UC Riverside

UC Riverside Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

Reckoning the Rural: Racial Capitalism, the San Joaquin Valley, and the University of California

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9nb2m4nr

Author

Alvarado, Aaron

Publication Date

2019

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
RIVERSIDE

Reckoning the Rural: Racial Capitalism, the San Joaquin Valley, and the University of California

A Dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction
of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Ethnic Studies

by

Aaron Alvarado

September 2019

Dissertation Committee:
Dr. Nick Mitchell, Co-Chairperson
Dr. Dylan Rodriguez, Co-Chairperson
Dr. Jodi Kim

Copyright by
Aaron Alvarado
2019

The Dissertation of Aaron Alvarado is approved:

_____

_____

Committee Co-Chairperson

_____

Committee Co-Chairperson

University of California, Riverside

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This project would not have been possible without a considerable amount of time, guidance, and patience from a lot of people. As someone who was born and raised in the San Joaquin Valley I will never forget what it was like to realize how few of us there are in academia, especially working on doctorate degrees, and do not think I could have persevered on this path if it was not for the people listed below.

First and foremost, I would like to thank my advisors. Nick Mitchell was always someone who helped push my thinking and provided me with many ah-ha moments during out meetings. Dylan Rodriguez for always providing the best conversations during office hours whenever I was stuck on a problem. Jodi Kim for her generous feedback and encouragement whenever we would meet.

I would also like to thank Crystal Baik, Mariam Beevi Lam, Jayna Brown, Sarita See, Ricky Rodriguez, Jennifer Najera, and Jade Sasser all at UC Riverside who provided me support or guidance at crucial times in the program.

I would also like to thank Wendy Ho, Amina Mama, and Julie Sze all professors who I had classes with at UC Davis for shaping my outlook towards scholarship and social praxis. It was through their own unique ways of teaching that inspired me to not only continue undergrad, but to actually try and get a Ph.D. too.

I would like to thank my fellow colleagues who were apart of the Ethnic Studies Graduate Student Collective. All of you were always so understanding and helpful, but most importantly never made me feel embarrassed for not knowing things because most of us were first generation college students. Specifically, I would like to thank Iris Blake,

Jessica Fremland, Tomoyo Joshi, Beth Kopacz, Cinthya Martinez, Loubna Qutami, Marlen Rios-Hernandez, J. Sebastian, Brian Stephens, and MT Vallarta for your constant friendships, encouraging words, and straight forward advice in the most difficult times of graduate school.

I would like to thank all the archivists and library staff at Stanford University, UC Davis, Fresno State, and the Visalia Public Library for helping me access their archives and special collections.

Next, I would like to thank my parents who made many sacrifices to provide me a life where this degree could even be thinkable. My sister Alyssa Alvarado for always being a phone call away when I needed a friendly ear and her irreplaceable sisterly love.

Last, I would like to thank Justin Phan who has been my constant companion since I first started at UC Davis so long ago. Without your critical intellect, jokes, and many midnight conversations this dissertation would not have been possible. It was also through you that I met the most loveable dog, Winston, who helped to combat dissertation blues with his unending need for belly rubs.

DEDICATION

For mom, dad, and Alyssa.

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Reckoning the Rural: Racial Capitalism, the San Joaquin Valley, and the University of California

by

Aaron Alvarado

Doctor of Philosophy, Graduate Program in Ethnic Studies
University of California, September 2019
Dr. Nick Mitchell, Co-Chairperson
Dr. Dylan Rodriguez, Co-Chairperson

"Reckoning the Rural: Racial Capitalism, the San Joaquin Valley, and the University of California" is an interdisciplinary study of the socioeconomic and political connections between California's agricultural industry and the San Joaquin Valley from 1862 to the early 2000s. In telling this narrative, my dissertation focuses on a lesser known feature of these connections by examining the production of knowledge at public research universities—namely, the University of California system. Rather than peripheral to dynamics of race, my dissertation argues that the University of California system and California agribusiness more broadly are intricately linked to racial capitalism as can be evidenced by the effects of settler colonialism, farm consolidation, and mechanization in the region. By interrogating the relationship between the state, racial capitalist economics, and knowledge production, this dissertation attempts to demonstrate how the production of rural geographies have been central to California as a settler

colony and to perpetuating racialized oppression against various communities since the mid-19th Century.

In order to tell this story, "Reckoning the Rural" begins in 1862 with the passage of the Morrill Land Grant Act. From there, it weaves together California state and national histories on through the early 2000s to think about the creation of agricultural rural areas in California, and the fate of one of the state's most productive regions for agriculture in California—the San Joaquin Valley. While struggles over labor exploitation in the San Joaquin Valley are oftentimes remembered through figures and movements such as Cesar Chavez and the United Farmworkers, my dissertation attempts to give a longer account, or reckoning, of agriculture's racially exploitative practices. It does this by focusing in on the University of California's own history as an entangled player in settling the West, facilitating the consolidation of big agribusiness, and naturalizing the use of mechanization for agricultural harvesting—all projects that had produced and held detrimental effects for communities of color. In doing so, "Reckoning the Rural" argues that there was a co-constitutive relationship between the University of California and the white supremacist practices of agribusiness.

Table of Contents

Introduction

Introduction

"Reckoning the Rural: Racial Capitalism, the San Joaquin Valley, and the University of California" is an interdisciplinary study of the socioeconomic and political connections between California's agricultural industry and the San Joaquin Valley from 1862 to the early 2000s. In telling this narrative, my dissertation focuses on a lesser known feature of these connections by examining the production of knowledge at public research universities—namely, the University of California system. Rather than peripheral to dynamics of race, my dissertation argues that the University of California system and California agribusiness more broadly are intricately linked to racial capitalism as can be evidenced by the effects of settler colonialism, farm consolidation, and mechanization in the region. By interrogating the relationship between the state, racial capitalist economics, and knowledge production, this dissertation attempts to demonstrate how the production of rural geographies have been central to California as a settler colony and to perpetuating racialized oppression against various communities since the mid-19th Century.

In order to tell this story, "Reckoning the Rural" begins in 1862 with the passage of the Morrill Land Grant Act. From there, it weaves together California state and national histories on through the early 2000s to think about the creation of agricultural rural areas in California, and the fate of one of the state's most productive regions for agriculture in California—the San Joaquin Valley. While struggles over labor exploitation in the San Joaquin Valley are oftentimes remembered through figures and

movements such as Cesar Chavez and the United Farmworkers, my dissertation attempts to give a longer account, or reckoning, of agriculture's racially exploitative practices. It does this by focusing in on the University of California's own history as an entangled player in settling the West, facilitating the consolidation of big agribusiness, and naturalizing the use of mechanization for agricultural harvesting—all projects that had produced and held detrimental effects for communities of color.

In doing so, "Reckoning the Rural" argues that there was a co-constitutive relationship between the University of California and the white supremacist practices of agribusiness. While the University of California grew from a modest land grant college in its early year to one of the world's top public university systems, my dissertation mainly looks at the agricultural components of the University of California that in part fulfill the mission of the university's land grant founding in order to demonstrate the impacts of the University of California's and California agriculture's mutual constitution.

The University of California

The university serves an important role when it comes to the shaping of the Valley. Until the 1950s when UC Davis and UC Riverside were created, most of the agricultural research circulated from UC Berkeley to other parts of California in one way or another. By tracing how racial formations inform the University of California's institutional histories, "Reckoning the Rural" accounts for the massive growth of the University of California and its various agricultural components. It does this by casting the University of California as an institution that houses many contradictory actors and does not necessarily function as a single monolith.

Starting from its origins as a College of Agriculture, the University of California and its agricultural research wing has grown in myriad ways. For example, since its start, it moved to also establish Extension Centers among many other programs over the years that are directed at the aims of agriculture. Today, the University of California's agricultural programs are organized through the Agriculture and Natural Resources Division.

The Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources (UC ANR) houses many different components. They include the UC Cooperative Extension (formerly called the Agriculture Extension Service), the state's Agricultural Experiment Stations, as well as various Research and Extension Centers. Moreover, UC ANR also houses many statewide programs and institutes such as the University of California's 4-H program, Calfresh Nutrition Education, and the Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education Program (SAREP).

In addition to housing different programs, UC ANR works closely with the colleges located across the University of California campuses. This includes UC Berkeley's College of Natural Resources, UC Davis' College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, and UC Riverside's College of Natural & Agricultural Sciences. As noted here, UC ANR's functions range from outreach programs and institutes to the more specific happenings on each UC campus. In having this wide reach, UC ANR attempts to address ardent and practical problems within agricultural and natural research.

While these programs have been useful in generating research about agriculture, the history of the University of California complicates a rosy image of the UC's ongoing

institutional support of farmers and agriculture. Different actors or units in the UC's history have played a key part in advancing certain racial views and practices that were not necessarily undone with the institution's embracement of multiculturalism in the late 20th century. For one example, many of the actors who held the most power and prestige, like the University of California Presidents, Regents, and Chancellors, were sometimes the people benefitting from or invested in propagating these inequities the most.

While the actors within the University of California have embodied at various times overtly racist views or championed multiculturalist ideals, this privileging of whiteness was not always accompanied by intense and visible racial violence. It oftentimes meant that racial violence manifested in the dispossession of communities of color as a result of administrative decisions to house certain groups whose research interests were shaped and molded by the same big agribusiness interests that would exploit communities of color in the Valley.

As the dissertation will demonstrate, the University of California played a pivotal role in privileging whiteness and capitalist interests within the UC system's agricultural sciences. By examining how race functioned within and through the University of California's connections to agribusiness, this dissertation contends that this historic privileging of whiteness within the UC's agricultural sciences is part and parcel to so many of the inequities that are experienced and housed in the San Joaquin Valley today. The critiques forwarded about the University of California's linkages to big agribusiness, then, are efforts to examine how the histories of racial thinking informed the UC's institutional formation across the 19th, 20th, and 21st Centuries, and not necessarily an

effort to downplay the role that these programs played in researching agriculture. This is not to say that ideas of white supremacy or ideas that hurt working class people were not dominant at critical points in the University's history. As this dissertation will show, sometimes groups that had been housed under the University of California coordinated with other pro-big agribusiness interests to fund violence against those who oppose their interests.

By tracing the ways various actors and units within the University of California propagated both race and agricultural efficiency to support big agribusiness in a way that hurt farmworkers, small farm owners, and communities of color, this dissertation also looks to those within the University of California who believed the University should act differently. That leads this dissertation, especially in chapters two and three, to center the works of socialists like Anne Draper and Hal Draper whose pioneering document "The Dirt on California: Agribusiness and the University" exposed many financial ties to agribusiness and related industries that benefitted monetarily some of the most powerful people in the University of California at the time namely various regents.

