DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 111 563 RC 008 744

AUTHOR Miller, Michael V.
TITLE Mexican-American and Mexican National Farm Workers: A Literature Review.
PUB DATE Aug 75
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Rural Sociological Society (San Francisco, California, August 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Agricultural Laborers; Attitudes; Braceros; Foreign Workers; Income; Labor Unions; Legislation; *Literature Reviews; *Mexican Americans; *Mexicans; Migrant Workers; *Socioeconomic Influences

ABSTRACT

This paper is concerned with the scholarly treatment accorded to Mexican American and Mexican National farm workers by historical, legal, social work, and social science journals. Only those articles published after the arbitrary date of 1960 are reviewed due to space and time limitations. Works published since then are briefly summarized and evaluated in light of the contributions made toward the explication and understanding of the topic. The 29 articles are classified under 4 categories: (1) migrant farm workers, (2) the Bracero Program, (3) alien workers -- "wetbacks" and commuters, and (4) labor unionization. These articles are reviewed according to category, chronological relevance, and level of inclusiveness or abstraction. The paper concludes with some comments and suggestions pertaining to problems which appear to warrant future research consideration. (NQ)

MEXICAN-AMERICAN AND MEXICAN NATIONAL FARM WORKERS: A LITERATURE REVIEW*

Michael V. Miller

Department of Rural Sociology

Texas A&M University

*Paper presented at the August, 1975 annual meeting of the Rural Sociological Society, San Francisco, California.

For too long Mexican Americans have been almost totally viewed by the dominant society as merely an abundant supply of cheap and docile labor. And perhaps nowhere has this conception been more apparent than in agriculture. Only with the organizing efforts of the United Farm Workers under Cesar Chavez has the plight of Mexican agricultural laborers captured national attention. However, the history of the involvement of Mexican Americans and Mexican Nationals in Southwestern agriculture reveals more than a half century of economic oppression and exploitation coupled with political manipulation, chicanery, and neglect. This history obviously does not speak well of the most affluent nation from a humanitarian perspective. But perhaps more important sociologically, it graphically illustrates the notion that social inequality, rather than being a consequence of the differential contributions that groups make toward the well-being of a society, is more directly a function of the variances in power commanded between groups in the polity and marketplace.

This paper is concerned with the scholarly treatment accorded to Mexican American and Mexican National farm workers by historical, legal, social work, and social science journals. While a complete review of all relevant works including books, research monographs, as well as journal articles would be most desirable, space and time limitations necessitate the review of only the latter. Book reviews, of course, are available in numerous journals. Such limitations also require consideration of only those articles published after the arbitrary date of 1960. Works published since then will be briefly summarized and evaluated in light of the contributions made toward

the explication and understanding of this broad topic. I will conclude with comments and suggestions pertaining to problems that appear to warrant future research consideration.

A fairly intensive library search uncovered only twenty-eight appropriate articles. These works may be classified conveniently under four categories: (1) migrant farm workers, (2) the Bracero Program, (3) alien workers--"wetbacks" and commuters, and (4) labor unionization. In terms of ordering the articles for review, I have considered category, chronological relevance, along with level of inclusiveness or abstraction.

Although T. Lynn Smith's "Farm Labor Trends in the United States, 1910 to 1969" (International Labor Review, August, 1970) does not examine the situation of Mexican agricultural laborers per se, it provides a general frame of reference and delineates several trends which are related to this question. First, the number of farm workers today is only about one-third of the amount in 1910 (13.5 million in 1910, 4.5 million in 1970). Of course, the large-scale mechanization of agriculture has been the primary force behind this sharp reduction. Smith notes that mechanization, however, has been most dramatic in the Midwest and considerably less so in the Southeast and Southwest. He suggests that the basic impediment to greater mechanization in the latter two regions has been the existence of a large supply of relatively inexpensive labor, namely blacks and Mexicans. The two states having the greatest number of hired farm workers, California and Texas, are also the states with the greatest concentrations of Mexican Americans. Finally, the employment of farm laborers has been and continues to be highly seasonal: the highest peak in the summer months, the lowest,

in the winter. We might note that this fact has particular relevance for the migrant population in the Southwest and particularly South Texas, who work the winter crops near home and migrate northward for work in the summer.

