, in a lettuce field near this desert town just above the Mexican border, a striking farmworker named Rufino Contreras trespassed and was shot to death.

The killing came at a critical time in the Imperial Valley lettuce strike. It drew national attention and it sparked demands for justice from Cesar

Chavez' United Farm Workers. But 2 1/2 months later, when the strike and the attention had moved elsewhere, murder and assault charged against three men accused of the killing were unexpectedly dismissed.

At no time, however, has the case been dismissed in the minds of the Contreras family -- Rufino's widow Rosa, his brother Luis, his father Lorenzo. Now their concern is shared by others who have examined a recently prepared transcript of the preliminary hearing in El Centro Municipal Court, where the dismissal occurred.

... on strictly legal grounds, now acknowledges that Kimball's attitude helped influence the outcome. Asked whether the lack of argument was significant, the judge replied: "That helped -- the D.A. didn't care."

Interviewed here in his small, air-conditioned chambers on a 107-degree day, the judge said that Kimball's lack of enthusiasm for further prosecution had to be taken into consideration.

"He [Kimball] didn't actually say, publicly, in front of the defense lawyers, that he wanted the charges dismissed, but he let it be known," Lehnhardt said. "He wasn't ready to take that stance publicly. It had to be me." The judge would not specifically confirm or deny that he and the prosecutor reached their understanding in chambers, but he made it known that on the crucial point of dismissal, communication between them was unmistakably clear.

El Centro, the hub of a fertile, agricultural valley where most of the nation's winter iceberg lettuce is grown, was torn with labor strife at the time of the Contreras shooting. Growers claimed that their non-union workers were targets of UFW intimidation. Using mass picketing techniques and sometimes driving workers from fields, the union brought production at several of Imperial County's largest lettuce operations to a near standstill.

The conflict was at its height on Feb. 10 when Contreras, a 27-year-old Mexican farm worker described by those who knew him as quiet and gentle, entered a lettuce field owned by Mario Saikhon, considered by the UFW to be among the most anti-union of the growers.

Most of the fields where crews were harvesting at the time were guarded by Imperial County sheriff's officers. But on Feb. 10, most of Sheriff Oren R. Fox's deputies were 20 miles away, trying to head off a violent confrontation at another field. Fox says the growers had assured him on the night of Feb. 9 that there would be no work in the Saikhon field the next day.

On the day of the shooting, 40 pickets, some of them armed with sticks and clubs and shouting cries of "scab, scab," in Spanish and English, crossed into the Saikhon fields with the evident purpose of chasing off three harvest crews comprised mostly of Filipino and Anglo workers. Entering from the southwest corner of the field, they ran north along the lettuce rows. Contreras and five others were in front of the main body of pickets, Shots rang out. Contreras took a bullet in the head, just beneath his right eye. He fell face downward, his body sprawled across three rows of lettuce.

After the shooting, angry strikers clustered around the edge of the field, demanding the arrest of three men they said had fired at them from separate locations. Fox and his men rushed to the scene. By the end of the day the sheriff's department had ...

... organizers in Imperial County have been suspicious of a local government they regard as grower-dominated. Law enforcement here has been viewed similarly by more militant elements of the Mexican community. Local law officers, they say, are always ready to break a strike or put down a demonstration.

This attitude has softened in recent years. Sheriff Fox, who has a reputation for even-handedness, was elected in 1978 with significant Mexican-American support.

Even today, however, Public Defender Cognata says that no UFW member arraigned in court against local farming interests has any hope of receiving a fair trial.

"This is a small county," he said. "Everybody's relating to the farming interests in one way or the other."

Cognata is so convinced of the difficulty of obtaining a fair trial here that he automatically requests a change of venue for all Mexican farm worker clients charged with strike-related offenses.

This year some of the old bitterness between Anglos and Mexicans was rekindled by the early success of the lettuce strike, now in its ninth month. In the past, growers had little trouble breaking Imperial County farm strikes because of the reservoir of available Mexican labor just across the border. This year, however, the overwhelming majority of Mexican workers, whether UFW members or not, heeded Cesar Chavez' plea and refused to help growers break the strike.

This new-found Mexican solidarity symbolizes the growing economic and political strength of the farm workers that some hope will be brought to bear

The Washington Post, September 16, 1979

in the Contreras case and lead to a reopening of the investigation into the farm worker's death.

"While people are thinking it's ended [the Contreras case] I don't think it has," says Carlos Alcala, a Harvard-trained UFW lawyer from Salinas.

Alcala has filed a complaint with the California Agricultural Labor Relations Board, alleging "that in killing Rufino Contreras, the Saikhon Corp. violated the rights of Rufino and the others to organize." Alcala anticipates that the board will take up the matter, issue subpoenas and hold a hearing. A board spokesman would say only that the case is under investigation.

While the U.S. Justice Department has maintained that it lacks jurisdiction, the FBI recently completed a confidential preliminary inquiry into the shooting that was turned over to the department's civil rights division. Last Thursday, U.S. Sen. Harrison Williams (D-N.J.), who as chairman of the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee heard testimony on the Contreras shooting during a Salinas hearing last April, asked the Justice Department to review the seven-volume transcript of the preliminary hearing.

Williams' request came in a letter to Attorney General Benjamin Civiletti, who promised in a recent Washington speech to the National Council of La Raza Unida, a Mexican-American political group, that the Justice Department no longer will ignore allegations of civil rights violations just because state or local agencies are investigating.

The Economist

September 15, 1979

California;
Storm in a salad bowl

SAN FRANCISCO

BODY:

Eight months ago the proposal that the lowliest farm workers, those wielding a hoe in lettuce and broccoli fields or stooped double to pick strawberries, should be paid over \$5 an hour brought hoots of derision from growers and widespread scepticism from most other Californians. Such workers were thought lucky to be getting the \$3.70 an hour guaranteed three years ago by the first labour contracts ever won for seasonal farm workers.

But \$5 an hour is just what the United Farm Workers, under Mr Cesar Chavez, have finally won in the first new contracts to be negotiated since Californian field strikes began last January. Although some 30 big lettuce and vegetable growers have not yet signed the agreement, and only five vineyards have made new three-year commitments, the nation's biggest lettuce grower, Sun Harvest, a subsidiary of United Brands, agreed to the \$5 contract last week. At least another 71 cents will be added over the next two years, with further sums to keep abreast of cost-of-living increases. In three years the field hands could be earning \$6.15 an hour.

The Washington Post

August 14, 1979, Tuesday, Final Edition

UFW Settles a Contract
SALINAS, Calif.

BODY:

California's largest tomato grower agreed to the United Farm Workers' most liberal contract in history as a UFW strike against lettuce growers neared the eight-month mark, a union spokesman said.

Meyer Tomato Co. of King City agreed to a three-year contract after negotiating independently of other growers, said UFW spokesman Marc Grossman.

The pact still must be ratified by union members.

The Washington Post

August 13, 1979, Monday, Final Edition

First Section; A3

216 words

UFW Convention Cheers Call for Expanded Strike

From News Services

SALINAS, Calif., Aug. 12, 1979

BODY:

United Farm Workers President Cesar Chavez called today for an expanded strike against California vegetable growers, amid grower claims that an eight-month strike against 11 lettuce firms has been a flop.

Chavez said the 13-year-old union faces its "greatest test," but stopped short of declaring a general strike against the 20 California vegetable growers where the UFW has strike authorization.

Speaking at a rally Saturday with Gov. Edmund G. Brown Jr. at his side, Chavez said he would ask the UFW convention here for "total mobilization for the extension of the strike...."

Actress Jane Fonda told Chavez and cheering farm workers that she would mobilize support for the union's boycott of certain grower products in an upcoming 50-city tour.

Chavez, who has been on a water-only fast, said he felt "pretty weak." Asked when he would end his fast, begun a week ago for "love and patience" in the strike, he said, "We'll let the spirit tell us."

An expanded strike could affect - corn, strawberries and peppers as well as lettuce.

UFW members are now paid \$3.70 an hour. The union has sought increases to \$5.25 an hour by the third year of the contract. The companies' latest offer Friday was \$5 an hour, plus improved fringe benefits. The UFW rejected the offer.

The Washington Post

August 12, 1979, Sunday, Final Edition

First Section; Around the Nation; A5

107 words

UFW Plans to Extend Strike

From news services and staff reports

SALINAS, Calif.

BODY:

Cesar Chavez, weakened by a fast but buoyed by 12,000 cheering supporters at the end of a 12-day march, said yesterday the United Farm Workers union would extend its strike to all vegetable farms where its contracts have expired or are due to expire.

Chavez, who marched the final mile with Gov. Edmund G. Brown Jr. at his side, called the latest contract offer by growers "unreasonable" and said he would ask for financial support at the UFW convention today to mobilize and support an extended strike.

So far, the UFW has authorization to strike 15 farms in addition to six already being struck in Salinas and the Imperial valley.

The Washington Post

June 12, 1979, Tuesday, Final Edition

First Section; Around the Nation; A11

60 words

Lettuce Workers Clash

From news services and staff reports

SALINAS, Calif.

BODY:

Several people were hospitalized, one with stab wounds, and least 75 were arrested in a clash between more than 1,400 striking lettuce workers and harvesting crews in the Salinas Valley.

It was the first seious outbreak of violence in several weeks in the

five-month strike by Cesar Chavez's United Farm Workers union against six large lettuce growers.

The Washington Post

June 7, 1979, Thursday, Final Edition

Business & Finance; D5

530 words

Way Cleared for Arizona To Use Farm Labor Law

By Morton Mintz, Washington Post Staff Writer

BODY:

In a sharp setback to Cesar Chavez's United Farm Workers National Union, The Supreme Court has cleared the way for Arizona to enforce a law that the UFW had denounced as the "brainchild" of the state's fruit and vegetable growers and more harmful than no law at all.

The law was found by a panel of three federal judges in April 1978 to be "unconstitutional in its entirety," because five key provisions couldn't be separated from the rest of the statute.

But the Supreme Court ruled 9 to 0 Tuesday that the constitutional requirement that litigation involve a true "case or controversy" hadn't been met by two of the provisions.

... courts had resolved certain important questions of the state law.

One of the provisions was intended to prevent union-instigated consumer boycotts by making it an unfair labor practice for a union to discourage consumers from buying any agricultural product with the use of "dishonest, untruthful and deceptive publicity."

The other provision imposed criminal penalties for violations of the law.

The court was unanimous as to the consumer-publicity provision. But, Justices William J. Brennan Jr. and Thurgood Marshall parted company from the majority as to the criminal penalties.

The court again was unanimous as to the fifth provision, which specified procedures for the election of employe-bargaining representatives.

In the opinion for th court, Justice Byron R. White wrote that this was the only provision that was properly before the panel.

The panel concluded that the election scheme severly curtailed employes' freedom of association rights under the first Amendment with various delays and technical limitations on who may vote in unit elections.

But even if the scheme allows workers to compel their employers to negotiate in "an assertedly niggardly fashion," White said, the complaint is one "for the Arizona Legislature and not the federal courts."

The decision is expected to influence efforts being made in other states to make it nearly impossible for the UFW to organize.

Arizona has between 30,000 and 40,000 farm workers, most of them migrants.
The National Labor Relations Act doesn't cover farm workers.

Under the state law, the UFW says, workers and unions covered by it petitioned for only seven elections in five years. By contrast, under a California farm-worker law they petitioned for nearly 400 elections in the first five months following enactment.