Another example could be seen with William Friedland, a founder of Community Studies at UC Santa Cruz. He also becomes another person whose life work displayed an understanding of the importance of the University of California's role in agricultural research, but who could also help us see a vision of justice in agriculture that centered small farmers and just working conditions for farmworkers. That vision was not reflected in many ways by the research the University of California was doing, especially when it came to mechanization. By holding the multifaceted natures of the various forces and

people that shape the University of California together, "Reckoning the Rural" hopes to accentuate and offer key histories that must be considered when we think about injustices the University has caused historically and how best to think about how such histories should frame ideas of justice.

Racial Capitalism and the San Joaquin Valley

While the San Joaquin Valley's agricultural productivity might seem positive at first glance, much of the agricultural production in the San Joaquin Valley is owned by massive companies whose operations are very far from the ideals of small or family farms that are often evoked through idyllic images of agriculture. The profits that come from the San Joaquin Valley's agriculture have historically been ushered out of the Valley, away from its communities, and towards the urban areas of California where that capital joins broader exchanges of wealth outside of California's bounds.

This flow of capital was shaped by the historic consolidation – and, in various ways, the historical development – of industrial agriculture in California. During points of California's history, corporations like Bank of America and many others have owned massive swathes of land. The agricultural industry in the Valley, which over time tended towards consolidation, shaped social life in the Valley, especially during the tussles between organized labor and growers in the early 20th century until the tail end of the century.

One of the main arguments advanced in this dissertation is that these historical developments in agriculture around the settlement of lands, consolidation of farms, and broader projects of mechanization are both economic and racialized projects. In doing so,

it draws from theorizations of racial capitalism to situate these claims and contextualize the socioeconomic and political events that facilitated settler colonialism, consolidation of farms, and mechanization in California and in the San Joaquin Valley specifically. Cedric Robinson's *Black Marxism: The Making of the Black Radical Tradition* is particularly generative for this argument since some assessments of U.S. agriculture can at times come to only critique the failures of agriculture on specific communities of color or the economic exploitation of its farmworkers by agribusiness.

Cedric Robinson's theorization of racial capitalism helps to locate both critiques of racialist differentiation and capitalist exploitation together. Robinson's theorization of racial capitalism, in locating the basis of racialisms in Europe, argues instead that part of how capitalism originated and continues to function is through differentiation rather than homogenization—to exaggerate regional, subcultural, and dialectical differences into 'racial' ones".[1] Robinson draws on how racialism functioned at the beginning of the 16th century where the bourgeoisie, proletariats, mercenaries, and peasants all came from different cultures or ethnic groups in relation to "its slaves from entirely different worlds".[2] By arguing that racialisms originated in Europe, Robinson makes the very useful argument that "capitalism was less a catastrophic revolution (negation) of feudal social orders than the extension of these social relations into the larger tapestry of the modern world's political and economic relations".[3] In doing so, Robinson's critique of

[1] Robinson, Cedric J. *Black Marxism: The Making of the Black Radical Tradition*. Chapel Hill, N.C: University of North Carolina Press, 2000, 26.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid, 10.

the accounting of capitalist histories allows us to understand the workings of racial differentiation as central to the creation and upkeep of capitalism.

To more broadly narrate the relationship between racial capitalism, the university, and agriculture, I draw on Critical Ethnic Studies scholar Jodi Melamed's description and extension of racial capitalism. To her, racial capitalism is a process in which,

> Capital can only be capital when it is accumulating, and it can only accumulate by producing and moving through relations of severe inequality among human groups—capitalists with the means of production/workers without the means of subsistence, creditors/debtors, conquerors of land made property/the dispossessed and removed. These antinomies of accumulation require *loss, disposability, and the unequal differentiation of human value*, and *racism enshrines the inequalities that capitalism requires*. Most obviously, it does this by displacing the uneven life chances that are inescapably part of capitalist social relations onto fictions of differing human capacities, historically race.[4]

These processes of creating uneven life chances are central to how scholar Ruth Wilson Gilmore defines racism as "the state-sanctioned and/or extra-legal production and exploitation of group-differentiated vulnerabilities to premature death, *in distinct yet densely interconnected political geographies.*"[5] Melamed describes how Gilmore's definition highlights the way that racial capitalist processes are a "technology of antirelationality" that creates dense connections between regions while keeping different people separated from one another.

[4] Melamed, Jodi. "Racial Capitalism." *Critical Ethnic Studies* 1, no. 1 (2015): 79. Emphasis added.
[5] Ibid, 80.

This conceptualization of racial capitalism as a complex mode of relationality and antirelationality approaches continued oppressive conditions not as peripheral to the process of wealth accumulation; rather, it views the controlling of anti/relationality as central to resultant accumulation and dispossession. In an agricultural example, the social division that agrarian industries created in the San Joaquin Valley reflect other places in the production of social oppressions for marginalized communities, especially communities of color. By drawing on Melamed's understanding of racial capitalism as a complex mode of relationality, we can begin to tease out how race's central function to capitalism also requires that certain groups be dehumanized and delinked to make their capacity for labor ripe for capitalist exploitation. In a similar vein, scholars like Ruth Wilson Gilmore have demonstrated the necessity to link traditionally delinked communities together. In her context, Gilmore writes about how Southern California areas composed of working-class communities and communities of color are intimately connected to the San Joaquin Valley through California's massive prison regime, detailing how these regions operate more as an interconnected region (using the idea of desakota) than places that are discrete and socially disconnected.[6]

By drawing linkages between the histories of racial capitalism in California, "Reckoning the Rural" provides a space to map out the many ways that the San Joaquin Valley functions as a region on its own and as a region in conversation with others, a kind of trans-regional mapping. For example, the presence of prisons in the San Joaquin

[6] Gilmore, Ruth Wilson. "Forgotten Places and the Seeds of Grassroots Planning." In *Engaging Contradictions: Theory, Politics, and Methods of Activist Scholarship*, edited by Charles R. Hale, 31–62. Global, Area, and International Archive. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008.

Valley are a direct result of the many social disparities that exist there. Composed of the southern half of what is usually referred to as California's Central Valley, the San Joaquin Valley goes as far south as Bakersfield to the northern town of Stockton just shy of the Sacramento Valley. As will be discussed in the chapters, much of how we come to understand the political and economic shifts in the San Joaquin Valley are made possible by deeply trans-regional connections that connect the Valley to Southern United States, the San Francisco Bay Area, Los Angeles County, and many other spaces as well.

Being able to think about the role that the University of California has played to further racial capitalism can help us, as Melamed reminds us, "to comprehend the complex recursivity between material and epistemic forms of racialized violence, which are executed in and by core capitalist states with seemingly infinite creativity (beyond phenotype and in assemblages)".[7] Thinking about this is important because the university is a key institution that was not only able to sow white supremacist ideologies through agriculture, but also able to direct the flow and direction of capital with state-subsidized research and technological innovation for big growers. The system of big agriculture as this dissertation will discuss is based at its core on racial capitalism's ability to differentiate groups of people worthy of accumulation from those worthy of dispossession, while relying on the delinking of lived experiences and effects that render material accumulation and dispossession possible.

[7] Melamed, "Racial Capitalism", 79.

Chapter Breakdown

The dissertation is organized across three chapters. Chapter one traces what is called the advent of settler rurality that combined the United States' colonization of California with legislations passed in 1862 that intended to root settlers in sparsely populated areas and to make settlers productive farmers through a scientific and systematic examination of agriculture. In order to do this, my chapter begins by examining the creation of state-sponsored agricultural colonies in California's Central Valley, which were largely considered the brainchild of Elwood Mead. Mead was a Professor of Rural Institutions at the University of California, and an advocate of an idyllic white-only rural civilization in the United States through the proliferation of agricultural colonies. The chapter then argues that Mead's views are the result of a culmination of national debates around race and the workings of a settler colonial system in California that produced the underpinnings of a spatializing process I tentatively call settler rurality. In order to show this, the chapter looks at the racial-colonial, state, and national politics that structured the emergence of land grant legislation before the advent of the Civil War and their effects on the early University of California. By recounting these histories, chapter one demonstrates the ways that white populist groups like the early Grange became central players in the University's budding agricultural sciences. The chapter ends by revisiting Mead's colonies and examines the central role of race in early California agriculture and the University of California.

Chapter two uses the work of Anne Draper and Hal Draper to piece together a critical genealogy of the University of California from post-World War I to the 1970s.

Through a reading of the Drapers' pamphlet "The Dirt on California: The Agribusiness and the University," this chapter offers an accounting of how the aging university had come to support what would come to be called agribusiness over the concerns of smaller family farms. In particular, the chapter looks at the University of California's Agricultural Extension Service and how that program – through directors and farm advisors – envisioned a racial hierarchy in agricultural areas that viewed white citizens as the beneficiary of rural civilization and viewed communities of color as part of a naturally inferior labor source at the bottom of the hierarchy. In doing so, this chapter draws from and extends the Drapers' analysis by examining the central role of race in early farm consolidation through organizations like the California Farm Bureau Federation. The chapter ends by discussing the University's role in promoting the Bracero Program to the detriment of braceros and other farmworkers of color, and by examining how the Drapers envisioned coalitional politics and worker solidarity as one of the possible ends to the exploitation of farmworkers.

Chapter three focuses on the creation of UC Merced by further tracing the link between agribusiness and the UC through the 1980s. A major event during this time was a lawsuit by the California Agrarian Action Project and California Rural Legal Assistance that accused the university agricultural researchers of privileging the needs and wants of big agribusiness over small farmers and farmworkers. By following the lawsuit, this chapter demonstrates the emerging racial paradigms that defined 21st century agriculture. In particular, it examines the work of Professor William Friedland who advocated for an agricultural research methodology that requires an assessment of social and communal

impacts as one of the key cornerstones for scientific research funded through federal or state funding sources. As will be demonstrated, Friedland's ideas would inform how CAAP would examine the UC's connections to the impacts of new technologies such as the introduction of mechanized harvesters. In doing so, they implicated the UC for destroying thousands of jobs for farmworkers, wrecking rural communities, and disadvantaging the California consumer. To close, this chapter argues that mechanization, which was a key public issue during the gestation of the tenth UC, might have a lot more to do with the history of the University of California and its tenth campus, UC Merced, than is oftentimes told.

Ultimately, "Reckoning the Rural" builds off the works of people like William Friedland, Anne Draper, and Hal Draper to showcase the deep connections between the University of California, agribusiness, and a racial capitalist system. It aims to show the ways that communities of color were not just excluded from the university through racist world views; rather, it also demonstrates how such exclusions were marred with violence, deeply interconnected to national, regional, and local political shifts, and moreover had long lasting impacts on rural communities. By forwarding these ideas, this dissertation examines and questions what a just agriculture would look like, especially in regions of California that have always been and continue to be economically linked to agribusiness like the San Joaquin Valley.