Migrant Farm Workers

"The Migratory Farm Worker" prepared by the USDA is one of several pieces dealing with Mexican farm workers in the June, 1968 edition of the Department of Labor's Monthly Labor Review. This article essentially offers a static analysis of migratory farm workers--how many there are, how many days they work, how much they earn, etc. Of the approximately 400,000 farm workers classified as "migrant," almost half work within seventy-five miles of their homes. Yet, on the other hand, twenty percent of the migrants venture more than one thousand miles for work. Also revealing is the fact that the majority of migrant workers derive a greater share of their incomes from non-farm as opposed to farm sources. Nevertheless, the migrant's average wage in 1966 was $1,580 with $1,046 from farm sources and $534 from non-farm work. The author(s) fails to relate why this apparent paradox exists. Other statistics relative to age, sex, education level, and homeownership are presented also. Glaring shortcomings of this analysis, however, lie in its failure to specify the ethnic composition of the migrant population and their states of origin.

Slightly historically oriented and considerably more enlightening is the "Socioeconomic and Cultural Conditions of Migrant Workers" by Faustina Solis in Social Casework (May, 1971). Solis provides a brief historical overview, a delineation of recent unionization

attempts, an analysis of employment patterns, and an examination of the migrants' social and cultural conditions, particularly as they relate to the social work orientation. Although she apparently synthesizes much of the standard knowledge already developed on these topics, she raises one point that I have yet to run across in other sources. In reference to unionization attempts prior to 1960, she argues that professional organizers failed "... because they were unwilling to modify their approach for agricultural workers. They failed to observe how the workers' strong social and cultural values were inconsistent with the patterns of trade unionism, and most important, they did not develop able leadership within the ranks of farm laborers themselves" (309-310). Conversely, more recent works (see Gomez-Quinones, 1972, and Weber, 1973) concerning Mexican-American agricultural labor unions between 1900 and 1934 reveal a strong radical tradition among workers and partially indigenous leadership structures. As she correctly notes, farm laborers have a considerably different structural relationship with their employers than do those involved in industrial manufacturing and also are not covered by the NLRA. Yet she fails to emphasize such factors as the extreme hostility unions have faced from both agribusiness and state and local governments, and the stiff economic competition that domestic workers have encountered from government-sponsored braceros, commuters, and illegal aliens.

While purporting to offer an overview of possible employment alternatives for migrant workers, Mildred Pratt ("Effect of Mechanization on Migrant Farm Workers," Social Casework, February, 1973) provides a superficial and often incoherent description of the situation of migrants in Illinois, a probe into their acceptance by Anglo residents

and welfare agencies, and a proposal to establish farm cooperatives for former migrants. Nowhere does she suggest what the "effects of mechanization" have been for migrants. These cooperatives or "community development centers" would be created and financed initially by the federal government, and as well as providing jobs, would offer educational training programs. Nevertheless, she fails to delineate other viable possibilities, nor does she examine the orientations of migrants to such a program, the problems associated with farm communes, the basic problems of bureaucracies, and the fundamental questions of welfare dependency and control.

Horacio Ulibarri noted marked attitudes of fatalism, resignation, and timidity in action among a sample of sixty-five migrant workers dispersed in Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas ("Social and Attitudinal Characteristics of Spanish-Speaking Migrant and Ex-Migrant Workers in the Southwest," Sociology and Social Research, April, 1966). Possessing present-time orientations, the workers were also reportedly apathetic toward government and resigned to poverty. He does not speculate as to why these attitudes were so pronounced, much less does he address the frequently debated question as to such orientations being due to class or culture. On the other hand, family life was a particularly strong area of life for the respondents although close bonds did not extend beyond the nuclear unit. The only area of study in which significant differences were found related to perceptions of discrimination: while Mexican Nationals did not perceive discrimination and migrants from northern New Mexico were aware of it only in limited work situations, the Colorado and Texas samples felt acute discrimination.