In the decision for the unanimous panel, Judge C. A. Muecke wrote that it prevents the workers from organizing "to exercise their right of freedom of speech and assembly" under the First Amendment. Together with other provisions, he said, this results in "a complete perversion" of the intent claimed by the legislature in enacting the law.

U.S. News & World Report

May 28, 1979

SECTION: Labor; Pg. 60

LENGTH: 920 words

HEADLINE: A Lettuce Strike Takes Unusual Turn

BODY:

What began last January as a strike by West Coast lettuce pickers has escalated into a national controversy over the government's policy toward illegal Mexican workers.

United Farm Workers President Cesar Chavez, whose union has picketed 11 major lettuce growers for four months, claims the walkout is being prolonged by the government's failure to stop illegal aliens from working in the lettuce fields. He estimates that 80 to 90 percent of the strikebreakers are not legal U.S. residents.

Moreover, Chavez claims that illegal strikebreakers have prevented his union

from expanding into Texas, Florida and other states with labor-intensive farming. "If we ever get the government to enforce the law," he says, "our expansion could be pretty rapid."

The Washington Post

May 25, 1979, Friday, Final Edition

First Section; A11

511 words

Adventures of a Lettuce 'Strike-Breaker'

By Helen Dewar, Washington Post Staff Writer

BODY:

Defying risk of arrest as an illegal alien, a 24-year-old Mexican farm worker told a Senate committee yesterday how he was recruited as a "strike-breaker" for the California lettuce fields.

His testimony, translated from Spanish as he went along, was delivered against a backdrop of continuing recriminations between the United Farm Workers and the Carter administration. At issue are illegal aliens who allegedly are being used to break the UFW's four-month-old lettuce strike.

The Washington Post

April 29, 1979, Sunday, Final Edition

First Section; A7

1234 words

Chavez's Lettuce Walkout Is Wilting;
Heavy Economic Pressure Is Affecting Striking Harvest Workers; Some Are Defecting

By Lou Cannon, Washington Post Staff Writer

SALINAS, Calif., April 28, 1979

BODY:

Chavez still hopes for a separate bargaining agreement with Sun Harvest, the nation's largest lettuce producer, that would set a generous pattern for farm labor contracts. The worrisome alternative is a summerlong strike that could put the very existence of the militant UFW in jeopardy.

"It's a big risk," says Marshall Ganz, the UFW strike leader. "We've got to win this strike."

The UFW's chances of winning may depend less on what happens in the lettuce fields than on a national ice-berg lettuce boycott, which Chavez announced here last Thursday, and on a related union boycott of Chiquita bananas.

The boycotts are directed against United Brands, the New York-based parent company of Sun Harvest. They are intended to put United Brands at a competitive disadvantage with Castle and Cooke Foods, a rival conglomerate.

Castle and Cooke owns Dole bananas, the chief rival to the Chiquita brand, and Bud Antle lettuce, one of Sun Harvest's main competitors.

Since Bud Antle has a Teamster contract, it will be exempted from the lettuce boycott and stands to make huge profits throughout the strike. The strategy of the UFW is aimed at convincing United Brands, whose single most profitable product is Chiquita bananas that it will lose more from the combined boycotts than by yielding to the 41 percent pay increase the union is seeking.

Even within the union, however, there is some concern that the UFW may be unable to duplicate earlier boycott efforts against lettuce and table grapes. The banana boycott committees have been slow to get organized, and the task of what the union calls "political education" is more .

The Washington Post

April 27, 1979, Friday, Final Edition

First Section; A18

611 words

Chavez Employs Senate Hearing To Urge National Lettuce Boycott

By Lou Cannon, Washington Post Staff Writer

SALINAS, Calif., April 26, 1979

BODY:

Most of the growers in the fertile Salinas Valley, which produces four-fifths of the nation's summer crop of iceberg lettuce, boycotted the hearing of the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee. The one-man hearing was conducted by Committee Chairman Sen. Harrison A. Williams (D-N.J.), a long-time supporter of the farm labor movement.

Growers held a rival press conference two doors away from the community college auditorium where Williams was taking testimony from Chavez.

The growers, who felt they would have been unable to get a fair hearing before Williams, claimed that the UFW is systematically violating the rights of farm workers who do not want to join the union.

Williams called the boycott of his two-day hearing an irresponsible tactic that he said prevented a dialogue that might lead to a solution of the bitter lettuce strike. The three-month-old walkout has spread across three southwestern states and now centers in Salinas.

The California Agricultural Labor Relations Board, which growers consider strongly pro-Chavez, found earlier this week that the 28 struck companies were not bargaining in good faith.

There was no common ground today on Chavez's charge that the growers and the immigration service are engaged in a conspiracy to provide illegal workers for the struck fields.

Donald C. Day, assistant commissioner of the U.S. Border Patrol, disputed the charges and said the patrol is arresting illegal workers on truck farms. He complained that his agency is hampered by lack of manpower and by court rulings that a "foreign appearance by itself is not enough to enable an officer to question about citizenship."

The growers said they are not knowingly hiring illegal immigrants. They said

that they are trying to recruit Mexican workers with legal "green cards" who have worked for them in prior years.

A year ago, the growers maintained, Chavez took a different tack and insisted that illegal immigrants be employed if they were members of the UFW.

"There are as many illegal immigrant on the picket line as in the field," said Salinas grower Hal Moller.

Many of the farm workers who appeared here to cheer Chavez appeared angered by the dismissal of charges earlier this week in Imperial County against the tree grower employes who had been accused of killing Contreras.

Luis Contreras, an elder brother of the slain farm worker, said he witnessed his brother's murder and told Sen. Williams he wasn't even called to testify at the preliminary hearing before the judge dismissed all charges.

Jerry Choen, general counsel for the UFW, suggested to Williams that the Justice Department should investigate the dismissal of the charges. Chavez, however, showed no enthusiasm for the idea.

"They're not going to do anything," Chavez said. "We've had three people killed before, and Justice did nothing. What we need is a national boycott."

The Washington Post

April 22, 1979, Sunday, Final Edition

Style; M1

2697 words

Cesar Chavez's Causa;
Cesar Chavez's Causa-Meditating, Fasting, Fighting, Pleading;
In the Heat of the Day, The Farm Workers' Leader Meditates, Fasts, Fights and Pleads-Still

By Paul Hendrickson

BODY:

... cousin. The district attorney, he was jumping up and down. 'We've got to get this guy out of here,' he kept saying."

His voice drops. This is a secret. "They don't want to put me in jail any more."

Cesar Chavez grew up in Arizona, in the Gila River Valley near Yuma. The

family wasn't dirt-poor: There were horses and cows and some watermelons and lots of chickens. "It was like this," he says. "We could have had chicken three times a day, but not salt for it. You had to buy that."

There was a cool adobe house and there was love inside it. Chavez's grandfather had homesteaded the land in 1879, when he had come into the Territory as a peon from Mexico. It was all tumbleweed and mesquite and ugliness then. But the old man did what he could. And the land turned. In time, there was a harsh beauty. Fragile too, because in 1937, the property tax bill fell due and Cesar's father, Librado Chavez, couldn't pay. The county foreclosed. The farm was sold at auction. Cesar went to the fields. He was 10.

"All I knew growing up was that I was very determined," he says. "My mother always had trouble with me. I never wanted to play with anyone my own age. I was-hey, Richard, how do you call it? Caprichudo ."

"Stubborn," says Richard.

At the national Association of Farm-worker Organizations now, Cesar Chavez gets off the elevator, walks down a dark hallway. In every office are people crowding 30, wearing clothes you don't wear to Clyde's. You could blink and hope this was 1968.

Marc Grossman comes in. He does Cesar's press. He met Chavez in '69, when he was a student at U.C., Irvine. He got hooked. He will brief Chavez on his talk later today at the National Press Club.

"Castillo's at it again," he says. In his fist is a copy of the morning paper. He is talking of Leonel Castillo, head of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. Castillo denies his bureau is tolerating the illegal

entry of Mexican nationals to break the strike.

Chavez does a funny thing. He reaches down and pulls his pant leg past his knee. He absorbs himself in scratching his leg, maybe so that he doesn't have to think of Leonel Castillo, who in a sense is a blood brother.

Most UFW workers make an hourly wage of \$3.70. Chavez says that is worth \$1.84, given inflation and the cost of living. The growers say most workers actually make much more than \$3.70 because of "piece work" during harvest time. Some make \$8 and more an hour. It doesn't matter, says Chavez. "Would you be out there all ...

Copyright 1979 Reuters Ltd Reuters

April 18, 1979, Wednesday, AM cycle

441 words

Washington

BODY:

Cesar Chavez today said the Carter administration is siding with big farming corporations to break a three-month-old farmworker strike against California lettuce growers.

Mr Chavez, leader of the United Farm Workers' Union, told reporters at a National Press Club lunch that the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) has allowed lettuce growers to hire strike-breaking, illegal foreign workers. At the same time the INS enforces federal laws against union members who are illegal migrant workers, he said.

"What began as a strike to win decent wages and benefits has become a strike to save the union," Mr Chavez said. The strike involving 4,500 of California's 300,000 farm workers began on January 19 after the union's first three-year contract expired.

Mr Chavez is touring the eastern states to seek public support for a nationwide boycott of United Brands' "Chiquita" bananas and contributions for the striking workers. Sun Harvest, a subsidiary of United Brands, is the nation's largest iceberg lettuce producer.

Mr Chavez said he has tried to meet with Mr Carter or his top aides, with no success.

He said the union offered to accept wage increases within the administration's wage guideline of seven per cent, if the growers would keep prices increases to seven per cent. The growers refused the offer, he said.

Most lettuce workers earn about 3.70 dollars an hour and field workers earn 57 cents per box of lettuce they pick, Mr Chavez said.

The 11 growers affected by the strike have started a nationwide campaign against the boycott and strike, including full page advertisements in major newspapers.

Sun Harvest said in a statement that the union's pay and benefit increases would triple its labor costs.

Mr Chavez acknowledged that the UFW has reached agreement with several smaller growers at less than the amount they are seeking from the larger corporate farms.

In 1975 the union lead a successful boycott against grapes and Gallo wines enabled the farm worker movement to organize as a union in 1976, Chavez said.

"Each side of the strike would like the INS to take away the opposition, but we are trying to remain neutral," INS spokesman Verne Jervis said.

Reuters Ltd., April 18, 1979

He said the INS lacked the manpower to enforce immigration laws effectively in the interior of California. The agency's border patrol has 2,300 personnel along the Mexican and Canadian frontiers.

The Imperial Valley Vegetable Growers Association said the strike's greatest impact would be felt at the summer harvest. Lettuce plantings were expected to be far lower this spring. Although the trade association could not estimate how much.

The Washington Post

April 11, 1979, Wednesday, Final Edition

First Section; Around the Nation; A6

142 words

Farm Workers Union Sued

From news services and staff reports

LOS ANGELES

BODY:

The nation's largest lettuce grower has filed a \$275 million damage suit against Cesar Chavez's striking United Farm Workers, charging the union with trying to shut down Sun-Harvest Inc. through the use of violence.

Joe Herman, an attorney for the Salinas-based lettuce company, said the suit seeks \$25 million for alleged damages and crop losses during the 11 1/2 week strike, as well as \$250 million in punitive damages.