Chapter One

Introduction

By the end of World War I, the State of California was in the early throes of creating two agricultural colonies. These colonies were created by the state to spur settlement in the more rural regions of California and to demonstrate what could be possible if states were more involved with planned agricultural settlements. Both colonies were in California's Central Valley. The first was built in Butte County, part of the Sacramento Valley, on 6,239 acres in 1918, and was named the Durham colony. 2,400 acres were paid in cash for the Durham colony while the state purchased the rest on a contract that required payments over 20 years with a 5 percent interest rate.[8] The second colony was built in 1919 with an infusion of $1,000,000 from the state legislature to the Land Settlement Board that oversaw the colonies.[9] The second colony, Delhi, was located on over 8,400 acres in Merced County, which is in the San Joaquin Valley. While the state had paid cash for this purchase, the state was also heavily invested and involved in other projects that concerned the land.[10] Part of the planned aspect of these agricultural colonies saw that the state not only picked out the land; it divided that land, checked soil qualities, ensured a source of irrigation, and worked to provide liberal loan terms to support improvements on the land such as the building of a house.

[8] California. Department of Agriculture. Division of Land Settlement, and Charles W Cleary. *Final Report, June 30, 1931*. Sacramento: Division, 1931, 3.
[9] Adjusted for inflation, this cash amount is equivalent to approximately $15.5 million in 2019.
[10] California. Department of Agriculture. Division of Land Settlement, and Charles W Cleary. *Final Report, June 30, 1931*. Sacramento: Division, 1931, 4.

This move on the part of the state was the brainchild of University of California professor Elwood Mead. Mead joined the faculty at the University of California in 1911 as a professor of Rural Institutions. His appointment came by no surprise since Mead was well known for his specialty in irrigation due to his earlier positions with the US Department of Agriculture and with Victoria, Australia where he respectively directed irrigation studies and worked as the chairman of the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission.[11] Mead would eventually become one of the central people that tried to demonstrate how state-planned agricultural colonies could be superior to privately owned agricultural colonies.[12]

The state's involvement in land settlement through state-funded agricultural colonies dove tailed with popular white supremacist ideas of who belonged to the United States during the first decades of the 20th century. State-funded agricultural colonies then were a response to the failure of private agricultural colonies to thrive and were imagined serving as a model for future ones, either privately or publicly owned. These colonies are an example of the events and institutions that this chapter aims to track. This chapter tracks these events and triangulates them to discuss how the state and the University of California played a role in the creation of an understanding of agriculture whose divisions of labor were based on race. The buildup to this racial view of how agriculture should

[11] Powell, J. M. "Mead, Elwood (1858-1936)." In *Australian Dictionary of Biography. Volume 10. 1891-1939, Lat-Ner*, by Bede. Nairn and Geoffrey Serle. Carlton, Vic.: Melbourne University Press, 1986.
[12] In 1880, just 32 years after the United States acquired California through the signing of the 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, Fresno County had 10,240 acres owned by private companies who ran agricultural colonies. Many of the private companies that operated these settlements would sell parcels of land and ensure that these lands were irrigated and ready for settling families. These colonies were attractive to many settlers who were aiming to move to the West. By 1903, the agricultural colonies occupied 71,080 acres in Fresno County alone. For more, see Panter, John. "Central California Colony: 'Marvel of the Desert.'" *The Journal of the Fresno City and County Historical Society* 36, no. 2 (1994): 1–11.

operate came to impact the many agricultural areas present in California at the beginning of the 20th century. By understanding the racial order that the University of California and state of California propagated through agriculture, this chapter will demonstrate how agricultural regions like the San Joaquin Valley were impacted by this racial imaginary. The state colonies in many ways can be understood as a direct result of the accumulation of various racial logics in the state of California that were fostered by the University of California and emerging agricultural industry.

The rest of this chapter will trace the proliferation of these racial logics and asks how the privileging of whiteness in these time periods came to influence California agriculture, the University of California, and most of all the San Joaquin Valley. In particular, the chapter will continue by examining the passage of various land grant legislation alongside the 1862 Homestead Act, which were crucial pieces of legislation when it came to settling parts of the United States – including parts of California.

From the creation of land grant universities, the chapter will then move to the early University of California and look at how its early endeavors in agricultural research aligned with white populist forces that helped foment and concretize deep-seated roots for white supremacist ideologies in the coming years. This chapter then ends by examining how these early white populisms that partially informed the directions the University of California would then manifest through the University of California's Extension and the state-sponsored agricultural colonies by following the central role of Elwood Mead in the creation, management, and reports on the agricultural colonies.

1862: War, Land, Nation State Building, and the Farmer's Dilemma

The year 1862 was a watershed year to many due to the broader political and legislative climate that existed in the United States at the time. The year prior in 1861 saw the rest of the Southern States that would make up the Confederacy secede from the union, leaving the 1862 Congress in a place where legislative acts blocked by Southern Congressmen could finally be passed. The advent of the Civil War was only 14 years after the United States achieved its ideology of Manifest Destiny with the acquisition of what we now call the U.S. Southwest through the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo of 1848. This vast territorial acquisition fueled the debates around the role of slavery in the United States, especially as various forces sought to either curtail or enable the spread of slavery beyond the South. As this section will demonstrate, the events leading up to the Civil War would facilitate a spatial restructuring of California's geography, amounting to both the ideological and material reordering of the land along U.S. settler colonial paradigms, a process that leads to the production of what I call settler rurality.

With the Southern states seceded, two important pieces of legislation that are central to understanding the role of knowledge production in shaping rural and agricultural places like the San Joaquin Valley were able to pass. The first was the Morrill Land Grant Act, which handed certain federal lands over to various states in order to finance universities where agriculture, the mechanical arts, and military sciences could be studied. Justin Morrill, the architect of the bill, saw the necessity of applying scientific research knowledge to agriculture in order to improve the yields of crops grown while reducing the exhaustion of soil. Morrill is widely remembered today as the father of the

land grant universities that eventually grew from the 1862 Land Grant Act and other subsequent land grant legislation.

The conjoining legislation that is important to consider when understanding the creation of the United States' idea of rural is the Homestead Act of 1862. Having been passed several months before the Morrill Land Grant Act, the Homestead Act of 1862 made it easier for settlers to procure lands in the still populating Midwest and West of the United States. This act benefitted the United States by having settlers populate territories acquired by the United States under the broader ideological banner of Manifest Destiny that was popular at the time. While the Homestead Act gave away territory that was primarily acquired through the 1830 Indian Removal Act, this federal act along with state policies and enforcement of federal anti-Indian policies further enacted genocidal practices against California Indians. Historian Benjamin Madley describes how both the federal and California state governments disenfranchised California Indians from 1846 to 1873 through various means and created conditions of genocide that California Indians had to endure.

The violence that California Indians endured during this time came from various factors. The 1850 California Legislature banned California Indians from the right to vote and also barred those with "one-half of Indian blood" or more from testifying in court against white people.[13] These legislative acts made it so that California Indians could not easily participate in the political process or seek meaningful legal protections against state and vigilante violence. Moreover, as Madley discusses, California Indians were also

[13] Madley, Benjamin. "Op-Ed: It's Time to Acknowledge the Genocide of California's Indians." *Los Angeles Times*. May 22, 2016.

subject to work as unfree labor following the state-legalized placing of Indian minors into white familial custody.[14] Outside of disenfranchisement from the legal process and legal protections, the period of 1850 to 1861 saw the California government create and fund state militias. The state's moves on legal and military fronts demonstrated "that the state would not punish Indian killers, but instead reward them, militia expeditions helped inspire vigilantes to kill at least 6,460 California Indians between 1846 and 1873".[15] Between 1846 and 1870, Madley's account also demonstrates that California's Indian population went from roughly 150,000 to 30,000 as a result.[16]

Even though this chapter argues that agriculture was one way that a racial order was established in 20th century California, the history of genocide against California Indians urgently reminds us that these white supremacist visions of racial order were made possible by extreme violence against Native peoples in California and beyond. Especially in the overall sociopolitical climate of 1862, the Civil War period saw an intensification of violence against California Indians. Rather than marginal, this intensification of violence against California Indians was foundational to the eventual production of private agricultural colonies in California's San Joaquin Valley.[17]

---

[14] For more, please see: Madley, Benjamin. "Op-Ed: It's Time to Acknowledge the Genocide of California's Indians." *Los Angeles Times*. May 22, 2016; Madley, Benjamin. *An American Genocide: The United States and the California Indian Catastrophe, 1846-1873*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2016; and Smith, Stacey L. *Freedom's Frontier: California and the Struggle over Unfree Labor, Emancipation, and Reconstruction*. Chapel Hill, NC: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 2013.

[15] Madley, Benjamin. "Op-Ed: It's Time to Acknowledge the Genocide of California's Indians." *Los Angeles Times*. May 22, 2016.

[16] Ibid.

[17] One of the first private agricultural colonies was the Central Valley Colony established near what is now called Fresno in 1875. Some of these private agricultural colonies in the Central Valley were located near places where the California militias had attacked California Indians in preceding years. For instance in Mariposa County, which used to extend to parts of what we now consider the counties of Fresno and Merced, many California Indians suffered violence from state and federally sponsored militias and armies.

The rapid reduction of California Indians by these genocidal practices laid the ground for a massive change in how agriculture was done in the state. Before the 1840s "Indians were practically the sole source of agricultural labor and whites used every possible means to obtain their services. Slavery, debt, peonage, and wage labor all had a place in Mexican and Anglo California".[18] Alongside the massive reduction in the California Indian population due to the California government's genocidal practices, there also emerged different social arrangements that utilized other racialized groups as sources of cheap agricultural labor, such as Mexicans and Asian immigrants.

The Homestead Act was another factor in the changing shifts in California agriculture during this time. In California, about 10% of the state's land went to people who took advantage of the Homestead Act. That resulted in 66,738 claims made under the act for a total of 10,476,665 acres out of the state's total of 99,822,720.[19] The 1862 Homestead Act was one of the biggest transferences of wealth from the government to individual people. Yet, the transference of wealth and lands were not race-neutral but went on to create racial disparities. In California and many other states, racist policies or procedures barred some from acquiring their claims to a homestead. For instance, in

---

These instances of violence, which were exacerbated by the advent of the Civil War and the Union's funding of a standing army in California, led to violent events like the Konkow Maidu Trail of Tears in September 1863. For more information about the Central Valley Colony see Panter, John. "Central California Colony: 'Marvel of the Desert.'" *The Journal of the Fresno City and County Historical Society* 36, no. 2 (1994): 1–11. For more information about the Civil War, its impact on California Indians, and the Konkow Maidu Trail of Tears, please see Madley, Benjamin. *An American Genocide: The United States and the California Indian Catastrophe, 1846-1873*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2016, 186-194.

[18] Hurtado, Albert L. *Indian Survival on the California Frontier*. (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 2010), quoted in Madley, Benjamin. *An American Genocide: The United States and the California Indian Catastrophe, 1846-1873*. (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 2016), 38.