Two articles by Perry and Snyder investigate Ohio farmers' attitudes and opinions toward migrants ("Opinions of Farm Employees Toward Welfare Assistance for Mexican American Migrant Workers" Sociology and Social Research January, 1971, and "Farm Employer Attitudes Toward Mexican-American Migrant Workers" Rural Sociology, June, 1970). In the first article, mixed feelings are noted among farmers toward social welfare services for migrants. Only about one-fifth of the sample believed that the provision of welfare aid usually resulted in worker absenteeism. This orientation was found to be significantly related to educational attainment, religious affiliation (Catholicism), and interestingly, low status distance. Conversely, almost half of the farmers felt that welfare agencies interfered too much with farm activities. Educational level was the only variable significantly associated with this opinion. In the second article, Ohio farmers were found to have generally positive attitudes toward migrants. Neither positive or negative attitudes were related to such variables as farm size, age, income, education, or political affiliation. Catholicism and low status distance, however, were significantly associated with negative attitudes. Their evidence also strongly supports the "contact" hypothesis as "The farmer with little or no contact was likely to respond negatively to the migrants, and the inverse was also true" (p. 249). Seemingly in both articles the writers fall somewhat short methodologically, particularly in their findings concerning status distance and religious affiliation, since they fail to run data controls.

Bracero Program

(Aside from perhaps Ernesto Galarza, the most intensive research conducted on the Bracero Program has been that done by Otey Scruggs. His "Evolution of the Mexican Farm Labor Agreement of 1942" (Agricultural History, July, 1960) is an extremely well-researched analysis of the the creation of the Bracero Program. In explicating the development of the agreement between the U. S. and Mexican governments whereby tens of thousands of Mexican farm laborers were imported yearly between 1942 and 1964 to bridge the "manpower shortage," Scruggs delineates the initial factors giving impetus to the program, the various groups which were instrumental in its formation and those who were opposed to it, and the nature of the concerns of the two governments and how these were reflected in the formalized policy. In addition several interesting points are raised. First, several Mexican-American organizations staunchly opposed any program supporting the wholesale importation of braceros, realistically fearing that braceros would displace domestic laborers and depress wages. Secondly, most American farmers were opposed to any agreement in which the Mexican government would be an active participant. They simply wanted immigration restrictions dropped so that they could recruit and exploit without being hampered by controls. The Farm Bureau was one of the major groups supporting this stance. Thirdly, American negotiations had to overcome the resistance of Mexican officials to such a labor transfer. Not only had Mexican leaders long been offended by the heavy-handedness and discrimination encountered by Mexicans in the U.S.; they had serious doubts about the actual existence of a labor shortage and the purposes behind importation. Also, Mexican officials had to consider the labor needs of their own

nation as Allied production orders began coming in. In conclusion, Scruggs shows that the Mexican Farm Labor Agreement was not solely the result of the unhampered designs of American agribusiness, but that it evolved through a process of compromise.

Two other articles by Scruggs essentially examine the exclusion of Texas from the Bracero Program during World War II ("Texas, Good Neighbor?" Southwestern Social Science Quarterly, September, 1962, and "Texas and the Bracero Program, 1942-1947," Pacific Historical Review, August, 1963). Although during the war approximately 220,000 braceros migrated to the U. S. to work, none worked in Texas. Banned by the Mexican government due to the long history of discrimination in the state, Texas relied heavily on illegal alien labor, particularly in the southern area. Scruggs details the powerful role played in the censure by the Mexican press, the dilemmas faced by Mexican politicians, and the attempts at reconciliation by the Texas government, which even created a special agency ostensibly designed to promote goodwill and diminish discrimination, the Good Neighbor Commission.

Another excellent article on the Bracero Program but one that concentrates on its actual operations is that by Roy Gilmore and Gladys Gilmore, "The Bracero in California" (Pacific Historical Review, August, 1963). The Gilmores trace the use of contract Mexican labor in California and the official policies supporting it from the early 1920's to 1963. Of particular interest is their analysis of the Bracero Program in terms of meeting certification criteria (the rule stipulating that the importation of braceros must not adversely affect domestic workers) and enforcing compliance on other regulations, the methods used for the estimation of labor needs and "prevailing" wages, and the

dominance of braceros in certain geographical areas and specific crops. They found that the program seriously damaged the position of domestic farm workers. However, the advantage of using bracero labor was not that it was necessarily so inexpensive, but that it was dependable and docile labor.