The Economist

March 10, 1979

California;
Lettuces of wrath

BODY:

The farmworkers strike in California, now in its sixth week, is beginning to take the course that had been feared. With the end of the winter lettuce harvest, it is moving out of the Imperial Valley, near the Mexican border, into central California's vegetable fields. The guiding force behind the strike, as behind every Californian agricultural movement for the past 13 years, is Mr Cesar Chavez, the leader of the United Farm Workers. His union has already managed to keep a quarter of the lettuce crop being harvested, rotting instead in the fields. This has brought losses of more than \$5m to 10 California growers and has sent salad prices soaring throughout the United States.

The United Farm Workers represents a particularly helpless and inarticulate workforce. It is also a new union, founded in 1975 only after tireless campaigning by Mr Chavez against both the growers and the rival claims of Teamsters union. For both these reasons, it is a union still essentially in its leader's pocket. The present strike is, more than anything, a personal crusade by Mr Chavez to promote his leadership both inside and outside California. Out of this show of strength, he hopes to increase the membership of the union from its present meagre 10% of California farmworkers.

Business Week

March 5, 1979

HEADLINE: Why Chavez needs a big win

BODY:

Cesar Chavez, unable to shake off charges of mismanagement in his United Farm Workers, badly needs a victory in the UFW'S five-week strike against California lettuce growers. Although Chavez claims the union is striking to win wage parity with industrial workers, most observers say he purposely brought on the strike in an attempt to rally the union. The UFW has faltered lately in efforts to increase members beyond its current 10% of California's farm labor force.

But with no end to the strike in sight, the Chavez strategy may be failing. Unless Chavez can win a settlement soon -- one close to the minimum 40%, one-year wage increase he is demanding -- he may lose face among farm workers, further setting back the UFW's efforts to expand both within California and into

other states such as Arizona, Florida, and Texas.

... unlike the successful grape and lettuce boycotts during the UFW's early organizing drives, a boycott today would be unable to drum up much support for unionized lettuce workers, now among the highest-paid agricultural workers. "Chavez won't be able to rally the troops for this one," argues one company insider.

Unusual tactics

Under terms of the 29 UFW lettuce contracts that expired early this year, workers earn a minimum of \$3.70 an hour, with the majority averaging \$6 to \$10

an hour, including piece-work pay. Although Chavez settled most 1978 labor contracts for a 7% wage increase or less, he is asking the lettuce companies for a 40% to 85% gain, plus corresponding boosts in fringe benefits and such amenities as air-conditioned tractors. "This strike is our first chance to catch up to what industrial workers are making," says Chavez. As evidence that

Chavez wanted a strike, critics cite the fact that he engaged in sporadic bargaining with the growers -- and only after the contracts had expired and a strike was certain. He then took the unusual step of publishing his demands in local newspapers.

A defeat in the lettuce strike would compound the union's problems.

Workers

at four farms voted out the UFW last year, the first such decertification elections under California's four-year-old farm labor law. Although the union

has appealed the results of three of these elections, more decertification votes are expected. Union dissidents claim the UFW has been lax in pursuing contracts

at more than 100 farms at which it is certified. Some of these growers have gone for more than a year without any contact with the union. Other complaints

center on the union's alleged slowness in processing grievances against employers, and on its unique requirement that all members donate one day's pay

to its political fund.

1979 McGraw-Hill, Inc., Business Week, March 5, 1979

Such UFW troubles are welcomed by some California growers as a sign the union is losing ground. "If Cesar doesn't deliver the big settlement the promised, the UFW is all through as a union in California," says Frederick J. Heringer, president of the California Farm Bureau Federation, a grower trade group. But other Californians fear that a weaker UFW will mean a return to the farm labor violence that once plagued the state. The Imperial Valley strike has already led to the death of the striker and numerous injuries on both sides. Says one labor lawyer, "If the strike isn't settled soon, we are going to see a lot more blood in the Fields."
Newsweek

March 5, 1979, UNITED STATES EDITION

Cesar's Lettuce Strike

MERRILL SHEILS with STRYKER McGUIRE in the Imperial Valley

BODY:

Just before dawn, hundreds of striking United Farm Workers massed in the streets of Calexico, a small border town in California's Imperial Valley. Then, toward mid-morning, they piled into cars and pickup trucks and headed north toward a field where strikebreakers were harvesting a lettuce grower's crop. For two hours, the farm workers confronted a battalion of lawmen recruited from as far away as Yuma, Ariz. - and when the tear gas finally cleared, two deputy sheriffs and three workers had been injured.

Last week, the United Farm Workers' strike against California lettuce growers entered its second month, and emotions were higher than ever. Already, the strike has produced one death: UFW member Rufino Contreras, 28, was shot two weeks ago when he and fellow workers marched into a field being harvested by nonunion labor. Cesar Chavez, president of the UFW, is using that incident as a rallying point for public support. "When Rufino asked for a just salary and to share in the profits of his work," Chavez told the 7,000 mourners at Contreras's

funeral, "the company responded with a bullet."

... officials maintain, that would still pay UFW members less than other lettuce workers. But most of the union's 3,000 members do not receive hourly wages; they are paid instead according to piece rates - roughly 30 cents per dozen heads picked. UFW negotiators are also seeking a 50 per cent increase in piece rates. Also, they want employers to jack up their contributions to fringe-benefit programs - in the case of pensions, from the equivalent of 1.5 per cent to 6 per cent of a worker's gross pay.

Double Jeopardy: The lettuce growers contend that these demands translate into an over-all increase of nearly 200 per cent. So far, their most generous offer has been an 11 per cent boost that would bring the hourly wage to \$4.12 - a proposal the UFW has rejected out of hand. The growers also suggest that Chavez may be hurting his workers by preventing them from moving the lettuce out of the fields. "The union is not just striking at the height of the lettuce-harvesting season, they're striking during the peak of the planting season for other crops," argues Tom Hubbard, 36, a harvester in the Imperial Valley. "The workers are going to suffer twice because of this strike."

If so, Chavez's leadership could also suffer considerably. Recently, criticism of the UFW president's policies has been mounting. Organizers in Texas and Arizona have accused Chavez of trying to quash their independent efforts to help farm workers, and a few former aides have suggested that he tolerates little dissent within union ranks.

Newsweek, March 5, 1979

But in California, Chavez's stronghold, his followers are fiercely loyal. To them, the soft-spoken, 51-year-old leader is the union. Chavez founded the UFW with \$1,000 in personal savings and nursed it through the grape, Gallo wine and lettuce boycotts that brought it nationwide recognition and support. Today, the union represents about 100,000 farm workers - most of them Mexican vegetable pickers - under its contracts. Like the rest of the UFW leadership, Chavez earns only \$10 a week in salary, and lives simply on food and in lodgings provided by the union.

Food Drives: Privately, UFW officials acknowledge that they will back down somewhat from their original demands in the lettuce strike. And many of the 27 growers represented at the bargaining table concede that the farm workers are badly underpaid. But the two sides are still far apart, and both UFW officials and lettuce growers are predicting a long struggle. "We're ready to stay out," says UFW spokesman Marc Grossman. "The rich have money, but the poor have time." Still, on the meager \$25 a week UFW members get in strike benefits, plus whatever they can collect in Southern California food drives, the wait promises to be painful - and victory is far from assured.

U.S. News & World Report

February 26, 1979

HEADLINE: A Strike That May Backfire On Strikers

DATELINE: LOS ANGELES

BODY:

The latest strike by Cesar Chavez's United Farm Workers union ultimately may bring the workers the one thing they fear most: mechanization.

The walkout that started in January of 4,000 farm workers in California and Arizona has halted the harvest of about 40 percent of the winter lettuce crop, creating keen interest among growers in a lettuce-harvesting machine.

Until now, all lettuce has been harvested by hand. But manufacturers say that the \$120,000 lettuce harvester can pick 12 heads per second. Each machine would replace 40 farm laborers. The machines are known among Spanish-speaking lettuce pickers as los monstruos -- the monsters.

... more than I've had in the last year."

The strike's impact on prices also could hasten mechanization of the lettuce harvest. "If the price of lettuce gets high enough, you'll see the machines roll into the fields," says Jack Lloyd, manager of the Coastal Growers Association. West Coast lettuce prices already have risen from 39 cents to 79 cents per head since the walkout began in January, and prices could remain high if the workers achieve their demand for a big wage increase.

The United Farm Workers does not oppose mechanization entirely. But union officials predict that there will be disastrous social consequences if workers are displaced by these machines without adequate retraining for other jobs.

"The workers see the machines as mechanical behemoths that could ruin their livelihood and turn California into another Appalachia, bulging with an underclass of unemployed workers," says Marc Grossman, spokesman for the United Farm Workers.

Orville E. Thompson, a professor at the University of California at Davis, says that the problem goes beyond the need for retraining farm workers displaced by mechanization. "Before we retrain workers for better jobs in agriculture, we need to communicate to many of them that they are capable of doing other work," he says. "We need to teach them self-esteem."

Thousands of farm workers already have been displaced by machines used in the harvesting of processed tomatoes. While some were retrained, most of these unemployed workers are forced to live on welfare, the union contends. Says UFW President Chavez: "These farm workers learned that mechanization grabs your dignity as well as your job."

U.S. News & World Report, February 26, 1979

As California's processed-tomato industry has flourished since the development of the tomato harvester in the 1960s, employment has declined. Annual production of processed tomatoes increased from 2 million tons in 1960 to 7 million tons in 1975.

During that period, says the California Employment Development Department, the number of jobs in the industry fell from 286,000 in 1969 to 279,200 in 1978.

The advent of an electric-eye sorter four years ago has taken away even more jobs from tomato workers. And one study predicts that the mechanical sorter will have eliminated about 14,000 seasonal jobs by 1982.

Nineteen unemployed farm workers went to court in January seeking to stop researchers at the University of California from developing any new farm machinery. The suit alleges that the school is misusing public funds by developing agricultural machines that benefit wealthy growers and put farm laborers out of work.

Mechanization or total loss? Roger Garrett, chairman of the Agricultural Engineering Department of the University of California at Davis, asserts these farm workers fail to realize that local growers could no longer compete with the prices of Mexican tomatoes without using the harvesting machines. "If we hadn't

The Washington Post

February 17, 1979, Saturday, Final Edition

First Section; A14

983 words

Both Sides Bracing, During an Uneasy Lull, in California Lettuce Farm Strike

EL CENTRO, Calif., Feb. 16, 1979

BODY:

... high-risk entrepreneurs who gamble in the risky crop of

lettuce. Technically not a grower, he has contracted to harvest 1,200 acres of lettuce and take the proceeds of half the acreage as his payment.

"It's a dice roll," Hubbard says. "Lettuce-growing is free enterprise in its finest form."

Since Hubbard's workers have not struck, he has been making money hand-over-hoe in the current harvest. Lettuce prices have soared from \$5 a 24-head carton at the beginning of the season to as high as \$12 a carton. This week the prevailing price in the Imperial Valley is \$10 a carton.

Unlike many other major crops, there is very little artificial regulation of lettuce supply. Prices are determined by the market, and swing wildly from week to week. The original high price of lettuce this year was caused not by the strike, but by severe winter rain that created expectation of a scarce winter lettuce crop. This was followed by a budworm scare, which also boosted prices.

The strike has accentuated the roulette wheel quality of lettuce-growing. Some of the struck growers are talking glumly about going out of business, while others are making as much as \$6,000 an acre from their lettuce crop.

The same kind of disparity exists for farm workers. On the non-struck farms (18 of 28 in the Imperial Valley have union contracts), workers on piece-rates are regularly making \$450 a week. Their fellow UFW members on strike are receiving a \$25 weekly union benefit.