[19] National Monument of America Nebraska. "Homestead: State by State Numbers." National Park Service: Homestead, 2015. https://www.nps.gov/home/learn/historyculture/statenumbers.htm.

California, Black people were denied the ability to homestead in the state.[20] Besides benefitting the United States as a political entity, such expansion also saw that free white men and their families who obtained these lands through the Homestead Act would most likely turn to agriculture as the prominence of farmers still occupied one of the most populous U.S. professions at the time.[21] The push for agriculture was both practical as the United States' population was on the rise and also an embodiment of the Jefferson yeoman ideal for the average American citizen since early in the nation's history.

This idealization of the family farmer and agriculture was instrumental to later attempts by the United States to further erode Native people's connections to their lands with the passage of the Dawes Act in 1887. The Dawes Act divided tribal lands into individual parcels, espousing the idea that the alleged act of "civilizing" Native peoples could be performed by having Native peoples learn how to be individual farmers. This move has been described by various scholars as a means to embed capitalist practices in Native communities. Underneath this push for the creation of homesteads across the Midwest and West were the ways that such homesteads continued to further the dispossession of Native nations from their lands and the seeds of free labor ideologies starkly contrasting with the southern plantations that relied on chattel slavery.

[20] Moore, S. A. W. "'We Feel the Want of Protection': The Politics of Law and Race in California, 1848-1878." *California History* 81, no. 3–4 (January 1, 2003), 96–125. https://doi.org/10.2307/25161701.
[21] Although it is important to note that even if these men did not make it as farmers, they still could sell the land after acquiring the deed through the Homestead Act. Sometimes selling land that was homesteaded could be quite profitable. The profit that was made from selling lands acquired through the Homestead Act compounded to create racial wealth disparities due to the ways that various racialized communities were either legally barred from homesteading or discriminated against when claiming land through the official procedures.

At a moment when it was widely held that the Southern plantation style of agriculture was on the decline due to the political curtailing of slavery and the ongoing problems of soil degradation emerging from the shift to solely growing intensive commercial crops, the United States pushed legislation that particularly hoped to institute a spatial change through homesteading. 1862 was a watershed year because not only did the Homestead Act reconfigure lands through the allotment of homesteads across racial lines; it also saw the beginning maneuvers to create the institution that would be entrusted with scientifically studying how to make these areas effective for the country's capitalist system. The vision behind the Homestead Act was to expand the United States' ability to have its citizens, who were free white men, continue to not only settle on Native lands through the U.S. state's genocidal policies, but to also produce a geography premised on the coexistence of these settlements with variegated forms of racialized labor.[22]

The land grant universities were entrusted with bringing over a model of education for the farmers' sons in ways that, unlike the massive success of elitist education models in some European countries, were not just for the sons of the elite. Morrill himself cited the competition between parts of Europe and the United States as part of the reason why this model could not be ignored in the United States. In his speech given when first introducing land grant legislation in 1858, Morrill narrates how other

[22] One example of these produced geographies that can be seen as the years progress were those of California's water and irrigation projects, especially in the San Joaquin Valley. For more on water and irrigation projects in California, see: Hundley, Norris. *The Great Thirst: Californians and Water -a History*. Rev. ed. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001; and Preston, William L. *Vanishing Landscapes: Land and Life in the Tulare Lake Basin*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981.

countries in Europe like Saxony and England are making use of agricultural colleges to produce higher yields with less land than the United States.[23] He goes on to say:

> I might contrast Bohemia with Saxony, and even Ireland with England … to show the difference between ignorant and educated culture of the soil, but I have not space. Thus, we behold the suffrage of all the wiser civilized nations in favor of the measure contemplated by the bill under consideration … If other nations advance, though we but pause, we are distanced.[24]

For Morrill, the stakes of creating a national university system were massive because failure to do so meant that Europe would not only have another advantage over the United States. Moreover, the stakes also embody the potential risk of rendering the entire United States ignorant and inferior to the more educated European civilized nations. The remedy, Morrill suggests, lies in investing in the necessary faculties of agricultural science.

Morrill's call for the necessity of agricultural science also comes following his concern about the South's management of the soil. Morrill witnessed a shift in focus in the South's agriculture. At this time, the South's system of chattel slavery focused on cash crops like tobacco and cotton, decimating and exhausting the soil in the process.[25] Drawing on these moments, Morrill suggested that the poor quality and decimation of the land marked the United States as dangerously distanced from civilization. The only solution in solidifying the wellbeing of the United States' health as a newly formed

---

[23] Morrill, Justin S. *Speech of Hon. Justin S. Morrill, of Vermont, on the Bill Granting Lands for Agricultural Colleges: Delivered in the House of Representatives, April 20, 1858.* Washington: Printed at the Congressional globe office, 1858, 6.
[24] Ibid, 11.
[25] Ibid, 5.

nation and ongoing settler colony, then, would be the application and funding of land grant institutions invested in agricultural science.

These years were also met with a shifting terrain for how racial tensions functioned in the United States, sowing the seeds of racial dispossession at various levels both nationally and in the emergent state of California. During this time, emancipation was on the horizon for enslaved African-Americans. Asian immigrants and Asian-Americans were also seeing an ever-growing antagonism set up against them by white labor unions. California Indians and other Native peoples were facing active and continual genocide under the United States' settler colonial policies. For different racialized communities that occupy different spatial locations, the forms of racial dispossession swung from outright acts of violence to the more concealed acts of violence that lay embedded in bureaucratic methods and logistics. Throughout this time, some of the most solid gains for racial equity were rooted in furthering racial logics.

The land grant act legislation also evolved over the succeeding years after 1862. In 1890, a second land grant act was passed by Congress. While the first land grant act served to help raise money for different states to start universities that would focus on agricultural research, the act did not result in the actual creation of many universities. This has to do with how the pieces of land grant legislation from the 1860s distributed federal lands in a way that flooded the market with people reselling different parcel of lands that they received. This reselling had a negative effect on land value; it caused land to quickly depreciate in price. This price depreciation made it so that the lands received and sold from the 1862 land grants did not result in enough funding to start these

universities. The 1890 legislation helped also by producing more land for the states. Moreover, the 1890 land grant legislation also hit the traditional power elites in the reincorporated South hard by including a provision that requires land grant colleges to either offer admissions to African Americans or the establishment of a separate but equal land grant institution. Unlike the land grants provided through the 1860s legislation, however, many of the colleges created following the 1890 land grant legislation were not provided grants of land or land scrips. Instead, "the Second Morrill Act granted further appropriations to land-grant schools and withheld funds from states with institutions that had racist admission policies unless they created separate institutions", leading to the creation of "17 Black land-grant schools".[26]

The United States' expansion through the homesteads helped produce a specific understanding of space via settler rurality that stands with us till today.[27] The term settler rurality uses an understanding of space that conceptualizes it as something that is produced rather than a transparently and wholly empirical measurement of a place.[28] What I am calling settler rurality is the result of the way that those with European

[26] For more on this point, also see: Stein, Sharon. "A Colonial History of the Higher Education Present: Rethinking Land-Grant Institutions through Processes of Accumulation and Relations of Conquest." *Critical Studies in Education*, December 2, 2017; and Stein, Sharon. "Confronting the racial-colonial foundations of US higher education." *Journal for the Study of Postsecondary and Tertiary Education, 3,* August 21, 2018.

[27] While land grants were used for homesteads and universities, there are other legacies of land grants used in ways that hurt racialized communities. For one example, see: Karuka, Manu. *Empire's Tracks: Indigenous Nations, Chinese Workers, and the Transcontinental Railroad*. Oakland, California: University of California Press, 2019.

[28] For more on work that speaks to the social production of space are: Lefebvre, Henri. *Critique of Everyday Life: The Three-Volume Text*. Translated by Gregory Elliott. London: Verso, 2014; Goeman, Mishuana. *Mark My Words: Native Women Mapping Our Nations*. First Peoples: New Directions in Indigenous Studies. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013; and Brady, Mary Pat. *Extinct Lands, Temporal Geographies: Chicana Literature and the Urgency of Space*. Latin America Otherwise. Durham: Duke University Press, 2002.

ancestry at these historical moments in the United States sought to propagate a new understanding of the land that changed its actual spatial composition by changing the landscape. In paying attention to how settler rurality is both materially produced and ideologically constructed, I draw on feminist indigenous scholar Mishuana Goeman's work in geographies and mappings as a useful tool in deconstructing geographies that attempt to situate an agricultural and rural vision of American land settlement.

In one example, feminist indigenous scholar Mishuana Goeman draws on and extends Ricardo Padrón's discussion of maps. Goeman and Padrón bring attention to how settler colonialism by the Spanish, Mexican, and United States all attempted to naturalize and understand themselves as projecting "the real through the use of grids and mathematics". Yet, by unsettling these purportedly 'real' grids and empirical sciences, my understanding of settler rurality then follows Goeman's lead and attempts to take note on how geographies such as those created through ideological and material maps can "exert political control by manipulating the representation of space into a language of normativity".[29] Morrill's speeches and the work of the acts explored thus far can be broadly understood as a means of representing settler colonial space through ideological maps, political maneuvering, and material dispossession and distribution that normalize U.S. settler colonialism.

Settler rurality, as I have conceptualized it then, is particularly useful to understand the spreading of race through agriculture. It was through how settlers used genocide that created the foundation of all these other forms of oppression that we see in

[29] Goeman, Mishuana. *Mark My Words: Native Women Mapping Our Nations*. First Peoples: New Directions in Indigenous Studies. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013, 18.

California and the area. Critical education scholar, Sharon Stein, calls this formative connection between the land grant university and settler colonialism as an "indirect but dependent relationship", especially since the passing of the Morrill Act of 1862 is entirely dependent on the United States' indirect but nevertheless foundational racial-colonial violence enacted on Native Nations to accumulate land.[30] In drawing from this understanding of rurality, settler colonialism, and land grant legislation, my dissertation takes aim at settler rurality in the United States as a space to work out contradictions that can help us rethink key questions of knowledge production, the role of institutions in regional and racialized life, and most importantly how we understand the establishment of dominant white supremacist renderings of space.

The University of California: Origins, Contestation, and Its Duty

While registering the national shifts that were reflected in the San Joaquin Valley can help us understand the broader context of spatial production in the United States during this time, it is important to consider how California itself as a territory has its own unique racialized histories of colonialism and settlement. This can be seen by California's unique position as one of the most ethnically and racially diverse areas of what would eventually be the United States. Scholars have discussed and noted how race relations played out during California's early settlement and how the late 1800s and early 1900s brought more migration to the state as it aged.[31] While the San Joaquin Valley was

[30] Stein, Sharon. "A Colonial History of the Higher Education Present: Rethinking Land-Grant Institutions through Processes of Accumulation and Relations of Conquest." *Critical Studies in Education*, December 2, 2017, 8. https://doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2017.1409646.