Complementing the Gilmores' study, James F. Rooney evaluates the impact ofthe Bracero Program in a limited area within California ("The Effect of Imported Mexican Farm Labor in a California County," American Journal of Economics and Sociology, October, 1961). His documentation of farm labor practices in San Joaquin County reveals that (a) braceros were used to supplant rather than supplement the domestic work force, and (b) domestic laborers were heavily exploited by labor contractors. In some cases, contractors withheld almost half of the laborers' pay. Although the article is purported to be a case-study analysis, it is much too sketchy and also fails to examine the dynamics of bracero dominance and contractor practices.

The creation and implementation of the policy supposedly meant to guarantee that the position of domestic workers would not be damaged by imported alien labor is the subject of Howard N. Dellon's "Foreign Agricultural Workers and the Prevention of Adverse Effect" (Labor Law Journal, December, 1966). The major contribution of the article is the description of how "adverse effect" evolved from a highly general and ambiguous policy applied episodically to individual cases to one that detailed a variety of specific criteria to be met by all employers of legal aliens. Dellon, a staff economist with the Department of Labor (the agency which designed and was designated to enforce the policy), argues that this transition in "adverse effect" had a significant

impact in reducing the number of Mexican Nationals imported during the latter years of the Bracero Program, and in raising farm wages. However, these assertions are debatable. Other relevant sources have credited "adverse effect" with little or no positive impact on the situation of domestic workers.

Alien Laborers - "Webtacks" and Commuters

Concerning the topic of alien workers other than braceros, a number of well-written and informative articles were found. Sheldon L. Greene's "Immigration Law and Rural Poverty: The Problems of the Illegal Entrant" (Duke Law Journal, vol. 3, 1969) is a highly legalistic but useful review and analysis of legislation relative to illegal Mexican aliens, and its enforcement and subsequent impact on illegal immigration. Greene notes that even after World War II, South Texas agriculture and industry shunned the use of braceros and with the complicity of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) continued to rely on "wetback" labor as a de facto right. He argues that the contemporary illegal alien problem is the consequence of toothless laws and lax enforcement. Presently, no legal sanctions may be imposed against those who even knowingly employ illegal entrants. Likewise, ineffective monitoring systems allow many Mexican Nationals, who gain legal but restricted entry and who violate those restrictions, to gain permanent U. S. residency. Greene deems the law absurd that provides U. S. residence status for aliens yet simultaneously allows them commuter privileges to work in the U. S. but live in Mexico. He concludes by saying that legislation is simply not enough: even if tighter laws are passed their impact will be minimal unless appropriate enforcement agencies become

commensurately more responsive.

Jorge Bustamante has written two very penetrating articles on the illegal alien phenomenon ("The Historical Context of Undocumented Mexican Immigration to the United States" Aztlan, Spring, 1973, and "The "Wetback" as Deviant: An Application of Labeling Theory" American Journal of Sociology, January, 1972). Using the perspective of historical materialism in the first article, Bustamante briefly reviews 19th and 20th century immigration and importantly points out that the real issues are clouded when immigrants (legal or illegal) are blamed for depressing wages, breaking strikes, etc. He points out how each of the groups involved in the "wetback" game have a general role and role specifics which include that: (a) Mexican American farm workers stop illegal immigration in order to raise wages and bargaining power, (b) American farmers maximize profits by using the least expensive labor, (c) legislators gain the political backing and support of farmers by passing favorable laws (i.e., toothless laws); and (d) immigration officials due to insufficient appropriations and the pressures of vested interests enforce laws selectively. With these objectives in mind, Bustamente notes that the following contradictions are then made clear:

> (1) a condemnation of the Mexican worker (without visa) by defining him as a criminal and, at the same time, maintaining a demand for his labor force, reflected in a steadily increasing flux of Mexican workers (w.v.) each year; (2) penalizing a worker from Mexico for being in the United States without a visa but not penalizing a farmer for hiring the former; (3) maintaining an agency for the enforcement of immigration laws and at the same time exerting budget limitations and/or political pressures to prevent a successful enforcement of the law (p. 276-277).

