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In the interest of providing some background material on the Delano Grape Strike and the Church's involvement therein, we offer the second part of a two part article by Wayne C. Hartmire. The first part of this article appeared in the December issue of the opinion.

THE CHURCH
AND THE DELANO GRAPE STRIKE
(Part Two)

by Rev. Wayne Hartmire, Jr.

Questions and Comments

Certain questions are asked again and again as churchmen engage in dialogue around the Delano grape strike:

1) Why is the Church involved in something like the Delano labor dispute? Because people are involved and some of those people have suffered over a period of years because of an unjust farm labor system that needs to be changed. The farm workers' struggle to be organized, like the Negro struggle, is a basic attempt to establish a measure of justice and thus to carve out a place of dignity for farm workers and their children. Where human worth and the alleviation of human suffering are at stake, the churches should be present and active. Of course, the Church is already involved as we minister in agricultural communities. The question is not whether we are involved but rather the nature of our involvement.

2) Why is the Migrant Ministry (MM) taking such a one-sided position in an economic dispute? First, let's face the fact that our denominations have for many years given one-sided institutional support to the managerial side of the tracks in agricultural communities. Our churches have been and are part and parcel of the strength of the established community and its traditional way of doing things. That way of doing things has worked untold hardships on low income people. Unless we stand up for change, that traditional way will continue to hurt people.

The MM is a small part of the whole Church with a limited responsibility. Our task is to be with farm workers in their joy, their pain and their struggles. It is natural for our staff to be with farm workers in the Delano struggle.
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REV. WAYNE C. HARTMIRE, JR. is a Presbyterian minister, presently serving as Director of the California Migrant Ministry, an Agency of the Southern California Council of Churches.
At the beginning of this past December the Southwest Region of the Interseminary Movement (ISM) was organized under the advis-ership of Dr. John Cobb of the School of Theology at Claremont. At this meeting, held at the Claremont Inn, three school of this area were represented: California Baptist Seminary, Covina; School of Theology, Claremont; and Fuller Theological Seminary. Dean Fuller and I, representing this school, met with the Deans and Student representatives of the other two schools.

ISM is a movement whose aim is to involve students and faculty in ecumenical conversation with each other, the university, the church and the world. On a national scale ISM is an ecumenical movement involving Roman Catholic, Orthodox, and Protestant students and faculty. According to its own official statement, ISM is a movement of students and faculty who believe in Jesus Christ as Savior and Lord, who, in institutions in North America, are training for various aspects of the Christian ministry, and who are dedicated to the ecumenical reformation, namely, that fundamental reawakening among individuals, congregations and confessions, which leads to the pursuit of the full mission of the church of Jesus Christ in the entire world, and which seeks greater unity among Christians and churches in this world mission.

Locally, there are several concrete possibilities for inter-seminary involvement through ISM. (1) In the past Fuller, California Baptist, and Claremont have jointly sponsored seminars in the fields of Biblical Studies, Theology, or History. It is hoped that there will be a revival of this in the Fall of 1967. (2) Joint participation in the area of Social Concern is also a possible avenue of ISM endeavor. Already the chairmen of Social Action Committees of the three member-schools have met to discuss possibilities for cooperation in this field. (3) Interseminary communication between Protestant and Roman Catholic seminaries is the third avenue of endeavor for our local ISM. At present Catholic-Protestant conversation at the seminary level is nil in the Southern California area.

I hope this brief presentation of ISM has given you an adequate picture of this movement and has awakened your interest in it. I would encourage your active participation in ISM. In a rather kangaroo election at the Claremont conclave I was elected Vice-President of the local ISM, so any inquiries you may have concerning ISM may be directed to me.

RAB
SOME SERIOUS THINKING

"... I wonder if we have done as good a job at removing the beam from our own eye as we have in deploring the moat in our brother's eye."

Everyone condemns Apartheid—the princes of the Roman Church in council at the Vatican, the delegates to the United Nations, even (I am told) some of the Evangelicals gathered at the Berlin Congress on Evangelism. We at Fuller condemn Apartheid. The Social Action Committee of the Seminary in years past has spent considerable money to bring speakers to campus who have agreed with us on the evils of such a system. And after a couple of years of lily-white entering classes, we now have one whole Negro student from Watts in the B.D. program.

But I wonder if we have done as good a job at removing the beam from our own eye as we have in deploring the moat in our brother's eye. I personally accompanied the Negro student in the entering class (Mr. Pipes), when he received a card from the student housing office, describing an attractive apartment within easy walking distance from campus. I parked outside while he inquired of the owner who told him that the unit was promised to someone else.