It is not lettuce alone that will be affected by the current dispute. The prediction on both sides in the Imperial Valley is that the strike will spread to other states and other crops as the migrant harvest pattern continues.

If the strikes spread widely, they could also set the pattern for renewed agricultural labor violence. Scarcely a day passes in the present hostile atmosphere where there is not some scattered outbreak of violence somewhere in the state, such as occurred Thursday in Oxnard, 300 miles northwest of here, when rocks were thrown at a busload of workers going to a Sun Harvest celery farm.

The violence also has racial undertones. In El Centro this week one of the social events is a lettuce harvest ball, sponsored by Los Vigilantes, a group whose name brings memories of the anti-Mexican violence once common in

Imperial County.

When Contreras was shot to death, he and a group of strikers were attempting to talk to a group of Filipino "replacement workers" who since have left the area.

Three men, including the foreman of the Saikhon Ranch, where the killing occurred, are scheduled to be arraigned in the killing next week.

The Washington Post

February 5, 1979, Monday, Final Edition

First Section; A1

1265 words

Lettuce Strike Apparently Succeeding Despite Odds
Chavez Lettuce Strike Apparently Succeeding Despite Odds

By Lou Cannon and Katharine Macdonald, Washington Post Staff Writers

LOS ANGELES, Feb. 4, 1979

BODY:

It is an axiom of the turbulent, bloody history of farm labor conflict in the southwest that unions rarely win a strike near the border and its cheap, plentiful supply of Mexican labor.

That axiom appears to have gone the way of the 19-cent head of lettuce after a carefully designed walkout that United Farm Workers President Cesar Chavez calls "a dream strike" because of its virtual absence of strike breakers. It is a dream that growers say will become a nightmare for American consumers if Chavez's demands are met.

As the sometimes-violent Imperial Valley strike enters its third week, the eight struck growers who produce nearly a third of the nation's winter (iceberg) lettuce have been unable to find a surplus Mexican labor force, either legal or illegal, to harvest the crop now rotting in the fields.

"No Mexican farm worker in his right mind is going to break the strike," Chavez said late last week in an interview at his Tehachapi Mountains headquarters 350 miles north of the struck lettuce fields. "It's just impossible."

... half of the workers drop below the \$4-an-hour level in pre-harvest periods. Carter's wage guidelines are supposed to apply to workers earning \$4 an hour or more.

Under the contract sought by Chavez, a lettuce loader who now makes as much as \$89 a day (excluding medical benefits) would make \$220 a day. Lettuce crew members who get the piece rate of 57 cents per 24-head box would get 87 cents a box.

(A check of several Washington-area grocery stores today showed that most were selling iceberg lettuce for 79 cents a head, a price that jumped from 49 to 59 cents a head a month ago.)

The growers, fearing a long strike have asked for federal mediation. Chavez, aware that he has more economic power now than he is likely to have later, has rejected mediation.

By striking selected targets at a time when lettuce prices are high, Chavez has tried to encourage the growers, who can see their competitors making huge profits, to make a quick and generous settlement. He hopes to use this prospective settlement as leverage for other contracts.

The question is whether Chavez miscalculated and struck too soon. The UFW pays only \$25 a week in strike benefits, and no payments were made during the first two weeks of the walkout. Some doubt that the farm workers will be able to hold out during a long strike, and the growers hope that their increasing desperation will turn them away from Chavez.

"We feel that there is a silent majority of workers out there who believe that their union is being unreasonable," says Vessey. "And the growers are united because this contract would affect all the produce in the state of California. We'll never sign this, I'll guarantee you that."

With growers and the union far apart, the only harvest reaped so far by the strike has been one of bitterness and violence.

A clash last Monday left two strikers in the hospital and caused the smashing of several vehicles owned by the growers.

Imperial County Sheriff's Lt. Richard Wilson says that the violence apparently was started by private security guards hired by some growers. He adds that his department also is investigating allegations that a striker set a grower's truck on fire and that a 64-year-old man was knocked unconscious when a picket hurled a rock through his windshield.

Business Week

January 8, 1979, Industrial Edition

SECTION: INFLATION WATCH; Pg. 18

LENGTH: 310 words

HEADLINE: Chavez' farm union attacks the 7% limit

BODY:

The Carter Administration's wage-price guidelines may soon yield an unexpected crop: a farm worker strike in California, with a resulting spurt in the price of some winter vegetables.

Cesar Chavez and his United Farm Workers (UFW) are currently bargaining with California produce growers on contracts covering about 20,000 workers. The existing three-year contracts expire on Jan. 1, but progress in the talk has so far been slow.

The UFW and Chavez, its president, are demanding that farm workers be exempt from the government guideline limiting wage and benefit increases to 7% annually. Workers earning less than \$4 an hour are exempt. UFW members average \$5 to \$6 an hour for harvest piecework, but UFW leaders contend that the seasonal nature of such work means most earn less than \$7,000 a year and so deserve special consideration. "Our members are at the bottom of the economic ladder, with many below the poverty level," says Marc Grossman, a Chavez assistant. A possible strike

Officials at the Council on Wage & Price Stability concede privately they would do little should the growers exceed the guideline. But the growers, worried about spiraling costs and increased competition from Mexico, say they will comply with the 7% limit. Under pressure from the UFW, which represents about 10% of California's 300,000 farm workers, average farm wages in the state have shot up 30% in three years.

Close observers say the bargaining conflict could lead to a strike in late January, when the state's vegetable season is in full swing. This area grows about 90% of the nation's winter lettuce, much of it picked under UFW contract. If such a strike occurs, says Claude M. Finnelli, agricultural commissioner for Imperial County, "we'll see dollar-a-head lettuce within two or three days."

The Washington Post

September 11, 1978, Monday, Final Edition

First Section; A1

1250 words

2 Labor Unions Openly Aiding Illegal Aliens; Labor Unions Enroll Illegal Aliens

By Joel Kotkin, Special to The Washington Post

LOS ANGELES

BODY:

... can stop the tide of immigration until countries like Mexico begin providing more jobs for their citizens. "There will be no long-range solution until Mexico gets on the ball," said Marc Grossman, spokesman for the United Farm Workers.

His solution has large numbers of illegal aliens Grossman admits but we're not the government, we don't bring them here, the employer do. But when they de, we'll organize them.

Grossman said these illegal workers are extremely vulnerable to employer pressure because of fears about "Migra," as INS is known to Hispaic John Moore, attorney for the California Agriculture Labor Relations Board in Fresno, said veiled employers threats about deportation and the very presence of INS attempts to organize undocumented farm workers.

"The effect of the INS comes through the whole social system in the field," Moore said. "When the Migra comes to a place like Giumarra Vineyards and starts popping people like locusts in the fields just before the (unionization) election, what do you think the effect is? If you're an illegal, you're scared. You have no choices, your survival depends on doing what the employer tells you."

Giumarra Vineyards, just east of Bakersfield in the San Joaquin Valley, was the site of a disputed election last year in which a UFW representation bid was defeated. The election itself and the employer tactics are being investigated by the California Farm Labor Board.

For many illegal workers, a union job seems the best protection from the

alleged abuses of employers and the dreaded Migra.

"We have to have the union to help us," said Arturo Vlallejo, who comes from an impoverished town south of Mexico City and was arrested during the INS raid at Sbicca. "I think that with our union maybe we will have some representation. Without it we have no protection, no benefits."

NEW YORK TIMES

September 10, 1978, Sunday

SECTION: Page 52

LENGTH: 105 words

BYLINE: BY WALLACE TURNER

ABSTRACT:

Twelve Mexican-American United Farm Workers (UFW) members file suit in California Superior Court against UFW. Accuse union of forcing dismissal of member Cervando Perez because he refused to make mandatory contribution to union's Citizenship Participation Day (CDP) Fund. Fund is used by union for political purposes. Suit attacks as unconstitutional section of California Agricultural Labor Relations Act that permits contracts requiring union membership as condition of work. Attorney Jordan Bloom is handling case without charge, and expenses are being paid by National Right to Work Legal Defense Foundation Inc (L).

The Washington Post

May 13, 1978, Saturday, Final Edition

First Section; Around the Nation; A4

65 words

Chavez Signs Contract

From news services and staff reports

DELANO, Calif.

BODY:

Declaring that both sides "had to make concessions," Cesar Chavez has signed United Farm Workers union contracts with seven Delano table grape growers after five years without a pact.

"We believe and hope the concessions we have made will bring peace and justice and begin a truly beneficial relationship for both the employer and worker," Chavez said at a signing ceremony Thursday.

HEADLINE: Farm Union Ends Boycott Actions

The lettuce boycott was begun in 1970. The boycotts of table grapes and wines produced by the E. & J. Gallo Winery in Modesto, Calif. were initiated in 1973.

The end of the boycotts was announced by UFW President Cesar Chavez at union headquarters near Keene, Calif. He said the union was looking to the future with "cautious optimism." Under the 2 1/2-year-old California Agricultural Labor Relations Act, he said, the UFW had signed contracts with more than 100 growers and was negotiating with about 100 more. An additional 43 representational elections won by the UFW were awaiting certification by the state labor relations board. The union's membership currently stood at about 30,000.

"Despite temporary setbacks and continuing maladministration," Chavez said, the new farm labor law was "alive and functioning."

February 1, 1978, Wednesday, Final Edition

First Section; Around the Nation; A6

182 words

Boycott of Grapes, Wine, Lettuce Halted By Cesar Chavez as No Longer Needed

From news services and staff reports

LOS ANGELES

BODY:

An organized boycott that kept some California wine off the liberal cocktail party circuit for more than four years and drew support from politicians and trade unionists was called to a halt yesterday by Cesar Chavez.

The leader of the United Farm Workers union said boycotts against California's lettuce, tablegrape and wine industries are no longer necessary.

Business Week

January 30, 1978, Industrial Edition

HEADLINE: The latest threat to Chavez: Mechanization

BODY:

By last spring, Cesar Chavez and his United Farm Workers had every reason to think they had overcome the last major obstacle to UFW domination of agriculture in California. The International Brotherhood of Teamsters agreed in March to give up any jurisdiction over field workers, leaving the UFW an organizing potential of more than 300,000 workers. But now the UFW faces an even more serious threat: the mechanization of farm jobs.

To cut production costs, farm owners in California's \$3 billion-a-year fruit and vegetable industry are replacing manual labor with mechanical harvesters.

Farm wage rates have risen 20% faster in California than in other states over the last five years, largely because of union pressures. Only in California are farm workers extensively organized.

As the result of these cost pressures, growers are introducing mechanical pickers even for crops, such as wine grapes, lettuce, and fresh-market tomatoes, that traditionally have been harvested by hand. And the pace of labor displacement is likely to increase. A research office of the California legislature estimates that 20,000 of the 112,000 harvest jobs in 10 major crops may disappear by 1982.

... No. 1 legislative priority," says Mack Lyons, the UFW's chief lobbyist. Adds another UFW leader: "We're not antimechanization. We just don't think the taxpayer should pay twice -- first for the university research and then for

increased unemployment, welfare, and social service costs."

It is unlikely that the UFW has enough public backing either to stop the research or to pass the legislation. Nor has it had much success with using bargaining to limit the introduction of new machines. A few UFW contracts restrict the amount of harvesting that can be done with machines, but employer resistance to such clauses has stiffened. Setting a price

The union has also tried to discourage mechanization through other contract demands. For example, in negotiations at the Klein Ranch -- a Tracy (Calif.) asparagus and tomato grower -- the UFW demanded four weeks' pay for workers displaced by mechanization and automatic pay increases for those remaining. After two strikes and two years of bargaining, the UFW agreed to a contract that provides only for advance notice of labor displacement.