In "The 'Wetback' as Deviant," Bustamante further elaborates on the role analysis, but additionally applies the labeling approach to the

historical transformation of the Mexican worker (w.v.) into the criminal "wetback." He convincingly argues that [redacted] vested interests which have transformed wetbacks into deviants have facilitated their exploitation, and that the agencies and groups which in one way or another support the "wetback" phenomenon are in essence "antilaw enterprises."

Two well-written and informative articles were found relative to Mexican commuter workers (Anna-Stina Ericson's "The Impact of Commuters on the Mexican-American Border Area," Monthly Labor Review, August, 1970, and Lamar B. Jones' "Alien Commuters in United States Labor Markets," International Migration Review, Spring, 1970). Ericson uses immigration data and labor statistics to assess the influence of the 70,000 commuters who daily cross the border. She notes that in U. S. bordertowns (and those of Mexico even more so), unemployment rates are extremely high--and even with these high rates a tremendous amount of legal as well as illegal commuting occurs. And while commuters were banned in 1967 by federal regulation from breaking strikes, the INS has failed on many occasions to enforce it. She argues that the total elimination of the commuter system, however, would probably be worse than its present effects, as it would severely disrupt the interdependent border economies, strain diplomatic relations, and cause extreme personal hardships. While eighty to ninety percent of all commuters desire to move to the U. S. if the commuting system is discontinued, U. S. bordertowns would in no way be capable of handling housing, education, and demands for other services. To diminish the negative impact of the system, she suggests several possibilities: (1) strengthen and enforce labor certification procedures--"adverse effect," (2) require that commuters be paid above the "prevailing wage," and (3) the provision

of limited work permits, a commutation tax, or a commuter ticket. Jones ("Alien Commuters...") supplies much of the same background information and statistics that Ericson does but goes into greater detail in terms of employment patterns, job displacement, wage effects, employers' views, reform proposals. Farm work is the largest occupational category for commuters. Over forty percent are employed in agriculture. However, interestingly, while sixty percent of California commuters are farm workers--only seventeen percent in Texas are so employed. One-half of all commuters work in Texas, thirty-eight percent in California, and in Arizona, thirteen percent. Jones posits that commuters have deleterious effects on domestic workers. For example, commuters make up one-third of the predominantly agricultural labor force of the Imperial Valley of California, yet in 1966 unemployment averaged ten percent. He insightfully notes that most commuters could not reside in the U. S. even if they so desired because of their low earnings which prevents them from meeting the requirement of showing proof that they and their families would not become public charges. Tighter restrictions may not be appropriate to handle the problem--conditions may not improve and employment opportunities may not increase. According to Jones, commuters may be considered resource imports and domestic workers who are displaced should therefore be covered by the Trade Expansion Act and consequently be provided with relocation allowances. Long promoted by Niles Hansen, subsidized training and transfer might be a viable alternative for unemployed and underemployed bordertown residents. However, even though the LTV experience was relatively successful; relocation seemingly may not be appropriate in the sense that many residents may not desire to leave and the labor force would be

increasingly comprised of commuters with a subsequent deterioration of work conditions for domestics.

Labor Unionization

Not surprisingly, unionization was the topic which the greatest number of articles addressed. In "Collective Bargaining on the Farm" by Karen Koziara (Monthly Labor Review, June, 1968), a rather concise but enlightening examination of agricultural labor relations is provided. Koziara analyzes the conditions peculiar to farm employment which negatively influence the possibility of large-scale unionization, such as seasonality, the consequences of mechanization, the oversupply of labor, the position of the labor contractor, and the compositon and degree of mobility of the labor force. She also briefly reviews the historical role of government in the farm labor situation, and concludes with a discussion of the evolution, effects, and prospects for collective bargaining in agriculture.

Several writers recently have developed analyses of the historical antecedents to the contemporary organizing efforts of the UFW. Contrary to conventional understandings, these works reveal that agricultural unionization among Mexican Americans did not begin with the efforts of Chavez, but has a lengthy and varied, albeit unsuccessful, tradition. A valuable research piece is that by Juan Gomez-Quiñones ("The First Steps: Chicano Labor Conflict and Organizing 1900-1920," Aztlan, Spring, 1972). Gomez-Q provides a demographic overview of the Mexican American population between 1900 and 1920, factors behind immigration, labor distribution, and an analysis of early labor conflicts (Oxnard - 1903, Asherton - 1912, Wheatland - 1913, Turlock - 1917, numerous strikes in the Southern California citrus

industry - 1919, and the Arizona cotton strikes - 1920). In summary, Gomez-Q states that agricultural and industrial vested interests capitalized on racism, and the more established unions were able to gain concessions at the expense of excluded workers.