Knowing that Fuller students have rented in that apartment complex in years past—there are two or three couples from the Seminary living there now—I returned alone a couple of hours later, and having introduced myself as from Fuller, was promptly given my choice of two comfortable and commodious apartments. The conversation which ensued with the proprietor, who freely acknowledged that he did not take Negroes, was illustrative of how complex the question of integrated housing is. He claimed that his acceptance of two Indian students from Fuller some years ago had cost him several months' rent as irate tenants left and new prospects balked at moving in.

If this is true, and I suppose it is, for surely all the racists don't live in South Africa and Rhodesia, what can we at Fuller do? If we do nothing, then we ought not to complain too loudly about the lamentable conditions in far-off Africa. I hope the editors of the opinion will publish reader response. I for one feel that the least we can do is to inquire of those who seek to list their rental opportunities with the school, and refuse to accept listings from any who discriminate. If landlords are influenced by people who won't rent where Negroes are allowed to live, maybe some of them will be influenced by people who won't rent where Negroes are not allowed to live.

Paul King Jewett

* * * * *

Dr. Jewett is Professor of Systematic Theology at Fuller Seminary.
Farm workers are not better people than their employers, but their cause is just. They are weak and oppressed and they should have the right to stand like men and deal as equals in the society that shapes their lives and the lives of their children. Christians who care about justice and human dignity should be on the side of the workers in this struggle. The alternative is to support an established farm labor system that is unfair.

3) Why is the MM against growers? The MM is not against growers as persons. Growers are people, like workers and ministers. In this particular situation they are people with too much power over their workers. This unchecked power coupled with economic self-interest have worked to the disadvantage of farm workers. It is an all too typical human situation and does not prove that growers are bad. But people get hurt by this typical human situation. It is not a friendly act to employers to allow that situation to continue. The way we treat farm workers on and off the job is important morally. Who will communicate the urgency of that moral issue if the Church is silent?

The MM expects the Church to continue to be with agricultural employers; hopefully, the shape of that ministry will change to meet the challenges of our times (e.g., small farmers need help as they confront an unjustly structured commodity market).

4) Why does the MM create conflict? Wouldn't mediation and reconciliation be more appropriate to the Church's role?

The MM has not created conflict any more than Martin Luther King creates conflict in the South. The conflict exists in the life of the community. Low income people feel kept down and discriminated against, they are separated from the established institutions, including the churches. Their situation is painful and they worry about opportunity for their children. This situation—this cleavage—exists. Farm workers feel it keenly. Middle class people do not feel it because they are participating in the fruits of community life and everything seems fine to them. When someone or some group says things are not fine, it comes as a shock to most church people, but low income people nod their heads.

Facing that cleavage, that conflict in the life of the community, is painful but necessary and healthful. Many will refuse to face the truth. Christians are called to be free from illusions and to face the real world as it is.

The MM is enthusiastically in favor of equal communication between growers and workers. That is what the workers are asking for. The growers are against it except on terms that leave them in charge of final decisions. Workers are insisting upon having their own organization with their own representatives so that their true feelings and their collective strength can be part of any negotiation process. Communication between individual workers or crews of workers or labor contractors and employers can have the stamp of equality and genuineness, but in the main it is clear to everyone involved who has the power. Communication is limited by fear, unexpressed hostility, and paternalism.
Those who hope for genuine communication and reconciliation should encourage growers to meet with their organized workers and, in the meantime, help workers to gain in strength so that what employers may not grant (i.e., equal negotiations) will still take place as the result of a power struggle (hopefully, a non-violent one).

What many churchmen now ask for is that the workers give up their collective strength and communicate with their employers on the employer's terms. This is that kind of reconciliation that asks the oppressed man to reconcile himself and his family to continued weakness and poverty.

5) How can Christians participate in a power struggle with all this means for the breakdown of human relations, the possibility of violence, the exaggeration on both sides, public notoriety, etc.?  

Power is being exercised every day in community life. Most of it is the quiet power of established institutions carrying on their daily tasks in the usual way. The "usual way" is not always just. Some people exercise influence to change the "usual way" in covert ways, e.g., a luncheon conversation or a telephone call with a member of the city council. Low income people have no such access to the seats of power. They also own little if any land and do not have large sums of money for campaign contributions; the editorial policy of local papers is normally responsive to established interests than to low income outsiders. So when low income people want to make their voices felt, they generally have to resort to visible means: large scale voter registration, picketing, delegations to city hall, etc.