[31] For more, please see Almaguer, Tomás. *Racial Fault Lines: The Historical Origins of White Supremacy in California*. Berkeley, Calif.; London: University of California Press, 2009; and Molina, Natalia. *Fit to Be*

shaped by the broader racial politics of the nation, it also had deep connections to the rest of California. As time passed and other areas of California became less agricultural, the San Joaquin Valley became one of the most agriculturally productive regions in California. This agricultural productivity is due in part to the University of California whose early history was just as tangled with the racial logics through its various founders and institutional practices as the broader state government was.

The University of California is a land-grant institution whose founding came from the conjoining of the funds that California received from the Morrill Land Grant Act alongside the buildings and facilities of the former private college, the College of California in 1868.[32] The early University of California was far flung from its current status as a ten-campus university. Tracing the university's growth from its creation can illuminate how agriculture, research, and racial dispossession went hand-in-hand. While the chapter discussed racial dispossession through legislation and social practices on both a national and California state level, neither national or California state legislation or social practices touched on how racial dispossession was premised on wealth accumulation for various white people. The early history of the University of California can help us understand this movement by focusing on the role of the National and California Grange within early UC and California politics.

Tensions around what type of education the University of California should focus on plagued the institution's early years. When the University of California was first

---

Citizens?: Public Health and Race in Los Angeles, 1879-1939. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2006.

[32] Fiske, Emmett Preston. "The College and Its Constituency: Rural and Community Development at the University of California, 1875-1978 " Thesis (Ph. D.)--University of California, Davis, 1979., 1979, 1-10.

established, it was agreed upon that it would serve the mission as outlined by the Morrill Act of providing agricultural, technical, and military training alongside having classes dedicated to the classics and liberal arts. The commitment to classics and liberal arts emerged from the College of California board who agreed to merge the two institutions on the condition that the new university would not solely base its curriculum on practical courses.[33]

The first Professor of Agriculture that the new university hired was Ezra Carr in 1869.[34] Carr was originally trained as a medical doctor, but also had extensive history teaching agricultural chemistry at the University of Wisconsin. In various accounts of his time at the University of California, scholars were often critical if not neutral about Carr's work with the University of California.[35] Carr started at the university with no students or equipment for research, but he was known for his skill as a public orator. For most of his career, he toured California giving talks to farmers from different areas and recruiting students to take classes in agriculture at the University of California. These tours enabled him to advertise the newly formed university's agricultural classes, which were not immediately popular after the university's opening.

---

[33] Scheuring, Ann Foley., Chester O. McCorkle, and James. Lyons. *Science & Service : A History of the Land-Grant University and Agriculture in California*. Oakland, Calif.: ANR Publications, University of California, 1995, 9-11.
[34] Ibid, 13.
[35] Among the accounts given one of the most worthwhile to take a look at would be Anne Scheuring. Not only does she prelude Carr's eventual tussle with the UC regents by talking about a similar role he served in Wisconsin. She also goes to great length emphasizing his wife's role in his success and her centrality to helping him. In addition to Scheuring's account, Standtman's history of the UC is of particular interest as well. Please see, Stadtman, Verne A. *The University of California, 1868-1968*. 1st ed. United States of America: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Carr was particularly popular with farmers who were associated with the California Grange. The Grange, which is also known as the Order of the Patrons of Husbandry, was a national organization founded after the Civil War. Oliver Hudson Kelley, an employee of the Department of Agriculture and one of the founders of the Grange, found the organization in Washington D.C. after seeing the destruction that the Civil War caused for Southern agriculture and specifically Southern Farmers.[36] Most histories that are easily accessible about the Grange do not go into how the abolition of slavery was part of the cause of the South's agricultural decimation, which is important to note. The early Grange nationally attempted to facilitate support networks for farmers in order to help one another out and to advocate for their political interests. This ranged from advocating for railroads so that farmers could easily ship their crops on the one hand and on the other hand to eventually working against railroad monopolies when these monopolies threatened their livelihood with skyrocketing shipping costs.

The California Grange was made up by many local chapters that spanned across various California counties. While the Grange could be understood as a working-class political group, its politics and relative success in politics were also premised on its white male farming member composition.[37]

---

[36] Barns, William D. "Oliver Hudson Kelley and the Genesis of the Grange: A Reappraisal." *Agricultural History* 41, no. 3 (1967): 229-42. https://www.jstor.org/stable/3740337.

[37] During this time in California, it is crucial to understand the nature of racial attitudes that kept spaces like the Grange primarily for white people. For more information on California racism during the 19th century please see Almaguer, Tomás. *Racial Fault Lines: The Historical Origins of White Supremacy in California*. Berkeley, Calif.; London: University of California Press, 2009; and Delgado, Richard and Jean Stefanic. "California's Racial History and Constitutional Rationales for Race-Conscious Decision Making in Higher Education." *UCLA Law Review* 47, no. 1521 (2000): 1521-1614.
Ferguson, Edwin E. "The California Alien Land Law and the Fourteenth Amendment." *California Law Review* 35, no. 1 (1947): 61–90.

It is important to note that what enabled the organization's accumulation of political power and pull had to do with the racial climate at the time. Amidst their power accumulation, the U.S. also held dear early ideals of farming that had the dual effect of racially dispossessing non-white populations and bolstering the property-owning white men with forms of re-possession. During the early years of the University of California, many of the Grangers were unhappy with the funds and resources given to agriculture at the UC. One example was the placement of the College of Agriculture offices in what was described as "limited quarters in the north half of the basement floor" of Berkeley's South Hall. Moreover, they also brought issue to how the College's budget was a fraction ($1/20^{th}$) of the total University of California budget. These issues with structural placement and financial budgeting were central to the ways that Grangers felt the university was putting too much resources in the classics as compared to practical subjects like agriculture.[38]

This tension was useful for Ezra Carr who did not conduct research because of his traveling, potential lack of experience, and lack of funds. Ezra Carr eventually tapped into the populist Grange sentiments by publishing in the group's preferred periodical the *Pacific Rural Press* and invoking populist rhetoric in his published speeches. In addition to publishing in the *Pacific Rural Press*, Carr also joined his local Grange and was actively involved with the organization. In one article published in the *Pacific Rural Press* in 1871, it was recalled that Carr recounted the disparate relationship between

[38] Scheuring, Ann Foley., Chester O. McCorkle, and James. Lyons. *Science & Service: A History of the Land-Grant University and Agriculture in California*. Oakland, Calif.: ANR Publications, University of California, 1995, 13-16.

agricultural and classical classes as: "an Agricultural Professorship … tacked upon some classical institution, and left to flutter in the unkindly winds of competition with departments which have prestige and a class or aristocratic sentiment in their favor".[39] As this quote demonstrates, however colorfully, that the University of California had two differing communities that both caused strife for the university and were influential in deciding the university's mission. The constituents of the California Grange along with Ezra Carr viewed the UC as veering too much towards an elite university. Others, particularly the Regents and the current University of California President Daniel Coit Gilman, wanted to build up more classical studies for the university. More than departmental feuds about education, this tension then also reflects the desires of the original College of California Board of Trustees over what the university should teach, how it should teach it, and who it should serve. Battles over who and how the university serves will emerge at more points in the institution's history as later chapters will talk about.[40]

While there would be contestations over who the University of California should serve, there was also an instance where the Grange attempted to lobby for their interests. In January 1874, the Grange requested an investigation from the California Assembly into the university's handling of resources and agriculture, which the legislature

[39] Carr, Ezra. "The Needs of Agricultural Communities" (San Francisco, CA, *Pacific Rural Press*, October 21, 1872), 36, **quoted in** Scheuring, Ann Foley., Chester O. McCorkle, and James. Lyons. *Science & Service: A History of the Land-Grant University and Agriculture in California*. (Oakland, CA: ANR Publications, University of California, 1995), 15.

[40] The University of California wasn't the only land grant institution to suffer these problems. Other land grant universities in the American Northeast suffered from similar issues brought upon by working class farmers acting against what they considered to be elite interests. For more, please see: Sorber, Nathan. *Land-Grant Colleges and Popular Revolt: The Origins of the Morrill Act and the Reform of Higher Education*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2018).

responded by appointing a special commission to investigate due to the "large and vocal constituency" making the complaint.[41] This political battle was concluded with the legislature's committee finding that the University of California has been distributing resources between departments in a fair and consistent manner. Historian Ann Schuering explained the committee's response by saying

> Committee members concluded that "all had been done in the advancement of agricultural matters that could have been reasonably performed with the means at hand" … They attributed the controversy to "jealousy and bad feeling with some persons connected with the University".[42]

These connections to the university pointed to Carr who President Gilman had looked into before the Grange's request for an investigation into the university.

After this event, it came to the Regent's attention that Ezra Carr was dismissed at his former position at the University of Wisconsin for various reasons.[43] These reasons ranged from being behind on the most current science and being a better lecturer than actual scientific instructor. In addition, Carr had stirred up commotion at his old university to also cause an investigation into its management and budget there before coming to the University of California.[44] Shortly after their investigation into Carr's past employment, President Gilman and the Board of Regents moved to fire Carr after he would not willingly resign. Gilman cited Carr's multiple infractions during his time at the

---

[41] Scheuring, Ann Foley., Chester O. McCorkle, and James. Lyons. *Science & Service : A History of the Land-Grant University and Agriculture in California*. (Oakland, CA: ANR Publications, University of California, 1995), 17.
[42] Ibid.
[43] Ibid, 11-12.
[44] Ibid, 12.

University of California, from not conducting experiments to missing more than half of the faculty meetings for the year of 1873.[45] Carr was eventually fired to the upset of many people involved with the Grange throughout the state.[46] The political machinations at work behind this dispute shows the power that the Grange and the Regents both had when navigating how to handle the future directions of the university.

With Ezra Carr now out of the picture, one might assume that the Grange went on to take a marginal position in terms of influencing the University of California; however, this was not the case. Ezra Carr was later replaced by Eugene W. Hilgard in 1875. While he was not trained as a Doctor of Medicine like Carr, Hilgard brought with him a whole different set of skills. Hilgard had earned his Ph.D. in Germany and specialized in studying difficult types of soil for agriculture. While many farmers were still upset with how the University of California had fired Carr, Hilgard's knowledge of agricultural soils would prove useful to working with these farmers who didn't seem to take too kindly to Carr's successor.

Hilgard, who would become known for his successful stewardship of the College of Agriculture thanks in part to his political skill, was eager to turn the Grange's negative perception of him around. He did so by applying his expertise in soil science to help bolster California's emerging viticulture industry. Hilgard successfully started to win over Grange members and other farmers who disliked him. Edward J. Wickson who witnessed one of Hilgard's first speeches recounts his experience:

[45] Ibid. 17.
[46] Ironically, Carr ended up being elected as state superintendent of public instruction and was an ex-officio member of the Board of Regents during his tenure.