> Comparatively, for the Chicano, the A.F. of L. was implicitly hostile and the I.W.W. ineffectively sympathetic. The A. F. of L. explicitly opposed Mexican immigration. It blocked the enrollment of Chicanos as members ... In contrast to the A. F. of L. elitist liberal collaborationist policy, the I.W.W. believed its mission to be "subserve the immediate interest of the working class and effect their final emancipation." The I.W.W. did organize general industrial and agricultural labor. Though members were not free of hostile attitudes toward Chicanos, I.W.W. faced the issue of racism, appealed to worker solidarity and facilitated Chicano participation. Nonetheless, the I.W.W., battered by repressive assaults, infatuated with its rhetoric, and faulty in its organizing did not prove a viable alternative to the Chicano worker (p. 38).

Devra Anne Weber ("The Organizing of Mexicano Agricultural Workers: Imperial Valley and Los Angeles, 1928-34, An Oral History Approach" Aztlan, Fall, 1973) describes four efforts at unionization--the Imperial Valley (1928, 1930, and 1934) and El Monte (1933). In detailing the four case studies, Weber shows that, although unsuccessful, "the organizing was ideologically diverse, and conscious links existed with earlier, often radical, organizing which had originated in Mexico" (p. 307).

Charles Wollenberg's "Huelga, 1928 Style: The Imperial Valley Cantaloupe Workers' Strike" (Pacific Historical Review, February, 1969) is a more detailed analysis of early activity. Apparently indigenously organized, work-stoppages were centered around the town of Brawley during the beginning of the 1928 spring cantaloupe harvest. Well-supported by area farm laborers but only lasting for two days, the strike was broken with relative ease by growers and law enforcement officials

who threatened to deport some of the alien "troublemakers" and actually arrested a large number of activists on trumped-up charges.

The strike at El Monte in 1933 is given equally intensive coverage by Ronald W. Lopez ("The El Monte Berry Strike of 1933," Aztlan, Spring, 1970) and Charles Wollenberg ("Race and Class in Rural California: The El Monte Berry Strike of 1933," California Historical Quarterly, Summer, 1972). The El Monte strike, occurring near Los Angeles and lasting roughly one month, was unusual in the sense that Japanese Americans rather than Anglos were the growers being struck. Organized primarily by the Cannery and Agricultural Workers Industrial Union (C&AWI), a Communist Party affiliate, grievances centered around low wages. Although a compromise was eventually reached with the intervention of the State Bureau of Industrial Relations and the Department of Labor (federal), the terms were patently ignored by El Monte growers and the laborers' objective conditions were poorer than before the strike.

Providing a chronological review of legal and legislative events relative to the activities ofthe UFW, Salvador E. Alvarez's article "The Legal and Legislative Struggle of the Farmworker: 1965-1972" (El Grito, Winter, 1972-73), is a valuable reference for those interested in agricultural unionization. While it is not highly analytical or interpretive, the article is a testament to the lengthy, involved, and many times blocked, efforts of the UFW toward making the system responsive.

Two articles from the June, 1968 issue of the Monthly Labor Review examine cases of successful labor organizing. "La Huelga! Delano and After" by Irving J. Cohen is a brief but informative overview of organization in Delano, the jurisdictional lines set, contract

provisions, and prospects in other states. Cohen primarily credits the success of the UFW to its ability in mobilizing a secondary boycott among diverse segments of the nation's population. Mark Erenburg's "Obreros Unidos in Wisconsin" describes how progressive labor-related state laws combined with a receptive social environment facilitated successful unionization among Mexican American migrants. Implicit within both articles are the notions that viable organization depends on a number of factors beyond the immediate scope of the union: the support of essentially middle-class non-farm groups, negotiating with large agribusinesses, and operation within a relatively favorable legal environment.