Churchmen seem to accept without question the "usual ways" that power is exerted. Why should there be so much reaction to new forms of power exercised by farm workers and other low income people on behalf of a just cause?

Obviously, there are ambiguities related to all of our actions in this world. Silence, neutrality, triviality are enormously ambiguous in a world where men lose self-respect and hope because of "things as they are." Christians are not called to withdraw from dangerous situations or to shun confused college kids; rather we should be present with our Lord, and the more difficult the situation, the more powerful the presence should be. As a matter of fact, violence has been reduced because of "Christian presence" with farm workers in Delano. I only wish that the Church were as relevantly present with agricultural employers.

6) What does a labor dispute have to do with the Gospel and the mission of the Church?

Farm workers are important in the sight of God. But they are not treated that way by men and by the structures that men create. The way we treat farm workers (on and off the job) tends, therefore, to deny the truth of the Gospel we preach. Jesus' words are important and lasting because his life embodies the words. Farm workers and other men cannot hear and respond to the Gospel until our words take on flesh in the life of the world. The Church must be willing to risk its life to live out the urgent message we proclaim.
THE CHURCH AND THE DELANO GRAPE STRIKE (continued from page 5)

In Delano some churchmen are trying to say be deed that farm workers are important people who should be dealt with as men among men. God cares and our presence is a demonstration of that caring. If the Church were united in that presence, if we would put our institutional strength on the line in Delano, then the message would be heard loud and clear. As a matter of fact, Jesus had to put his body on the line, and that sacrifice bears the weight of his word to us.

This is not to say that the Church should not be present with employers. But the form of our presence may be different with growers and workers. Among other needs, the workers need our help in a morally just cause. Employers may need our help to confront a painful social situation that needs changing for everyone’s sake. Both need the chastisement and the challenge of the Gospel as well as the comfort and strength of a message of faithfulness and a community of faith.

The Migrant Ministry’s efforts must be seen in the context of the Church’s historical failure to serve low income people and in the context of deep cleavages in the life of the community. Being with farm workers would not be controversial if there were not a festering wound in the life of the community that results in suspicion and hostility on the part of farm workers and guilt and fear on the part of established citizens. Somehow that wound must be healed. It will only happen as men who are used to humiliation learn to stand and take their place in community life, and as those who are used to a superior place learn to share power and treat their brothers with respect. That day of healing seems to be a long way off. But the Church by its relevant presence in the Delanos of this Valley can announce its coming.

CONCLUDING REMARKS
by Gene Terpstra

"... a tendency in Mr. Talbot’s definition and analysis of the issues... changing or removing a problem by offering more exclusive definitions."

Solomon said, "Of making many books there is no end." If we were to continue writing criticisms and criticisms of criticisms, etc., I think this observation might also apply to journalistic dialogues such as the one Mr. Talbot and I have been conducting in the opinion. Because of this, and also because of the limitations of "the press" for conducting such a dialogue and because of concern for the reader, I have resisted the temptation to reply in detail here to Mr. Talbot’s criticism. This does not mean that I capitulate to his view of economic matters nor that I feel that the discussion should not continue. I feel, rather, that it should continue in direct personal discussion, CONTINUED ON PAGE 7
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CONCLUDING REMARKS (continued from page 6)
perhaps including others if they are interested in the issues. Whether or not it does continue in such a manner, I will make no further written comment after this issue.

I will not say that Mr. Talbot misunderstood some of my comments because perhaps I did not make myself understood, but clarifying my previous article is not my purpose here. However, I would like to comment briefly on a tendency in Mr. Talbot's definition and analysis of the issues, apparent in his criticisms of my article. That tendency is changing or removing a problem by offering more exclusive definitions. By this process, a thing "dies by a thousand qualifications"—to borrow one or Dr. Marty's terms. There are several examples of this in Mr. Talbot's article. He says that when fraud is behind price fixing, it "is not a market phenomenon" (emphasis mine). Then he goes on to say that if price fixing is not based on fraud, it is "merely an attempt to set monopoly prices" (emphasis mine). He does not deny the creation of health hazzards by business and industry, but dismisses them as "an irrelevancy." Why?—"because economic freedom does not entail the freedom to deface another's property," etc. Although he concedes the right of the government to control and correct such hazzards, he does not see them as a result of the free market's operation. The inherent innocence of the "market" is stated explicitly in his criticism of my use of the term and in the definition he offers: "an non-moral interplay of supply and demand," etc. A little farther on he makes the same observation in different words: "The market is by definition ethically neutral" (emphasis mine).