> I was present at a farmers' meeting in San Francisco in 1876, apparently called to see just how far the College of Agriculture had fallen. The room … was crowded with men of some prominence in farming and hostile to the University because they really believed that the College of Agriculture ought to be snatched from ruinous association with a so-called "classical institution." It was a stormy assembly but when there came a lull the chairman asked Hilgard to speak. He rose alertly, showing then a slim, graceful figure, and when he had folded and pocketed the blue glasses which a long continued eye trouble forced him to wear, they saw a scholarly face illuminated with an eagerness, cordiality and brightness of expression … He had them transfixed with surprise and curiosity, and when he began to speak in a low, conversational voice, with an accent which compelled to listen closely, every man was at attention.[47]

What followed over time was Hilgard's continual ability to garner more and more of the Grange's support. Drawing from his area of expertise, he was able to help improve agricultural outputs for many of these farmers. He was also able to successfully generate additional money for the College of Agriculture as well, demonstrating to the Grange that not only was Hilgard agriculturally competent. He was also delivering on their concerns over an increasingly disinterested and disinvested University of California from agricultural concerns. Hilgard was winning over the Grange's support.[48]

---

[47] Scheuring, Ann Foley., Chester O. McCorkle, and James. Lyons. *Science & Service : A History of the Land-Grant University and Agriculture in California*. (Oakland, CA: ANR Publications, University of California, 1995), 30-31.

[48] Schreuing goes on to quote Wickson stating "As the meeting closed … a tall giant from the San Joaquin who was a leader in the opposition and who was known to be able to damn the classics all around a thousand acre grain-farm, leaned down and whispered in my ear: 'My God, that man knows something!"

Keeping this in mind, it is important to consider the power of the Grange despite being made up of farmers and others who are not necessarily imagined as the elite class that would traditionally send their sons to college. Not only did the Grange provoke the Regents, which could have resulted in a distancing from future leadership of the College of Agriculture, but the Grange was essential for Hilgard to win over as well. Part of that was obviously a result of Hilgard's necessity of working with farmers to do his job. Yet, this necessity also does not account for the full political relationship between Hilgard and the Grange. It also speaks to the way that whiteness was enshrined in the early racial-colonial dynamics that prefigure how agriculture will function in California's future and how these dynamics would also result in direct material consequences in the San Joaquin Valley during the 20th Century until our present moment.

While the Grange might have been composed of working-class men, their politics were far from anti-capitalist. Like other populist movements during this time, like the California's Workingmen Party, the Grange had questionable racial politics at best. For instance, as mentioned above, the California Grange supported the various Alien Land Laws and Acts in California, which was pushed for by the Workingmen's Party. In addition, it has also been noted that the Grange also started joining various anti-Asian coalition groups since 1907.[49] Outside of these occurrences, the Grange's racial politics

---

Scheuring, Ann Foley., Chester O. McCorkle, and James. Lyons. *Science & Service : A History of the Land-Grant University and Agriculture in California*. (Oakland, CA: ANR Publications, University of California, 1995), 31.

[49] Ferguson, Edwin E. "The California Alien Land Law and the Fourteenth Amendment." *California Law Review* 35, no. 1 (1947): 61–90. The California Grange later issued a public apology to Japanese Americans in 2014 for its discriminatory past. For more, see: JACL National Staff. "California State Grange Apologizes to Japanese Americans for Discriminatory Past." Pacific Citizen: The National

were also shaped by ideas of free and unfree labor ideologies that were instrumental to California politics in the late 1800s and early 1900s. These ideas of unfree labor associated racialized populations with unfree labor: African-Americans with chattel slavery, Asians with indentured servitude, and Native Nations due to the Spanish mission system.[50] While these trends demonstrated the Grange's broader uptake of a racialized worldview that framed how they would conceptualize racialized labor, these trends then dovetail with the Grange's eventual move to supporting big agriculture.[51] Like many other populist formations, the Grange at this time might have challenged existing power structures through their invested interest in the American farmer; however, their interest is invested in such challenges only insofar as when these existing power structures are threatening the livelihood of its white members.

Even outside of the Grange, the University of California's early opportunities for interaction between scientists (also referred to as agricultural advisors) and farmers were tinged in a way that upheld asymmetrical priorities. Examining the University of California's early outreach to farmers which really took off during the Hilgard era is important and will be discussed in Chapter 2. There is a lot that could be said about the University of California's early history and race but, for the purposes of this dissertation,

---

Newspaper of the JACL, October 20, 2014. https://www.pacificcitizen.org/california-state-grange-apologizes-to-japanese-americans-for-discriminatory-past/.

[50] For more, please see: Smith, Stacey L. *Freedom's Frontier: California and the Struggle over Unfree Labor, Emancipation, and Reconstruction*. Chapel Hill, NC: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 2013; Day, Iyko. *Alien Capital: Asian Racialization and the Logic of Settler Colonial Capitalism*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2016; and Glenn, Evelyn Nakano. "Settler Colonialism as Structure: A Framework for Comparative Studies of U.S. Race and Gender Formation." *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity* 1, no. 1 (2015).

[51] Collins, John. "West Coast Grange Wars: A Reborn Farmers' Movement Takes on Corporate Agriculture." News. In These Times, June 14, 2015. http://inthesetimes.com/rural-america/entry/18029/a-grange-war-what-goes-around-comes-around-the-west-is-wild.

it is important to think about how the investment in white supremacy that was created came to shape agriculture for years to come. One immediate example can be seen in the state-owned agricultural colonies mentioned at the beginning of this chapter.

The State and Whiteness: Elwood Mead's Agricultural Colonies

The state-run agricultural colonies differed vastly from the privately-run ones. The former emerged as a response to the later. Many of the private agricultural colonies that emerged from 1880 to 1903 suffered from bad management and other financial woes. This was exacerbated by the way that many of the people purchasing these lands did not have experience in agriculture or an understanding of the different soils that these colonies were located on. Many of the early settlements in the San Joaquin Valley after the ones created by the construction of railroads were private agricultural colonies.

Mead's plan and vision for the state agricultural colonies were made apparent to the California legislature in 1916 when the Commission on Land Settlements and Rural Credits submitted their report to the governor on November 29, 1916. In 1915, the California legislature had authorized the creation of the Commission on Land Settlement and Rural Credits. As a result, the Commission was tasked with investigating "[t]he question of land colonization and the various forms of land banks, co-operative credit unions and other rural credit systems adopted or proposed in this country or elsewhere with a special view to the needs of the rural communities in the State."[52] While the

[52] State Colonization and Rural Credits Commission, Elwood Mead, Chester Rowell, Harris Weinstock, H Fleishhacker, David P. Barrows, and David N. Morgan. "Land Settlement and Rural Credits: The Need for an Investigation in California: Abstract of Statement of State Colonization and Rural Credits Commission." Sacramento: State Colonization and Rural Credits Commission, October 1916, 3.

Commission on Land Settlements and Rural Credits was officially housed under the University of California, it was also partnered with the Commonwealth Club.

The Commonwealth Club was founded in San Francisco in 1906 by Edward F. Adams who was the *San Francisco Chronicle* agriculture editor. Another founding member was also Benjamin Ide Wheeler who was a professor of Greek at the University of California who eventually serves as the President of the University of California from 1899 to 1919.[53] The Commonwealth Club, which still exists today, bills some of its early studies as including

> a variety of topics, some reflecting a social concern (child labor in 1906, Indian rights in 1909, air pollution in 1913) and others that led to social change and state legislation (civil service processes in 1904, California banking laws in 1908, selection of jurors in 1920 and public defender's offices in 1932).[54]

The early club's and commission's focus on issues of rural credit and settling lands congealed in a report addressed to California Governor Hiram W. Johnson, which was published on November 29, 1916.

The 1916 report discussed the creation of colonies and pointed out various confounding factors that strongly suggested that the state would be better than private companies in colonizing California. In the report, one of the issues considered by the writers was the failed effects of selling agricultural colonies through land speculation. Agricultural colonies emerged out of a process of land speculation in which investors

[53] Commonwealth Club. "Our History." History | Commonwealth Club, n.d. https//www.commonwealthclub.org/about/history.
[54] Ibid.

realized that they could make a massive profit selling to potential settlers by first buying a piece of land, creating an agricultural colony from the accumulated land, and subdividing the land into individual parcels. Then, they would begin improving these individual parcels through certain agricultural developing projects and finally selling the land at a higher price for profit. The report describes the impact of selling the land at a higher price for migrating settlers to the West.

> In no other part of the United States was there so wide a difference between the price of improved and unimproved land.… The immigrant from the corn-growing states of the Middle West or from the shops and stores of Eastern cities had no conception of the amount of money and time required to convert ungraded, uncultivated land.[55]

This higher price then created a stark difference between what the settling consumer paid and what the land had originally been sold for, since settlers were sold a vision of settling on 'improved lands' at an inflated price oftentimes without any real knowledge of how to work the land themselves. In this process, many of the settlers moved to the West on poor financial footing. In the report, Mead and his colleagues pointed out how the private colonies were guilty of not instructing the new settlers on how to farm. They also criticized how private agricultural colonies made it difficult for settlers to produce a financially profitable farm.

[55] Mead, Elwood, Harris Winstock, David P. Barows, Mortimer Fleishhacker, and Chester Rowell. "Report of the Commission on Land Colonization and Rural Credits of the State of California. November 29, 1916." Sacramento: Commission on Land Colonization and Rural Credits, November 29, 1916, 48-49. https://archive.org/details/reportofcommissi00caliiala,

The 1916 report goes on to list how, on top of rampant land speculation, another thing that made many of these early settlements unsuccessful was the settlers' lack of specialized farming knowledge and skills. The report emphasized how settlers needed to be ready to "undergo an apprenticeship in a most exacting form of agriculture, which makes far greater demands in the way of knowledge and skill than is required in the fertile corn and wheat growing states of the Middle West".[56] For Mead, the increased prices defeated the profit incentive that originally drove developers to create agricultural colonies. The more experienced farmers stopped buying these lands after realizing their unprofitability, leaving many of the buyers to be people who did not know much about agriculture. This led to the accumulation of handsome profits for landowners and sellers, while many settlers went into massive debt by taking out loans to purchase farms that ultimately could not produce enough to cover for its own costs.[57]

For Mead and the rest of the Commission, state-backed planned agricultural colony settlement could be more beneficial to the goals of increasing settlement in rural areas of California than their private counterparts. State-planned agricultural colony resettlement, they suggested, could ensure that such rural settlements were much more productive and profitable for those who lived there. If the state were to invest in creating agricultural colonies and sell the plots with liberal payments and a structured support system for the farmers, then the only other problem the Land Settlement Board would face is ensuring they find qualified buyers who have experience with and experience in growing.

[56] Ibid, 49.
[57] Ibid, 50-51.