"Current Developments in Farm Labor Law" (Labor Law Journal, April, 1965) by Charles A. Rummel, general counsel of the California Farm Bureau Federation, is, as might be expected, an analysis that is highly unfavorable toward the UFW. Rummel argues against what he calls the "new instant" NLRA (the new method for establishing labor disputes) and the secondary boycott. In essence, he submits that the legal pendulum has swung too far in favor of the UFW.

Thomas E. Murphy's "An End to American 'Serfdom' - The Need for Farm Labor Legislation" (Labor Law Journal, February, 1974) is a critical but sympathetic examination of the legal directions of the UFW. Reviewing the setbacks of the UFW at the hands of the growers-Teamsters coalition beginning in 1970, Murphy questions the continued viability of the secondary boycott, the unfavorable actions of the Nixon-controlled NLRB which restrict but fail to protect agricultural unions, and what he sees as the attempts by Chavez to gain federal protection

without restriction, which proved unsuccessful. "The fact is that had Chavez embraced NLRA coverage in 1969, his union would not be in its present disintegrating condition (p. 93)."

Conclusions

The fact that less than thirty relevant articles (an average of less than two per year) were revealed through a fairly intensive library search attests to the basic lack of interest in academia toward the study of farm workers. Interestingly, only seven articles were published between 1960 and 1967. All but one of these were related to the Bracero Program which was then beginning to be phased out. After the media captured the efforts of Chavez, research began to proliferate--most of the work was relative to unionization. As the record shows, sociology journals have not published much on farm workers (less than five articles). Rural Sociology has only one relevant publication. On the other hand, much more commitment and interest has been revealed by historical, law, labor, and Chicano studies journals.

Taken as a whole, these articles provide us with numerous insights into the history and contemporary situation of Mexican-American and Mexican National farm workers in the U. S. We see that as a collectivity, Mexicanos have served as the primary agricultural labor-base from which agribusinesses in the Southwest have profited since the turn of the century. Growers in the region have always desired to have the largest possible labor force at the lowest possible price. And to a very great extent, they have realized this through the tacit approval and support of the government. Evenmore, for a period of years the federal government played an active role as labor procurer for the sake

of insuring that a "manpower shortage" would not beset Southwestern agriculture. Only after the official termination of the Bracero Program do we see unions gaining any semblance of success, but even then, only during certain times and at specific places under particularly auspicious circumstances.

Although passage of the Brown Bill will undoubtedly have important consequences for the future course of the UFW in California, for the broad lot of farm workers the situation has improved little. Domestic laborers are encountering increasing competition from foreign workers. Since January of this year, the INS due to "insufficient revenue" is only apprehending these illegal aliens who are suspected of felony commissions. In the lower Rio Grande Valley, farm wages generally range from $1.10 to $1.50 an hour. Fieldwork is increasingly becoming an economically irrational occupational option for American citizens. Various Congressional bills are now pending which if passed and rigidly enforced would greatly stem the flow of immigration by imposing stiff penalties on those hiring illegal aliens. Passage, however, is highly problematic at this time given the political clout of vested interests in the region.

This summer, the Texas UFW under the leadership of Tony Orendain has attempted to organize South and West Texas melon workers. Starting in the lower Rio Grande Valley in May, the UFW has mobilized both Mexican American and Mexican National laborers. At times, their efforts were accompanied by grower violence as attested to by the shooting of ten activists on a melon farm near Hidalgo. The melon harvest has since taken the organizers to such places as Presidio and Pecos. However, grower organization and unresponsive Texas labor laws have largely stymied their efforts toward recognition.

In closing, this review has stimulated a variety of questions which, I feel, have relevance for future research. Oral historians, for example, could make important contributions by contacting and interviewing a portion of the vast numbers of Mexican Americans who both worked along-side braceros and were displaced by braceros during the previous three decades. First-hand knowledge is extremely limited on the personal and community impact of the Bracero Program. Concerning the renewal of the program in 1951 in the form of P.L. 78, we know relatively little. How was it passed given that the war emergency had ended six years before? What of the many unsuccessful attempts at unionization in the recent past? What were the dynamics of these failures? I know of only one study (and that being unpublished) on one of the most serious attempts ever in Texas, the 1967-1968 strikes against La Casita Farms in Rio Grande City. What do we have to learn from this case? What of the history and sociology of the migrant farmstream and the many who settled out in the Midwest? What have been the effects of mechanization on migrant workers? What factors were behind the recent decision of the INS to reduce its activities? How is the INS manipulated by vested interests? While these are some of the more obvious questions demanding research, certainly numerous other problems related to farm labor deserve scholarly attention.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alvarez, Salvador E.
1972-73 "The Legal and Legislative Struggle of the Farmworker: 1965-1972." El Grito. (Winter).