Of course, one must acknowledge the economists' prerogative of defining their terms. However, the "market" which results from the definition Mr. Talbot cites is a "kingdom not of this world" (not to be confused with that of which Jesus Christ spoke). The "market" is no more than a concept until the deliberate participation of human beings makes it function, and no operation in which people consciously participate and which is based on relationships among people (not just "interplay" among abstract forces) can meaningfully be considered "non-moral." One might with equal justice consider the driver's operation of an automobile as non-moral because the automobile itself is non-moral. The definition is also unacceptable because "non-moral does not seem to be an accurate description for certain economic events. The business practices I cited in my article I consider immoral, but Mr. Talbot disagrees about most of these. He feels that they are either not immoral, and thus spends much of his article explaining away these evils or qualifying them to death as part of the "non-moral interplay," or that they are not actually a part of the market's operation in the few instances when they are immoral. The latter approach seems to be a kind of economic excommunication to assure that the (concept of) market be kept pure, or at least non-moral.

But whether or not the market be defined in terms of non-moral economic forces or in terms of people's influence on these forces is not particularly important. What is important is the very real existence of certain business practices, such as those I noted in my article, and the determination as to whether they are conditions neces-
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ecessary to the operation of a free market and whether they are immoral. If they are necessary, they certainly do not measure up to the benevolent principles ("the cheapest possible price," "not at the expense of others, but by serving others," "mutual economic cooperation," etc.) which Mr. Talbot maintains govern the operation of the market. These practices, then, would seem to be immoral according to Mr. Talbot's description also. Economic interplay does not always have the ideal quality he describes. Harmful practices arise most frequently, perhaps, from abuse of the power possessed by many businesses and groups in the market. Because of their financial resources, great size, efficient organization, political influence (through their lobbying and through being an important source of taxes), and advertising, those who sell in the market often possess a great advantage in economic power over the masses who buy and even over other smaller groups who sell. While possession of this power does not necessarily mean that it is abused, human experiences show repeatedly the truth of the observation that "power corrupts." (It is noteworthy that political conservatives who regularly make this objection to "big government" and to labor unions rarely suggest that powerful businesses can become corrupt.) As Mr. Talbot asserts at the end of his article, "Since original sin affects man's behavior in economic matters, government is necessary to protect the market from sabotage by those who prefer the methods of coercion and deceit to the requirements of economic cooperation." I would agree with this, but would add that this protection does not exist just for the powers-that-be in the market (as proponents of laissez-faire economics seem to desire) but must cover the whole market—perhaps primarily those victims of the market who suffer from the practices of those who abuse their economic power. The "economic cooperation" Mr. Talbot mentions cannot be the highest good or the sole guide for government intervention; the masses of people in the market, the buyers, in many respects do not possess effective, organized power and thus are not able to compel powerful businesses to cooperate. A more comprehensive and effective criterion for government intervention is the wellbeing of the people as a whole.

* * *

(Previous articles in the above-mentioned controversy between Mr. Talbott and Mr. Terpstra may be found in the October, November, and December issues of the opinion on file in the reference room of the Library.)
THE SCION OF THE SIXTIES: LUCKY NUMBER SEVEN
by David K. Garth

There's a discrepancy in the morals of the land;
Auto-deaths are higher than we'd planned;
The most desirous Democratic nominee
Is scuttled
By one who voted last November '63;
The state that has the most is going to pot,
Unless the bearded ones (they say): have not.

It all adds up to...
(no, not two!
I.B.M. works just with
Oh and one)
No is 0, and Yes is 1.
It all adds up. 0 or 1?

Now we've reformed the universe
Back to a Calvanistic choice
Of 0 or 1,
And we know God best by his initials.

HOMESPUN PHILOSOPHY FROM A WAIF
by David K. Garth

They say that in this twentieth century society, our basic values are changing. I do not think so. We all have a secret longing to wake up in the morning and find ourselves back on the farm. But when the rooster crows, we, like Peter, know we were lying.

* * * * *

DAVID K. GARTH is a Middler at PTS. He received a B.A. in 1965 from the University of Virginia.
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See also Dr. Bromiley's amiable annotated bibliography of 1966 publications on Church history and Theology, Christianity Today, Feb. 3, 1967, pp. 3-5. Note well his observation that "One wishes sometimes that the mind could be given a little more of the time devoted to the pen."
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