Such decisions on who was a qualified and experienced buyer to buy a lot on the colony were made by The Land Settlement Board. In an article published in the magazine *Country Gentleman* on December 20, 1919, and later included in the Land Board publication entitled "How California Helps Men Own Farms and Rural Homes," Freeman Tilden discussed how the selection process works. The article was written from the point of a view of a skeptic who, upon visiting the Durham colony for a second time, was won over by what he saw. Reflecting the problem that the Land Board had identified and was trying to solve, Tilden writes, "The land kites who settled people on their speculative acres never worried about the kind of settlers they got, so long as they got the settlers' money. But to the state colony *the man* was all-important".[58]

The land board used multiple methods to ensure that someone was qualified to take on a farming lot in the state colonies. The first was that each applicant needed to have no less than $1500 in cash or equivalent in farming equipment or supplies. This financial requirement was on top of a questionnaire that prospective settlers had to complete as part of their application, which asked about relevant farming experience and backgrounds.[59] Moreover, while this provision was not included in the 1917 legislation that allocated money for the original colony purchase in 1919, the state passed a piece of legislation that enabled the Land Settlement Board to give special preference to veterans

[58] Tilden, Freeman, Robert Emmett Jones, and California State Land Settlement Board. "How California Helps Men Own Farms and Rural Homes." Sacramento: California State Printing Office, June 1920, 6. Emphasis added. https://archive.org/details/howcaliforniahe00jonegoog/.
[59] Ibid, 7.

from World War I.[60] There were also moments where the State Land Board would require in-person interviews if people were applying for the same lot of land.

While these procedures were interested in wealth, war experience, and farming experience, the State Land Board's mode of assessing the right candidates for purchase did not end there. One of the major factors of who could access the state-backed colonies was race, and explicitly so. Compounding with the continuation of the settler colonial occupation of Native lands by virtue of the existence and production of such agricultural colonies, these lands were also infused from their offset with white supremacist ideas.

One of the main sources of such views was in fact Elwood Mead himself. In an article entitled "Rural Democracy at Delhi," published in *Country Gentleman* in November 27, 1920, Robert Welles Ritchie recounts how Mead, oft considered the father of the state-sponsored land settlements, birthed this idea through white supremacist influences. Ritchie quotes Mead stating:

> Whether we realize it now, the time is coming when we will realize that there is no sacrifice of time, money, or effort too great to insure that the people who make up rural society have the education and character needed to make them sources of political and social strength in times of unrest like the present, and it will not answer that rural opinion shall be made by a limited class of well-to-do people. It must include those who have made their way in the world. What the farm laborer

[60] Mead, Elwood, Mortimer Fleishhacker, Frank P. Flint, E. S. Wangenheim, and California State Land Settlement Board. "Information Regarding Progress under the Land Settlement Act of the State of California and about the Plans for Soldier Settlement in the Future." Sacramento: California State Land Settlement Board, May 30, 1919. https://archive.org/details/informationregar00caliiala/page/n1.

> and his family think is really more important than what the nonresident land-owner thinks. [61]

Ritchie goes on to recount:

> Doctor Mead cited an instance to point this truth: He had seen forty people, he said, at work thinning a California beet field. A fourth of them were women; five wore the Hindu turban and fifteen squatted under the peaked sombrero of the Mexican. And "I pictured myself as an American boy working in that crowd. I know I would feel like a hobo, and if I stayed with them long enough I would be a hobo – not because of the work, but because of my associates."[62]

Mead's racial views and ideas of the importance of the rural were a white supremacist one. By extolling the importance of the everyday rural voter while denigrating farmworkers of color, he blatantly paints the visions of the rural United States that he wants. In part, it can be read that Mead blames people of color working in the fields as the reason for the degradation of the role of farm work and the common person who exists in rural society. In this way, Mead's solution to elevate the position of farmworkers and thus rural areas was to ensure that these "other associates" wouldn't make an "American boy" feel like a hobo.

Mead's sharing of his racial views was not confined to his speech at San Diego. In the initial report from the Commission on Land Colonization and Rural Credits that was published on November 29, 1916, white supremacist elements can also be found in

[61] Ritchie, Robert Welles. "Rural Democracy at Delhi: It Is Changing a Sandy Waste into Another Durham Colony." *Country Gentleman*, November 27, 1920: 8-36; published again in State Land Settlement Board. "Food First: How One Western State Is Staking the Farmers | Rural Democracy at Delhi: It Is Changing a Sandy Waste into Another Durham Colony." Sacramento: State Land Settlement Board, December 1920.
[62] Ibid.

Mead's plans for the agricultural colonies. While the Commission's report was a jointly-written document, Mead's views undoubtably shaped the state-sponsored land settlement colonies and the commissions that he served as chair of. In a section entitled "Character and Ability of Settlers Important" in the 1916 report, Mead and the other members of the State Land Board clearly emphasized the connection between rural settlers with the success of California as a settler colony more broadly:

> The character of our colonists will do more than any other single influence to make California an attractive place to live in or a good place to avoid. They will be voters. Their children will fill the rural schools, on which we are now spending annually about $6,500,000 to help to create good citizens. Our success in this will depend quite largely on the kind of homes the children come from and the civic ideals which their parents seek to establish. This political side of colonization has not been given the attention it deserves. Steadiness and sanity in our political life depend quite largely on the influence and the intelligence of the country voter.[63]

The above quote combined with other sections of the report paints a picture of rural California as not only important for California's own well-being, but also as a place that should be for white people. This particularly becomes most apparent when the report goes into talking about how tenant farming and farm laborers are more generally found on big farms or land holdings. The second section of the report, entitled "The problems of tenantry and farm labor," forwarded a vision of labor organization that does not match up

[63] Mead, Elwood, Harris Winstock, David P. Barows, Mortimer Fleishhacker, and Chester Rowell. "Report of the Commission on Land Colonization and Rural Credits of the State of California. November 29, 1916." Sacramento: Commission on Land Colonization and Rural Credits, November 29, 1916), 58.

with the type of labor exploitation that California's agricultural industry is known for, especially during the latter half of the 20th century.

The Commission on Land Colonization and Rural Credits took issue with how tenant farming and being a farm worker created sets of undesirable social conditions, namely poverty and a lack of engagement with the state. The Commission states in the report that, "On account of the great landed estates, tenant farming has always had an important place in the agriculture of California, but with the rise in land prices and the adoption of intensive cultivation it has taken on a new and less desirable aspect".[64] While economic problems were highlighted, such as the way tenant farmers got lower prices for the crops they sold due to economic desperation, there was a racial element to these critiques. The report states later on that, earlier in California history, the tenant farmer "was an American with an interest in national, state, and local affairs, as ready as the landowner to work for the upbuilding of the neighborhood".[65] The idea that the Land Settlement Board had put forth in this report limits an understanding of California's longer history of exploitative agriculture, especially when considering California Indian communities and large land holdings in the area under Spanish, Mexican, and American control. This rendering of the history of California eclipses how labor exploitation was always part and parcel to massive land owning and perpetuates the myth that labor practices in California used to be fair. Moreover, the myth that big land holdings in California used to be fair in their labor practices extolls the extent to which whiteness is focused on in this report's account.

[64] Ibid, 59.
[65] Ibid.

It is important to understand that this report and the Land Settlement Board's agricultural colonies represent the crux of how race and class divides functioned in California at the time. As suggested in their report, the Land Colonization and Rural Credits Commission, which would eventually become the Land Settlement Board, could only diagnose capitalist exploitation of workers via tenant farming for whites, particularly American and Western European whites. In this way, the land settlement colonies were carving a capitalism where the class divides operated under racial divides. The report stated:

> The degeneration of white laborers under these conditions is inevitable. Many of them become hoboes. They lose all ambition and all regard for the interests of their employers. The sections of cities where this kind of labor congregates are injuriously affected. As a class they are discontented. With their continuous tendency towards disturbance they are a menace to political and social peace. The remedy for this is to make conditions which will attract dependable white people, especially Americans. We can not go on creating bad conditions of life and seeking people who are indifferent to those conditions without destroying our rural civilization … we realize how far we have fallen behind the rest of the world in our understanding of rural needs and in our measures to elevate rural society.[66]

Mead and the others on both commissions sought to create one- to five-acre lots where farm workers could live in the vicinity of farms that utilize their labor while also being able to raise a family. The idea was that the farm workers' wives could grow produce and

[66] Ibid, 65.

raise livestock for sustenance and to supplement the husband's income as a worker. This was to combat what the report clearly stated was the influence of immigrants who were East Asian, South Asian, Mexican, and non-Western European.

These racial ideas that found their way into the commissions Mead was a part of and in his own speeches are important examples of how racial capitalism functioned in and through agricultural labor. These views were echoed in various forms throughout the life of the state's land settlements. One interesting thing to note is the way that in later reports, like the one published on September 30, 1920 by the Land Settlement Board, a more conciliatory approach is taken to other European ethnic groups while not given to Asian immigrant and Asian Americans. When talking about the issue of South Eastern Europe not becoming Americanized, the authors comment that "They are not being assimilated in the rural life of country districts. On the contrary, they crowd together seeking to acquire land to create neighborhoods of their own race or other foreign races and thus continue to live in the atmosphere of the country they come from".[67]

This sentiment is revealing as the report continues since it highlights how the report writers saw racial difference functioning in the city as compared to rural areas. Racial segregation, for the report writers, was "far more dangerous than similar grouping in the cities. There it may and often does enrich culture, art, and industry. In the country, its main effects are personal friction and economic competition that tend to destroy

[67] Mead, Elwood, Mortimer Fleishhacker, Prescott F. Cogswell, Frank P. Flint, and E.S. Wangenheim. "Report of the State Land Settlement Board of the State of California." Sacramento: State Land Settlement Board, September 30, 1920, 50.

American standards of living".[68] These sentiments about the importance of assimilating in a rural area as compared to the city also demonstrate some of the different levels of tolerance found in places classified as either rural or city. The report goes on to state that "The thirteen nationalities at Durham include some people who would, if left to themselves, join racial groups, but who at Durham are among the most active in creating the social fabric needed in the rural life of California".[69] While this part of the report might portray the idea that the writers would be happy with any immigrant who came and assimilated, it becomes clear that that isn't the case. In the next line the report states " … and more Durhams and Delhis there are, the more certain it is that rural California will be in the next half century remain the frontier of the white man's world".[70] Due to that, it is clear the writers meant to include only ethnic whites into the rubric of assimilation.

That assertion is especially enforced as the report goes on to specifically focus on Japanese farmers and farm workers. The report states that the colonies are "the antidote to the Japanese racial aggression and segregation disclosed by the report of the State Board of Control to Governor Stephens".[71] The report reinforces its anti-Asian stance in the next section entitled "Orientals Are Not Needed To Do The Hard Farm Work". The section claims that the reason why there is an exodus of American farm labor to the cities isn't because of the lack of desire of white men to do hard farm labor, but instead because they "object to competition with Orientals and backward people and to the kind of life

[68] Ibid.
[69] Ibid.
[70] Ibid.
[71] Ibid.

unplanned development imposes on their wives and children".[72] The racial propositions that underline the state's agricultural colonies did not just reflect the racist attitudes in society at the time, but also contributed to enforcing and making that racist climate.