"As wage increase, growers have to mechanize to stay competitive with other states," says Daryl Arnold, executive vice-president of the Western Growers Assn. He predicts that his association's 1,200 members will need 25% fewer farm workers within five years. Many growers relish that prospect. "Fewer

1978 McGraw-Hill, Inc., Business Week, January 30, 1978

workers mean smaller labor units, which are less efficient for the UFW to organize," says an official of the California Farm Bureau Federation, the state's largest organization of farmers.

While mechanization is not new in agriculture, most fruit and vegetable operations -- accounting for the bulk of California's unionized agricultural workers -- have until recently remained almost exclusively based on hand labor.

Mechanical harvesters for these crops tend to be complex, costly, hard to maintain, and specialized. But new product breakthroughs are now coming quickly.

Last fall, for example, E. & J. Gallo Winery, which produces 35% of California's wine and which previously had required that all its grapes be hand-picked, approved a new wine-grape harvester. This decision should push

other wineries to do the same, and some experts feel that the proportion of mechanically harvested California wine grapes could quadruple to 60% within five

years, eliminating 15,000 harvest jobs. Clare L. Berryhill, a Gallo supplier who hired 40 workers to harvest his 300 acres this year, has purchased one of the \$55,000 harvesters and plans to use only two workers next season.

Fear of unionization

Some growers point to fear of unionization as the main reason for investing

heavily in new farm equipment. Bernell Harlan Jr., a canning-tomato grower near

Sacramento, >Continued on page 70> >Labor/continued> was the target of an unsuccessful UFW campaign three years ago. "That made me mad," he says.

So he

spent an estimated \$200,000 to buy electronic tomato sorters, thus pruning his harvest labor force from more than 100 workers in 1975 to 28 in the season just

ended. "I have gotten rid of all the troublemakers," Harlan boasts.

The UFW's organizing attempts have sputtered in recent months partly because

workers fear that unionization will speed mechanization and take away their jobs. When the first elections were held under California's Agricultural Labor Relations Act in 1975, the UFW participated in more than 300 elections in five

months. In the last year it has been involved in only 65 elections. Of the 225

employers with whom the UFW has gained the right to bargain over the past 2 1/2

years, it has signed contracts with only 90. The UFW's membership, which dropped from 50,000 in the early 1970s to 15,000 during the organizing battles with the Teamsters, has climbed back only to 30,000, well under 10% of California's farm labor force.

Boosting wages

The UFW has made progress, however, in increasing the wages of farm workers

-- both union and nonunion. California farm wages averaged \$3.67 an hour last

October, up from about \$2 in 1972. Most UFW contracts call for a minimum hourly

wage of about \$3.50, with piece-rate workers in the \$4 to \$7 range.

Robert L. Meyer, a unionized tomato grower near King City, Calif., pays field pickers an average of \$8.75 an hour. Meyer notes, however, that he plans to be

one of the first in line for mechanical harvesters when current research in this

area bears fruit, probably in two to four years.

Several California state agencies are studying what the social impact of mechanization might be if thousands of low-skilled farm workers were displaced.

While some observers hope that California farm acreage will expand rapidly enough to take up the slack, most experts believe that creeping urbanization

1978 McGraw-Hill, Inc., Business Week, January 30, 1978

and the lack of new irrigation projects will make that impossible.

Most large growers believe, however, that the UFW will survive. Surprisingly, many growers give the union high marks for becoming more professional and businesslike in its approach to bargaining and to resolving grievances. Says one grower who has more than 10,000 acres in the fertile San Joaquin Valley: "The UFW is finally starting to act more like a traditional industrial union and less like a cause."

The Washington Post

January 30, 1978, Monday, Final Edition

First Section; A1

1661 words

Nuts-and-Bolts Unionism;

UFW Now Wrestling With Nuts-and-Bolts Unionism;

Chavez's UFW Struggling to Make Transition From Social Activism to Day-to-Day

Basics

By Helen Dewar, Washington Post Staff Writer

KEENE, Calif

BODY:

An old short-handled hoe sits conspicuously on a shelf in Cesar Chavez's small shrine-like office at La Paz, the United Farm Workers' headquarters tucked away in the Tehachapi Mountains at the foot of California's vast, fertile Central Valley. An aide tells a visitor that Chavez keeps it close by to remind him of his roots in the fields.

This back-breaking tool of stoop labor is also a symbol of battles won - of the union's glory days when its crimson and black banners, cries of "Huelga!" and nationwide lettuce and grape boycotts appeared to signal a social revolution within the multibillion-dollar agricultural industry.

Now, the short-handled hoe is banned in California. The state has a law -

landmark legislation for the nation - that sets up machinery for union organizing. The Teamsters have withdrawn from the fields, leaving the UFW free from other union competition.

... long march is not over. The UFW has moved into the less glamorous, highly technical world of nuts-and-bolts unionism, and its record so far is less than inspiring.

"They're social activists and agrarian reformers, not union leaders," said a grower who is well-regarded by the union and considered pro-UFW by many of his fellow ranchers. "They'd still prefer to tell off a grower than do the mundane work of trade unionists," he continued. "Unfortunately there's nothing they enjoy more than a good day of picketing. They're dedicated people, impeccably honest . . . but, my God, sometimes you're negotiating with nuns in miniskirts."

Alan Kistler, organizing director of the AFL-CIO, sees it differently, contending that Chavez is, at heart, a true unionist. "They're now facing tasks that other unions have dealt with over time . . . Cesar's got to do it all at once," said Kistler.

Says Chavez: "All we did in the past is strike and picket . . . now we have to build a union."

Chavez' union-building - an ambitious program ranging from teaching English to Mexican, Filipino and other foreign-born field workers to creating a cadre of well-trained bargaining specialists and union administrators - will be conducted against this backdrop:

Although the UFW has won most of the union representation elections that have been held under California's 1975 farm labor bargaining law, it has contracts covering only about 30,000 of the roughly 300,000 eligible workers. This is about half what the union claimed as its contract coverage in the early 1970s.

It weathered a crisis that threatened financing of the new law's enforcement but overplayed its hand in pushing unsuccessfully in 1976 for voter approval of a constitutional amendment to solidify the union's advantages under the law.

It has slowed down its organizing activities because of a huge backlog of uncompleted contract negotiations, which the union blames on grower recalcitrance and official footdragging and the growers attribute to poor bargaining by unskilled union negotiators.

Chavez' traditional liberal and church allies were angered when he went to the Philippines last summer and reportedly made statements favorable to the Marcos regime. A brief stir also arose when a top union official resigned the previous year to protest what he called "red-baiting" against leftists within the union.

More recently, Chavez had ducked the furor over proposed enforcement of the 160-acre U.S. limitation on federally watered farms in the West, a controversy that pits agrarian reform principles against the reality of fewer jobs for union members. There are also reports of tensions within the union between Hispanics and Filipinos and between those who ...

... record at least, the union blames everyone but itself for the loss: the Giumarras for unfair labor practices, the U.S. Border Patrol for making raids in search of illegal aliens during the election campaign, the state Agricultural

Labor Relations Board apparatus for timidity, footdragging and obstructionism.

But the fact of the loss has hurt the union and emboldened many growers.

"It could have turned the tables for Chavez," said Harry Kubo, president of the Nisei Farmers League and a leader of the growers' fight against the 1976 ballot initiative. "It's very difficult to come back from something like that. You have to have enthusiasm, drive, momentum. When you lose, you lose a lot more than an election."

Because of the Giumarra vote, defeat of the ballot initiative and other factors, "there isn't the anxiety there once was" about the UFW among growers, said Martin Zaninovich, a Delano-area grape grower and director of the South Central Farmers Committee.

A source more friendly to Chavez said: "Cesar's probably right in some of the charges he's made, but the fact remains that he lost an election that he should have won . . . He's got to survive in a tough, cruel world."

At Giumarra and elsewhere, the union's problems result in part from its earlier successes.

Since Chavez moved to the fore of farm labor organizing in California in the early 1960s, both wages and working conditions have improved dramatically.

According to UFW figures, grapes, which were picked for 85 cents to \$1 an hour before the 1965 Delano strike, now pay \$3.35 an hour under union contract.

Lettuce, paying \$1.50 to \$1.60 an hour before the Salinas strike in 1970, now pays \$3.55 an hour. Many non-unionized growers will pay the UFW wage, or more,

to keep the union out - a tactic not uncommon to industry as a whole.

Moreover,

many have health plans and other benefits, often as a result of previous UFW organizing efforts. Workman's and unemployment compensation are now available,

partly because of UFW pressure.

"We matched them point by point," including hourly pay of about \$4, vacations

and a medical plan that included \$700 in pregnancy benefits, said John Giumarra,

speaking of last summer's unsuccessful UFW organizing campaign at the family's

8,000-acre vineyards in the southern San Joaquin Valley. The UFW had organized

Giumarra's fields in 1970 but lost them to the Teamsters in 1970 when the powerful trucking union, accused by the UFW of offering sweetheart contracts to

the growers, all but drove Chavez from the fields.

"They may not be adequate from my standpoint, but wages and fringes are a lot

better than they were," said state Assemblyman Floyd Mori (D-Alameda), chairman

of the joint committee that oversees operations of the ALRB. "So what has the

union to offer that's all that much better?"

Mori said growers are showing "a lot more sophistication" in dealing with the

union, a point underscored by Giumarra's extensive use of Spanish-language radio, cartoons and other tools of the Chavez trade to blunt the union's propaganda offensive.

Similarly, the push for better wages and benefits has helped intensify pressure for mechanization of the fields, which in turn threatens the very jobs that the UFW is attempting to put under contract.

UFW lobbyist Michael Linfield testified last fall that mechanization would result in loss of 123,000 farm worker jobs over the next decade.

For instance, looking at two crops the UFW has focused on in the past, the union forecasts that the number of jobs in lettuce will drop from 16,700 to 5,400 and jobs in wine grapes will decline from 29,700 to 6,800 (mechanization of table grape harvesting is not foreseen).

Some agricultural economists like Refugio Rochin at the University of California at Davis contend that mechanization has peaked in terms of affecting the fulltime farm labor force, although it may reduce seasonal employment, especially for women and young people. But Chavez argues that it will have a "disastrous effect" in displacing workers and says the union is working on proposals to give workers an opportunity to share in profits made off the machines.

Meanwhile, the immediate problem is negotiation contracts. The UFW has 90 contracts that have been negotiated and 115 in negotiation, as well as 80 bargaining units that are awaiting certification, according to the union's own count. The union could triple in size if it could just get all its supporters under contract. Meanwhile its organizing has slowed to a trickle, to less

than 1,000 a month, according to Chavez.

"The union is groping around in its negotiating, it's not as sophisticated as some older unions in the effectiveness of its bargaining," said Mori.

To grapple with this problem, the union is creating a school within its rambling La Paz headquarters complex, an old tuberculosis sanatorium on 280 acres of sun-baked hills that were bought and donated to the union by a wealthy well-wisher.

Here the union will train "specialists" to assist the ranch committees in bargaining, with the eight-month curriculum ranging from labor history to agribusiness economics ("That's something we know nothing about," says Chavez).

Also, there will be training in union administration and contract servicing.

A

separate program, financed by a \$500,000 Labor Department grant, will provide

English-language training for about 1,500 migrant and seasonal workers.