Bustamente, Jorge.
1972 "The 'Wetback' as Deviant: An Application of Labeling Theory." American Journal of Sociology. (January).

Bustamente, Jorge.
1973 "The Historical Context of Undocumented Mexican Immigration to the United States." Aztlan. (Spring).

Cohen, Irving J.
1968 "La Huelga! Delano and After." Monthly Labor Review. (June).

Dellon, Howard N.
1966 "Foreign Agricultural Workers and the Prevention of Adverse Effect." Labor Law Journal. (December).

Erenburg, Mark.
1968 "Obreros Unidos in Wisconsin." Monthly Labor Review. (June).

Ericson, Anna-Stinna.
1970 "The Impact of Commuters on the Mexican-American Border Area." Monthly Labor Review. (August).

Gilmore, Roy and Gilmore, Gladys.
1963 "The Bracero in California." Pacific Historical Review. (August).

Gomez-Quiñones, Juan.
1972 "The First Steps: Chicano Labor Conflict and Organizing 1900-1920." Aztlan. (Spring).

Greene, Sheldon L.
1969 "Immigration Law and Rural Poverty: The Problems of the Illegal Entrant." Duke Law Journal. (Vol. 3).

Jones, Lamar B.
1970 "Alien Commuters in United States Labor Markets" International Migration Review. (Spring).

Koziara, Karen.
1968 "Collective Bargaining on the Farm." Monthly Labor Review. (June).

Lopez, Ronald W.
1970 "The El Monte Berry Strike of 1933." Aztlan. (Spring).

Murphy, Thomas E.
1974 "A End to American 'Serfdom' - The Need for Farm Labor Legislation." Labor Law Journal. (February).

Perry, Joseph B. and Snyder, Eldon F.
1971 "Opinions of Farm Employers toward Welfare Assistance for Mexican American Migrant Workers." Sociology and Social Research. (January).

Pratt, Mildred.
1973 "Effect of Mechanization on Migrant Farm Workers." Social Casework. (February).

Rooney, James F.
1961 "The Effect of Imported Mexican Farm Labor in a California County." American Journal of Economics and Sociology. (October).

Rummel, Charles A.
1968 "Current Developments in Farm Labor Law." Labor Law Journal. (April).

Scruggs, Otey.
1960 "Evolution of the Mexican Farm Labor Agreement of 1942." Agricultural History. (July).

Scruggs, Otey.
1962 "Texas, Good Neighbor?" Southwestern Social Science Quarterly. (September).

Scruggs, Otey.
1963 "Texas and the Bracero Program, 1942-1947." Pacific Historical Review. (August).

Smith, T. Lynn.
1970 "Farm Labor Trends in the United States, 1910-1969." International Labor Review. (August).

Snyder, Eldon F. and Joseph B. Perry.
1970 "Farm Employer Attitudes Toward Mexican-American Migrant Workers." Rural Sociology. (June).

Solis, Faustina.
1971 "Socioeconomic and Cultural Conditions of Migrant Workers." Social Casework. (May).

Ulibarri, Horacio.
1966 "Social and Attitudinal Characteristics of Spanish-Speaking Migrant and Ex-Migrant Workers in the Southwest." Sociology and Social Research. (April).

USDA
1968 "The Migratory Farm Worker." Monthly Labor Review. (June).

Weber, Devra Anne.
1973 "The Organizing of Mexicano Agricultural Workers: Imperial Valley and Los Angeles, 1928-34, An Oral History Approach." Aztlan. (Fall).

Wollenberg, Charles.
1969 "Huelga, 1928 Style: The Imperial Valley Cantaloupe Workers' Strike." Pacific Historical Review. (February).

Wollenberg, Charles.
1972 "Race and Class in Rural California: The El Monte Berry Strike of 1933." California Historical Quarterly. (Summer).