Some growers are skeptical that Chavez can pull it all together, but the UFW's history is replete with premature obituaries. "Remember," says John F.

Henning, executive secretary-treasurer of the California Labor Federation, "he did something no one else could do. He organized the farm worker."

NEW YORK TIMES

August 29, 1977, Monday

SECTION: Page 18, Column 1

LENGTH: 133 words

BYLINE: BY LES LEDBETTER

ABSTRACT:

UFW ends 3d annual convention, Fresno. Celebrates past accomplishments, unanimously reelects pres Chavez and approves resolutions opposing Carter Adm

proposals to identify and, in some cases, give legal status to illegal aliens as well as plan to include farm workers under revised Natl Labor Relations Act.

Chavez holds UFW must improve worker involvement in union's management, organize hundreds of thousands more farm workers in West, East and South, and continue to fight extensive legal and pol battles. Labor Sec Marshall, speaking at conv, asks union to support Adm proposals, noting final legis will be changed to meet union objections. Claims documentation of illegal aliens will not create discrimination against minority workers, as UFW claims.

NEW YORK TIMES

July 20, 1977, Wednesday

SECTION: Page 10, Column 3

LENGTH: 228 words

BYLINE: BY DONALD JANSON

ABSTRACT:

Amer Farm Bureau Federation leaders from NJ, Pa, NY, Conn, Del, Md and Va meet to discuss strategy for dealing with what orgn calls 'real threat' of unionization of farm workers by UFW, meeting, Essington, Pa. Arthur H West, pres of NJ Farm Bureau, claims Fla and NJ are likely to be major targets of organizing efforts. Major problem area for federation centers on Puerto Rican farm workers. NJ is nation's largest user of farm hands from Puerto Rico, and in summer of '76 employeed 3,500 Puerto Rican workers whose contracts were negotiated by Puerto Rican Govt. Small Puerto Rican union Asociacion de Trabajadores Agricolas, which has tried unsuccessfully to organize workers since '73, claims union could negotiate better contract than govt in San Juan. Puerto Rican union's recent merger with UFW, and latter's settlement of jurisdictional dispute with AFL-CIO, will enable UFW to use its resources and organizational abilities in other states. Amer Farm Bureau Fed is concerned about stepped up unionization efforts and also about Calif Agr Labor Relations Bd ruling giving

union reprs access to farm property for organizing efforts. Meeting focused on whether to seek legis to end agr's exemption from collective bargaining as way to gain protection from secondary boycotts, which UFW used effectively against grapes and other Calif farm products (M).

The Washington Post

June 12, 1977, Sunday, Final Edition

1458 words

The Struggle Goes On and On and On;
A LONG TIME COMING: The Struggle to Unionize America's Farm
Workers. By Dick
Meister and Anne Loftis. Macmillan. 241 pp. \$14.95

By Nick Kotz; Nick Kotz is the coauthor of A Passion for Equality, a book about George Wiley and the welfare rights movement, to be published in August.

BODY:

SEVERAL YEARS AGO it became increasingly difficult for American farm workers to get much attention about their struggles for a better life. By any legitimate news standard the stories were there - strikes, boycotts, violence, important economic issues - but the media weren't buying. As a reporter at that time, I was given an interesting explanation by one editor about why he didn't want to run a farm worker strike story. "Chavez and all that radical chic stuff isn't news any more," he said.

This editor somehow equated the struggle of farm workers to unionize and improve their hard life with a phenomenon of the 1960s, when rich folks boycotted grapes and gave garden parties in East Hampton to raise money for Cesar Chavez. But that period had passed, and the new news chic was to point out the hypocrisies of "limousine liberals."

I cite this news business incident not only to illustrate the gross trendiness of the media in its interests, but to point out the almost total lack of any historical sense in this country of our own tradition of radical struggle for social and economic justice. We do not have a body of popular literature,

certainly none that can be readily summoned, that provides a sense of the unending battle since the founding of America to achieve minimum justice for certain groups in our society, farm workers among them.

Facts on File World News Digest

March 12, 1977

HEADLINE: Chavez, Teamsters sign pact

BODY:

The Teamsters and the AFL-CIO United Farm Workers signed a five-year pact March 10 setting up jurisdictional lines to settle their organizing dispute.

The pact was signed in Burlingame, Calif. by the UFW President Cesar Chavez and M. E. Anderson, director of the Western Conference of Teamsters. Also attending the meeting was Teamsters President Frank E. Fitzsimmons.

The pact provided that the Teamsters would maintain jurisdiction over all workers covered under the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) and the UFW would have jurisdiction over all workers covered under the California Agricultural Labor Relations Act. Farm workers were excluded from coverage under the NLRA, which extended collective bargaining rights to industrial workers. Farm workers received that right in California under the state law passed in 1975, the first of its kind in the nation.

In general, the accord gave the Farm Workers jurisdiction if the employees were primarily engaged in farming and the Teamsters jurisdiction elsewhere, such as with truck drivers, cannery workers and others not directly working in the fields.

The Teamsters would retain any existing contracts with growers but would let the UFW take over when the pacts expired. This did not apply to some longstanding Teamsters contracts or relationships with growers dating back before 1970. These would be decided by negotiation on each contract.

Chavez said he expected the pact would result in a gain of about 15,000 members for his 25,000-member union.

The Teamsters were relinquishing some recent representational election victories that were under legal challenge either by the UFW or the state agricultural labor relations board administering the new farm law. At the latest count of the recent bargaining elections, the UFW had won 198, the Teamsters 115. Of these, the state board had certified 151 to the UFW, 41 to the Teamsters and had set aside 47 others for various reasons.

Newsweek

November 8, 1976, UNITED STATES EDITION
ANOTHER TEST FOR CESAR CHAVEZ

BODY:

One of the first accomplishments claimed by Edmund G. Brown Jr. as governor of California was a negotiated settlement with major produce growers, the Teamsters union and the United Farm Workers to end a bitter ten-year struggle over organizing migrant laborers. But the Agricultural Labor Relations Board - set up to oversee union elections and penalize unfair labor practices - ceased functioning after only five months amid charges of bias and a legislative impasse over its funding. And UFW head Cesar Chavez, with Brown's blessing, took the stalemated issue to the public as Proposition 14, a controversial referendum that could be a landmark victory - or setback - for the farm workers' movement.

Business Week

November 1, 1976, Industrial Edition

HEADLINE: A crucial vote on farm unions

BODY:

Of 429 elections held since August, 1975, the UFW won 58% and the Teamsters 33%. Other unions won 2% of the elections, and workers at 7% of the ranches voted for no union. In the past, the UFW and the Teamsters have concentrated their efforts at vineyards and lettuce farms, but Chavez says that if Proposition 14 passes, the UFW will set out to organize workers at ranches producing cotton, tomatoes, and other vegetables.

Farm worker unionization has been an emotional and often violent issue for more than 10 years in California, and it has now become a national issue.

Jimmy

Carter, the Democratic Presidential nominee, has endorsed Proposition 14. President Ford has not taken a stand, but last week his running mate, Senator Robert F. Dole (R-Kan.), singled out the California ballot fight as an example of organized labor's attempt to "dominate" the political process.

Furthermore, union farm organizing has now spread from California to such other big farm states as Texas and Florida. And these states are watching the struggle in California, preparing for the time when farm labor laws are demanded elsewhere.

The opposition. "We don't need the initiative, we already have a farm labor law," says Harry Kubo, president of the Nisei Farmers League and head of the growers' "No on 14" Committee. Virtually all of the 60,000 growers in the state belong to the committee.

"If the growers stop this initiative they'll go back to their old nasty ways," says Cesar Chavez, the UFW president. He charges that the growers "strangled" the law and decided to support it only when it appeared that the initiative had a chance of passing.

Passage of Proposition 14 would make the law considerably stronger than it is now. It would ...

NEW YORK TIMES

September 6, 1976, Monday

BYLINE: BY HENRY WEINSTEIN

ABSTRACT:

United Farm Workers pres Cesar Chavez promises Dem Pres nominee Jimmy Carter union support after Carter promises to support Proposition 14, controversial union repr measure on Nov ballot in Calif, union conv, San Francisco. Proposition would guarantee free elections in field, ensure operating continuity of Calif's yr-old agr labor relations bd and provide that union organizers can have access to growers' land to talk with workers. Calif Gov Edmund G Brown Jr

and US Sens John V Tunney and Alan Cranston (Calif) have endorsed proposition

February 28, 1976

SECTION: U.S. AFFAIRS; Labor

PAGE: Pg. 153 G1

LENGTH: 406 words

HEADLINE: Coast farm labor dispute continues

BODY:

The process of secret-ballot union elections among California farmworkers broke down Feb. 6 when the state Agricultural Labor Relations Board closed for lack of funds. The board supervised the elections and ruled on labor-practice disputes under a new California farm-labor law. [See 1975, p. 805B1]

Since August 1975, the board had conducted 410 elections, of which 195 were won by the AFL-CIO United Farm-workers of America (UFW), 120 by the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and 19 by other unions. The board had not ruled as yet on 51 of the elections and in 25 others the workers opted for no union representation.

NEW YORK TIMES

February 26, 1976, Thursday

SECTION: Page 1, Column 6

LENGTH: 308 words

BYLINE: BY LESLEY OELSNER

ABSTRACT:

Sup Ct rules unanimously on Feb 25 that states may forbid employers to hire illegal aliens if such hiring would make it harder for lawful resident workers to get jobs. In so ruling, Ct rejects views of both US Solicitor Gen and 2 Calif state cts that ruled on issue. All contended that laws on hiring of aliens should be left to Fed Govt rather than states. Sup Ct decision comes in case brought by 2 migrant farm workers citing '71 Calif statute that banned hiring of illegal aliens when 'such employment would have an adverse effect' on

workers legally entitled to reside and work in state. Use of illegal aliens, particularly on farms, has been cause of much controversy and labor unrest in Calif. Howard S Scher, 1 of lawyers for 2 farm workers involved in case, says Ct decision could lead to way for people to challenge use of illegal aliens through civil lawsuits. Marc Grossman, asst to Cesar Chavez, says real issue is

over question why illegal aliens are in state at all. Says problem is 'collusion' between Fed immigration authorities and growers. Says United Farm

Workers union includes both illegal aliens and lawfully admitted aliens among

its members. Says union supports 'amnesty' for illegal aliens. Eventual impact

of Ct ruling is clouded by fact that ruling did not uphold Calif statute.

Decision, written by Justice William J Brennan Jr and joined by all Justices except John Paul Stevens, who was not at Ct at time of oral arguments, reverses

lower cts' ruling that Calif law was unconstitutional because it intruded on areas within exclusive jurisdiction of Cong. Also establishes that states have right to enact such legis. Send case back to Calif Appellate Ct for determination of question of whether specific aspects of statute interfere with 'accomplishment and execution' of Cong purposes and objectives (M).

NEW YORK TIMES

February 18, 1976, Wednesday

SECTION: Page 39, Column 1

LENGTH: 259 words

BYLINE: BY LES LEDBETTER

ABSTRACT:

Fragile truce in Calif's Imperial Valley between migrant farm workers and farmers that resulted from passage 9 mos ago of state Agr Labor Relations Act is

in danger now that group of farmer-supported state sens has cut off funds to Agr

Labor Relations Bd, named by Gov Edmund G Brown Jr to implement law. United

Farm Workers of Amer pres Cesar Chavez warns of return to 'law of the jungle,'

citing isolated incidents of violence that have broken out in last wk. Repts union has begun boycotts in 10 E Coast cities of some Sun-Maid products and produce of 8 Fresno-area growers. Internatl Brotherhood of Teamsters, whose

Western Conf competes with United Farm Workers in trying to organize migrants, and growers reprs say labor bd favored Farm Workers. Say they will continue to block supplemental funds bill, which needs 2/3 majority for approval, until labor act is made more fair and equitable. Say they want bd and say bd will probably be revived in fiscal '77, when only majority vote will be needed to approve operating funds. Seek to use current leverage to narrow scope of labor act and limit bd's discretion. Western Growers' Assn repr Les Hubbard and Teamsters Conf exec dir M E Anderson comment. Farm Workers, Brown and bd members appear adamant against any changes. Farm Workers atty Jerome Cohen comments. Brown defends law. Bishop Roger Mahoney, chmn of defunct bd, fears 'bitter' clashes in fields this spring. Farm Workers organizer ...

NEW YORK TIMES

December 28, 1975, Sunday

SECTION: Page 19, Column 1

LENGTH: 134 words

ABSTRACT:

Former San Jose (Calif) deputy sheriff Jerome Ducote, who has been arrested for burglary, has told law enforcement officials that he was paid by Calif growers Jack Pandol and Stephen D'Arrigo to break into offices of United Farm Workers union in mid-'60s and steal union documents; other targets of burglaries, which apparently were committed in '66 and '67, were Ramparts Magazine, Student Nonviolent Coordinating Com, Amer-Russian Inst, People's World (Newspaper), offices of anti-war activists in 3 Calif cities, home and offices of community organizer Saul Alinsky and home of former Calif Assemblyman William Stanton; Ducote also reptdly had tried in '74 to persuade group of businessmen to lend him money in fruitless effort to link United Farm Workers leader Cesar Chavez to Communist party.

U.S. News & World Report

October 20, 1975

SECTION: LABOR; Pg. 81

LENGTH: 760 words

HEADLINE: AN ELECTION TO END FARM-UNION STRIFE . . . RESULT IS MORE "WAR"

BODY:

Rough stuff. Verbal brickbats are being hurled by both the unions and major farm organizations in California. All accuse the State Agricultural Labor Relations Board, which administers the law, of partiality. Two members of the board, including its chairman, Bishop Roger Mahony of Fresno, were roughed up by a crowd of Teamsters in Sacramento.

South of Fresno, a sheriff is jailing dozens of UFW organizers, and a few Teamsters, for trespassing as they seek to speak to farm workers in the fields - as the new law permits.

Amidst all this, the two unions are politicking for the allegiance of workers in a shrill manner that would embarrass most seasoned politicians.

Fliers printed by the Teamsters depict Cesar Chavez, the UFW's president, as a power-hungry, money-grubbing opportunist who "defiles the Catholic Church" to get his way.

Not to be outdone, UFW literature attacks the Teamsters as the labor arms of the Mafia, busily stealing millions of dollars in pension funds.

Neither union seems to be addressing the very real problems that confront farm workers: back-breaking work, poor housing and education and wages that few consider satisfactory.

The UFW's chief complaint is that the farm labor board does nothing to prevent or correct serious violations, such as intimidation by growers of their workers to persuade them to vote against the UFW. The United Farm Worker's

position is that many farmers are still in cahoots with the Teamsters - which holds most existing labor contracts - to keep the other union out.

This smacks of sour grapes to the Teamsters, who claim Mr. Chavez is merely covering up his inability to win most of the farm elections.

Both unions, in turn, are upset at the State board for its slowness in certifying elections and allowing bargaining to begin to new contracts.

Many farmers, meanwhile, claim the agency is biased in favor of Mr. Chavez - a charge with which the Teamsters concur. Farmers often admit they prefer the Teamsters to the UFW.

Frank Lucich, the 62-year-old owner of a 700-acre grape ranch north of Delano, says he urged his workers to vote for the Teamsters, which they did, 99 to 62.

To Mr. Lucich, the Teamsters are "more professional and more concerned about getting the product on a truck and off to market - which is what this business is all about."

To an observer in the San Joaquin Valley, a Teamsters local office presents a vivid contrast to a UFW facility.

In Delano, Teamsters Local 1973 is administered by a Filipino, and most business agents are Chicano.

"I admire Chavez," says Peter Maturino, a Teamster business agent. "Without him, where would the farm worker be today? The people around him corrupt his ideals, though."

Inside the UFW offices near Delano, college-age "Anglos" and veteran trade-unionists on loan to the UFW from other unions seem to outnumber the Mexican Americans.

"I never thought we'd win all the votes," says Ben Maddock, a long-time UFW organizer there. "To me, each victory makes us that much better off than we were before."

The big switch. The UFW held 147 contracts covering more than 50,000 jobs before 1973, when most farmers suddenly shifted and signed agreements with the Teamsters instead. At the time the new California law was passed, the UFW's working membership had shrunk to a few thousand persons.

Chances are the present turmoil will continue for some time. The next electoral battleground will be in the Imperial Valley in November, followed by the Cochella Valley in early 1976.

There remains the problem of negotiating contracts. The UFW will insist that farmers agree to use its hiring-hall system of employment, which the growers abhor. Mr. Chavez himself foresees new waves of strikes and renewed consumer boycotts against grapes and lettuce in support of UFW aims. He also told U.S. News & World Report: "The growers have been fighting this union for 20 years. Why should they stop now?"

U.S. News & World Report

September 22, 1975

SECTION: Labor; Pg. 82

LENGTH: 940 words

HEADLINE: CHAVEZ vs. THE TEAMSTERS: FARM WORKERS' HISTORIC VOTE

BODY:

For Cesar Chavez, the president of the UFW, the voting is and opportunity to prove his contention that the farm workers, if given an unhampered choice, would flock to his union. Lately, it has had only a few thousand of its dues-paying members employed under 12 contracts it had negotiated with farm companies.

The Teamsters, on the other hand, must defend the 400 field-labor contracts, covering an estimated 25,000 workers, that they already claim.

The early results of the elections showed that the United Farm Workers won votes on 17 farms employing 3,800 workers, and the Teamsters the victors at 11 locations employing 2,100 persons.

But the Teamsters were apparent winners in the most publicized yet held - at E. & J. Gallo, whose farming and wine-making operation in Livingston, Calif, has been the object of a strike and product boycott by the Farm Workers since 1973.

Counting of challenged ballots could change that result.

All but overlooked in the race to win the current elections is the changing character of labor relations on California farms. It's no longer a question of whether labor unions will bargain for large number of the farm laborers, but rather which of the unions will dominate the collective-bargaining process.

At

only one of the first two dozen farms where elections were conducted did workers

vote to have no union at all.

Not until 1970 did a union gain even a foothold in California agriculture.

Major organizing efforts go back as far as the early 1900s, when the "Wobblies"

- the Industrial Workers of the World - first sought to unionize laborers on the

farms. The Cannery and Agricultural Workers Industrial Union was active in the

Great Depression years, and the AFL-CIO maintained a moribund

Agricultural

Workers Organizing Committee until the early 1960s.

Eight-year fight. Mr Chavez began and led the State's first successful organizing drive. His group struggled for eight years before a breakthrough agreement with grape growers in 1970 gave the young union some stability.

By 1972, the United Farm Workers was at the height of its power. It held 147 contracts covering more than 50,000 jobs on farms in California, Arizona and Florida, and 30,000 workeng members, most of them of Filipino or Mexican orgin.

Cesar Chavez himself became one of the best-known American labor leaders, and

probably the most controversial.

Within a year, however, the union was in shambles. When many of its contracts came up for renegotiation in 1973, the farming organizations signed

agreements with the Teamsters Union instead, in hopes of more "stable" labor relations. In few instances had the workers themselves initiated the switch.

Economic warfare - and sometimes physical violence - raged across California again. This time it was between the Farm Workers and the Teamsters. The UFW pushed national - and even international - boycott campaigns against Gallo wines and against lettuce and grapes not picked by its members. The Teamsters threatened not to honor picker lines of other union that supported the UFW boycotts.

One handicap to ending the dispute was the lack of government machinery for deciding which, if any, union ought to represent farm workers, who had been excluded from the National Labor Relations Act in 1935.

New bargaining accord. Edmund G. Brown, Jr., California's new Democratic Governor, succeeded in getting both unions and the major farm associations to agree earlier this year on a State law to govern bargaining in agriculture. The major feature, the Agricultural Labor Relations Board, the supervises the elections now being conducted to determine which union will represent workers on each farm.

Starting August 28, either union could ask for an election on any farm on which it had signatures from more than 50 per cent of the workers. The winning union gets bargaining rights for one year, and any existing labor contract is voided.

Secondary boycotts such as those the UFW has led could continue with some restrictions in the State.

Even with the new law, turmoil is certain to continue for some time. The elections themselves will take up to a year to complete. And when a year has passed, each union can challenge the bargaining rights of the other on a farm by seeking a new election.

The elections themselves do not give the unions anything more than right to bargain. At each farm, they must now negotiate contracts ...

Business Week

September 8, 1975, Industrial Edition

SECTION: UNIONS; Pg. 24

LENGTH: 780 words

HEADLINE: California's farm law gets its first test

BODY:

A month of furious organizing efforts by the United Farm Workers and the International Brotherhood of Teamsters in California's vast farmlands will come to the first showdown this week. The two unions, competing for tens of thousands of farm hands, expect to petition for representation elections under the state's new farm labor relations law.

The law -- the first in the nation that regulates farm-labor organizing and bargaining -- takes effect Aug. 28. It provides for secret-ballot elections to be conducted by the new Agricultural Labor Relations Board. While it will substitute a legal framework for the chaos and violence that have characterized California's farm-labor battles since the early 1960s, the law will not immediately result in peace. The Teamsters, the UFW, and the state's growers are bracing for continuing turmoil through the fall harvests.

"It took the National Labor Relations Act 40 years to bring some sort of peace to industrial unions," says James C. Eller of the California Farm Bureau Federation. "It might take this bill as long." The federation has 67,000 members, or 70% of the state's growers, and most of them hope that the workers will vote for "no union" in the upcoming elections. In the past, the growers have preferred the IBT to the unconventional UFW. Looking for momentum. The Agricultural Labor Relations Board expects to run 100 to 300 elections in September alone, and the outcome of these might establish the dominance of either union in California's large farm industry. The grape industry is the initial target for both unions, but other growers will be

watching the first grape-picker votes to see which union is gaining momentum for further organizing.

Both unions have campaigned intensively in the last month. Cesar Chavez, president of the UFW, led a contingent of farm workers on a 1,000-mi. march to drum up support. The UFW has 500 organizers in the field, augmented by a delegation from the AFL-CIO with which it is affiliated. But Chavez complains that many farmers are denying access to his organizers.

The independent Teamsters now has about 400 contracts with grape growers, covering about 60,000 workers, or the bulk of the industry. "We have about 30 organizers throughout the state now," says Teamsters information director James Hansen. "But at everyone of those 400 ranches, our representatives are also talking to our members. We'll come up with the bulk of our contracts intact."

To strengthen that possibility, Teamsters organizers point to hefty terms in the 1970 contracts the union has negotiated this year. Recently, it won a 28% wage increase over three years at an Oxnard (Calif.) egg ranch and a 1976 wage reopener.

1975 McGraw-Hill, Inc., Business Week, September 8, 1975

The UFW had more than 50,000 workers under contract in the early 1970s. But the Teamsters stepped in when the UFW's contracts began expiring in 1972 and signed new pacts, which Chavez terms "sweetheart contracts." Now, with fewer than 15,000 members, the UFW claims those workers will return to the UFW if given a choice. "If employers allow fair elections, we'll win most of them," says Marc Grossman, Chavez' administrative assistant. Major target

Facts on File World News Digest

June 7, 1975

SECTION: U.S. AFFAIRS; Labor

PAGE: Pg. 398 E3

LENGTH: 387 words

HEADLINE: California enacts farm-labor law

BODY:

... labor union would be on the ballot if 20% of the workers petitioned for it. The workers also would be given the choice of a "no union" vote on the ballot. The elections would be held at harvest time to insure maximum participation.

Strikes to gain bargaining representation were barred.

On boycotts, the so-called "hard" secondary boycotts -- union action to bar handling by a secondary employer, such as a supermarket, of goods of a primary employer with whom the union had a dispute -- were barred; consumer boycotts -- such as picketing to urge consumers not to patronize a store because it handled products of an employer with whom the union had a dispute -- were sanctioned.

Brown was instrumental in enactment of the legislation, which occurred during a special session of the Legislature ordered by Brown for that purpose. Just prior to the session, in eight hours of meetings May 19, Brown got support for the legislation from representatives of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and AFL-CIO building and construction trades unions. The endorsement was made in return for guarantees that construction workers on the farms would continue to be represented by construction unions, not be farm labor unions, and that the Teamster's contracts with California growers would not be voided without a representational election.

Support for the legislation from growers and the AFL-CIO United Farm Workers, which was locked in a jurisdictional struggle with the Teamsters, had been obtained previously. The Teamsters represented 50,000 and the UFW 10,000, of the 250,000 farm workers in California. The union wage for the farm workers averaged \$2.50 to \$3 an hour.

Business Week

June 2, 1975

SECTION: LABOR; Pg. 57

LENGTH: 1380 words

HEADLINE: A law to settle farm labor strife

BODY:

The labor strife that has convulsed California's lettuce, grape, and wine-making industries for more than a decade has been aggravated by the lack of federal or state machinery for union representation elections. This week, an unexpected compromise agreement by such long-time antagonists as the United Farm Workers, the Teamsters Union, and the major growers assured California's enactment of the nation's first farm labor relations law. Even so, the West's stormy farm labor disputes will not end immediately.

With the support of the three parties -- they agreed to final compromises on May 19 -- Governor Edmund G. Brown, Jr., called a special session of the state

legislature to hurry passage of the bill. If it is enacted within two weeks as predicted, it will become effective 90 days later, or in late summer. This will ensure that certification elections can be held during next fall's harvest, when employment in the fields will peak.

The bill sets up state machinery for determining by secret-ballot elections which union, if any, will represent workers at each grower. Cesar Chavez, the founder and president of the UFW, had been demanding such a procedure for years, claiming that the majority of farm workers will vote for his union. Chavez' bitter and often violent rivalry with the Teamsters, which now has the majority of California's farm workers under contract, will be diverted to legal channels under the law.

After years of dawdling on farm legislation by state politicians, Governor Brown brought all sides together two weeks ago to draft a bill. The Teamsters opposed an early version of the bill -- and threatened to call a strike over it -- on the grounds that the bill could be interpreted as voiding all existing contracts when the law becomes effective. Many growers, confused about whom they should bargain with, were beginning to break off current negotiations with both unions. Certification. Under the compromise bill, contracts remain in effect until an election is held and a bargaining agent is certified by a new farm labor board. But the act of certification will void an existing contract, a provision that seems to favor the UFW since it has fewer contracts than the Teamsters. The advantage to the Teamsters Union is that it can shore up its position by continuing to negotiate with growers in the several months before the board could certify an election.

Both unions claim that they will win the majority of the representation elections. Organizing efforts are likely to be furious, and neither union is likely to abandon the fight if it loses an election.

1975 McGraw-Hill, Inc., Business Week, June 2, 1975

But the secret-ballot voting under state supervision should eliminate the confusion and violence that has marked past organizing efforts. Formerly, the unions have claimed representation rights on the basis of registration cards signed by the workers -- sometimes under duress.

"If the growers don't interfere and the Teamsters don't beat up our people, we can win most of the elections," Chavez says. "If we lose an election, that's it. We'll go elsewhere."

An election cannot be held until 51% of the full-time work force is employed, a provision that prohibits elections during the off-season when only a few year-round employees work for each grower. The UFW claims that its real strength lies with migrant laborers, who work mainly during the harvest seasons.

Nevertheless, M. E. Anderson, director of the Western Conference of Teamsters, predicts victory by his union when the ...

Newsweek

May 26, 1975, UNITED STATES EDITION

BUSINESS; Pg. 68

359 words

LABOR: A Boost for Chavez

BODY:

The California bill grants full collective-bargaining rights to farm workers, who are not covered by provisions of the National Labor Relations Act. It grants them the right to vote by secret ballot for the union of their choice - or for no union - and permits strikes at harvest time, the only time farm workers have real bargaining power. But the bill also limits secondary boycotts at the retail level, a key tactic Chavez and his supporters have used over the years.

Although the UFW supported the measure, the Teamsters and other labor unions were unhappy. John F. Henning, executive secretary of the California Labor

Federation, predicted a wave of jurisdictional disputes since the bill provides for only one union for each employer. Thus, if the UFW wins a representation election, a carpenter or other skilled worker employed by that grower must belong to the farm workers' union. "That picket lines will be up," Henning predicted.

The bill was an obvious boost for the UFW, whose membership has shrunk from a high of 55,000 to less than 10,000 in the two years since the Teamsters moved into the fields and signed 400 contracts with growers who employ 50,000 persons. Now that the farm hands can decide by secret ballot whom they want to represent them, Cesar Chavez - once a field hand himself - has a much better chance to compete with the powerful Teamsters.

The Economist

May 17, 1975

California;
Farmer Brown

San Francisco

BODY:

A bill reached the state legislature in Sacramento this week to confer on agricultural workers the right to choose their own bargaining agents in secret elections and to establish a state board to guarantee the rights of all parties in agricultural labour disputes. The chances now look brighter for an end to the long struggle in California over the right of farm workers to organise.

The bill must still negotiate weeks of review and possible amendment. It is, however, the product of an agreement that may be broad enough to carry it through. Credit for the hard bargaining that was needed to reach a genuine compromise is conceded on all sides to California's new young governor, Mr Edmund Brown, Jr, who kept 37 spokesmen for the disparate groups in a 10-hour session in his office all through one Sunday night. He won eventual agreement from growers and labour leaders. Mr Cesar Chavez of the United Farm Workers' union, who has crusaded for guarantees of pay and working conditions for the long-ignored mobile harvest workers, finally agreed to the plan wholeheartedly.

The teamsters' union, which competes with him in organising the farm workers, has not agreed yet. But the teamsters' main legislative ally, Senator George Zenovich, chairman of the industrial relations committee that has stood in Mr Chavez's way for years, this week sent the bill to the state senate with his own supporting vote.

NEW YORK TIMES

February 23, 1975, Sunday

SECTION: Page 31, Column 1

LENGTH: 217 words

ABSTRACT:

Several hundred members of United Farm Workers union begin 110-mile march, San Francisco, to focus attention on nationwide boycott of Gallo wines. March is scheduled to end with rally at winery in Modesto. Union has been boycotting Gallo since summer of '73 when winery decided not to renew contract with Farm Workers and signed instead with Teamsters union. March begins after several speeches, including 1 by Repr Phillip Burton and writer Jack Scott, speaking for basketball player Bill Walton. Scott says Walton will organize athletes' boycott of Gallo. Earlier, Teamsters hold joint news conf with 2 AFL-CIO unions, denouncing Farm Workers tactics. Winery Distillery and Allied Workers Union official Ben Koch says union is not supporting boycott because Gallo has union contract with distillery members. Glass Bottle Blowers Assn official Joseph Washburn also criticizes Farm Workers. AFL-CIO pres George Meany declines to sanction boycott because of Gallo contracts with 3 AFL-CIO unions covering about 2,000 workers. Gallo officials express dismay about complaints by Farm Workers pres Cesar Chavez that co signed sweetheart contract with Teamsters. Gallo official Walter Bregman says co's wage rates are among highest in agr labor.

NEW YORK TIMES

September 15, 1974, Sunday

SECTION: Section 6; Page 18

LENGTH: 100 words

BYLINE: BY WINTHROP GRIFFITH

ABSTRACT:

Apparent demise of Cesar Chavez and United Farm Workers Organizing Com discussed. Union currently holds few fragments of collective bargaining power it won in '70 and is fighting for survival against Teamsters Union, which, after 4 yrs of shrewd maneuvering are cementing their victories and expanding their representation of farm workers. Teamster tactics during 1st phase of their challenge to Chavez centered on collusive relationships with growers but has changed to physical violence that has seen shift of grower contracts away from United Farm Workers.

NEW YORK TIMES

July 23, 1974, Tuesday

SECTION: Page 11, Column 3

LENGTH: 96 words

ABSTRACT:

United Farm Workers Organizing Com pres Cesar Chavez demands crackdown by Border Patrol on illegal aliens, whom, he contends, are playing instrumental role in breaking strikes called by union. Charges more than 2,000 illegal aliens are employed by ranches in San Joaquin Valley, Calif, and that current influx of aliens is worst in US history. Sees conspiracy between Nixon Adm and agribusiness to ensure steady flow of aliens. Border Patrol official describes Chavez's charge of collusion as 'ridiculous,' but admits staff is inadequate to halt influx of aliens (M).

NEW YORK TIMES

June 3, 1974, Monday

SECTION: Page 34, Column 2

LENGTH: 148 words

BYLINE: BY JON NORDHEIMER

ABSTRACT:

Indio, Calif, grower K K Larson asks state to enjoin United Farm Workers union

from picketing his farm and to stop union appeals to public not to buy his grapes. Union head Cesar Chavez fears that if union loses ct battle, other growers will soon be seeking similar injunctions to carry them through harvest.

Larson contends he is caught in jurisdictional dispute between Farm Workers and

Teamsters unions. Asks Judge Fred Metheny to invoke Calif Jurisdictional Strike

Act to prohibit Farm Workers from interfering with production and sales.

Union

atty Jerry Cohen says state law is not applicable if grower has interfered in dispute and has demonstrated that he favors 1 union over other. Union also charges that Larson encouraged discontent among field workers, who voted in Apr

not to renew Farm Workers contract. Chavez contends that vote was not conducted in good faith.

NEW YORK TIMES

April 25, 1971, Sunday

SECTION: Page 43, Column 1

LENGTH: 88 words

ABSTRACT:

Several leading San Diego County, Calif, produce growers say they will move operations to Mex or go out of business rather than sign contracts with Cesar Chavez's United Farm Workers Organizing Com, which seeks to organize field

workers; local coll students and Chicano orgns are backing union's effort; union

spokesman charges growers' threat is 'scare tactic' and 'union-busting' attempt;

San Diego County Farm Bur exec sec Fred Hinrichs disagrees; says many big growers have already made plans to sell land to indus developers.

NEW YORK TIMES

March 27, 1971, Saturday

SECTION: Page 1, Column 2

LENGTH: 59 words

ABSTRACT:

Cesar Chavez announces United Farm Workers Organizing Com and Teamsters have reached agreement to divide jurisdiction over lettuce indus workers, news conf; under pact, com will organize field workers and Teamsters drivers and processors; Chavez orders 30-day suspension of natl boycott; urges growers to begin immediate negotiations with his union;