In fact, the University of California whose professors and Agricultural College was indispensable to the state agricultural colonies was actively mingling with white populist organizations who specifically held the anti-Asian fervor characterized by groups like the Working Man's Party that came out of San Francisco during this time period. The state ran the colonies for a total of 13 years and their importance for understanding the connections between the state, the University of California, and race in the San Joaquin Valley cannot be understated. This is especially so because of the insistence by the State Colonization and Rural Credits Commission and the Land Settlement Board that both agricultural models can be a model for all parts of rural California.[73]

Conclusion: Settler Colonialism and the Rural as a Basis of Agriculture

What does it mean to trace these histories of race and the rural? What can we learn from them that can be instructive to understanding the San Joaquin Valley? For one, it can help us see that racial exclusion functioned in various manifestations of California agriculture from its offset as a territory that was absorbed by the United States. This buildup between the University of California and white populism resulted in the

[72] Ibid.
[73] Also, it is interesting to note that much of the interest for this type of land settlement project came from Mead's involvement with the settler colonial state of Australia in preceding years. Most of the reports that came from the commissions and Mead were apart of not only discussed Australia's different projects, but also England and Germany too.

propagation of racial views that marginalized communities of color, specifically during this time Asian/Asian-Americans and California Indians.

Moreover, doing so helps us understand how white supremacy is closely embedded in how United States agriculture was enacted and performed through processes of settlement. The white supremacist visions of agriculture shared in this chapter were foundational to the upkeep of the structure of settler colonialism in California by recasting the land outside of the cities as part of an ideal white-only 'rural civilization' just years after outright genocidal violence against California Indians. The University of California emerging from legislation that wanted to infuse the American farmer with scientific training and methods of growing, was tied to the Homestead Act which encouraged the settlement of lands stolen from Native Nations and communities.

As this chapter demonstrates, these racial hierarchies that started out as ideologies on paper came to also take on material meanings through various projects. The creation of state-sponsored agricultural colonies is also one of those projects. The state-sponsored agricultural colonies and the white supremacist visions that propped up their promise for a strong 'rural civilization' show the fissures in the agricultural thought coming out of the University of California for decades to come. As this dissertation will go on to demonstrate, the University of California became an institution that incubated explicit and implicit white supremacist ideas in agriculture that came to shape agricultural regions across the state. The University of California was also an institution that housed forces who, for various reasons, worked against these white supremacist visions of agriculture.

What this chapter has been describing and terming as settler rurality has been particularly instructive to discussing the shaping of space produced through the agricultural industry and the land grant institution. Projects like irrigation and agricultural colonies changed the landscape of many areas of California. The ability for agriculture as an industry that had the power to shape California's landscape would change in preceding years. Especially following the end of World War II, California's economy rapidly changed altering acres of agriculturally rural areas into urban sprawl and budding suburbs. The next chapter will understand how these racial visions propagated by the state and the University of California through agriculture reshape as the San Joaquin Valley emerges as the leading agricultural producer in the state during these same times. While other areas of California were coming under the influence of aspects of racial capitalism, the San Joaquin Valley and other agricultural areas were dealing with a reforming agriculture.

Understanding the racial worldviews that encompassed the ideas around the state-sponsored land settlement helps to frame some of the inconsistencies Mead's ideas had when considering the University of California's embracement of the Bracero program, later in the century. The next chapter will focus on a shift in the university's specialists that saw the white supremacist impulses go from excluding people of color to make an ideal white-only 'rural civilization' to, as Carrey McWilliams said, a factory in the fields premised on the exploitation of laborers of color.

Chapter Two

"This does not mean that the great University of California, which is proudest of all its 'contribution to agriculture,' has ignored the farm workers. It is not, as we shall see. Its power has been one of their bitterest enemies.

That fact does not show to the casual observer, even to one within the university community, who can gad about its groves for years without ever learning that human values and social responsibility mean one thing in liberal-arts lectures and ceremonies, and quite another thing in the shadow of Giannini Hall. That chill fact lies mainly beneath the surface, like an iceberg".

—Anne Draper and Hal Draper, "The Dirt on California: Agribusiness and the University".[74]

Introduction

The epigraph quoted above comes from Anne Draper and Hal Draper's pamphlet "The Dirt on California: Agribusiness and the University", which was published by the Independent Socialist Clubs of America in 1968, the same year as the University of California's centennial. Rooted firmly in a socialist analysis of economic power, Anne Draper and Hal Draper's analysis highlighted the history of big growers and their relationship to the University of California. This particular emphasis on the university had generally not been seen before in the major works of 20th century critics of big agribusiness, which often focused primarily on the interplay between big agribusiness

[74] Draper, Anne, and Hal Draper. *The Dirt on California; Agribusiness and the University*. Independent Socialist Clubs of America, 1968, 1.

and the exploitation of farmworkers such as in the work of Ernesto Galarza, Walter Goldschmidt, Carry McWilliams, and Paul Taylor.

By centering the University of California's role in bolstering big agribusiness while undermining farmworkers, the pamphlet was able to offer a unique perspective that traced a long history of the University of California's role in establishing big agribusiness in the state. In it, the Drapers detail how the University of California played a key role in various projects, from creating exclusive farming organizations, to producing pro-Bracero Program propaganda via the Giannini Foundation of Agricultural Economics, and to funding research on mechanization programs that had a thwarting effect on farmworker labor movements.

It is useful to trace Anne Draper and Hal Draper's distinct analysis to their personal experiences. Much of their analysis in "The Dirt on California" emerges from their experiences of both being committed socialist organizers that focused on labor and racial justice issues at different moments in their lives. Anne Draper, for example, is oftentimes not cited in history books despite her central role as a labor organizer and socialist in supporting farmworker strikes across the state. Born in New York in 1917, Anne Draper entered the world to a pro-union Polish and Ukrainian family. Since then, she was involved in many political activities since her youth.[75] In 1958, she moved to California with Hal Draper and began working as a short-term research economist with the American Federation of Labor. Through this short-term research economist job, Anne

[75] For more information on Anne Draper, see the finding guide for her papers located at the Stanford University library. 1998, M0228, Anne Draper Papers, 1938-1973, Stanford University Archives, Stanford, California, USA.

Draper became more acquainted with and learned more about the harsh conditions that farmworkers faced in the fields. Following her work as a short-term research economist, Anne Draper would also come to host a radio show with Hal Draper in the Bay Area that oftentimes discussed farmworker labor issues, and serve as the Secretary of Citizens for Farm Labor.

In these capacities, Anne Draper became a crucial person who connected the political sphere situated in the San Francisco Bay Area to the political struggles that were occurring concurrently in the San Joaquin Valley and in other areas of the state. One central example of how she politically connected the San Francisco Bay Area to the political struggles in the San Joaquin Valley can be found in her labor organizing with the San Francisco Labor Council Delano Striker's Aid Committee. In this space, Anne Draper organized a food caravan to the strikers and chaired the San Francisco Labor Council Delano Striker's Aid Committee. During this time, Anne Draper was often in communication with the strike organizers. For instance, her involvement is documented in letters to and from major labor leaders in the United Farmworkers at the time such as Cesar Chavez and Larry Itliong.[76] Being engaged in these actions earned Anne Draper respect and a new nickname of "the favorite daughter of the Strike" in Delano.[77] Anne Draper's intense focus on the issues facing farmworkers helped inform the detailed history that she narrates about the University of California's involvement with big agribusiness.

[76] Ibid.
[77] Ibid.

While Anne Draper's previous organizing informed her analysis, Anne's husband, Hal Draper, also held experiences that informed his analysis in "The Dirt on California". Hal Draper served as an editor for several different independent socialist publications and was also a writer of socialist theory. During the 1930s, Hal Draper was an ardent student activist at the University of California, Los Angeles and organized socialist students to oppose rising fascism in Europe.[78] After his time as a student organizer, Draper went on to write about various social issues during and after World War II when working as a shipyard worker.[79] This was also when Hal Draper wrote about Jim Crow racism in Los Angeles.

By 1958, they both moved to Berkeley where Hal Draper worked as a librarian at the Bancroft Library and influenced a new generation of student activists involved with the Free Speech Movement. In an article written about Hal Draper's political thought, Joel Geier described that "Draper, more than any other radical from the 1930s, was able to make the leap into the new radicalism – as a participant, an interpreter, and a defender of the emerging New Left movements".[80] During that period, Hal Draper published a pamphlet entitled "The Mind of Clark Kerr" in 1964, which critiqued Kerr's understanding of universities that likened them to a factory. Due to his extensive

[78] Hal Draper's time organizing extended his whole life and reflected many divisions in the United States left at the time. He was specifically known for having a stringent anti-imperial stance, especially when it came to opposing For a more complete history about Hal Draper's involvement see: Cohen, Robert. *When the Old Left Was Young: Student Radicals and America's First Mass Student Movement, 1929-1941*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997; and Geier, Joel. "Hal Draper's Contribution to Revolutionary Marxism: Socialism from Below." *International Socialist Review*, Features, no. 107 (2018). https://isreview.org/issue/107/hal-drapers-contribution-revolutionary-marxism

[79] Geier, Joel. "Hal Draper's Contribution to Revolutionary Marxism: Socialism from Below." *International Socialist Review*, Features, no. 107 (2018). https://isreview.org/issue/107/hal-drapers-contribution-revolutionary-marxism.

[80] Ibid.

knowledge of being a student activist and working at the University of California, Hal Draper combined his expertise with Anne's expertise to provide the unique take mobilized in "The Dirt on California: Agribusiness and the University".

The Draper's work and life serve as a window to understand this hectic period in agricultural history. Not only was their work useful in illuminating the connections between agribusiness and the university. It was also particularly useful for how one can then begin tracing the ways that economic power functioned through race, agribusiness, and institutions like the university. Drawing on their work has been particularly useful for this chapter as their account of the UC's history with agriculture forms the spine from which most of this chapter emerges.

In the pamphlet, Anne Draper and Hal Draper discuss at length about how farmworkers were experiencing labor exploitation based on efforts by the university and big growers. While the communities involved were all inherently racialized, race was not always a central analytic. The pamphlet foregoes an explicit analysis of race to instead focus on the class dynamics at play that both affected the wage relationship between grower and farmworker on the one hand, and on the other hand affected the production of knowledge by universities aimed to help big growers fend off farmworkers' efforts at unionization. Although attuned and involved in struggles for racial justice elsewhere, the Drapers' analysis in "The Dirt on California" still missed some important moments in the history of California agriculture that ultimately could have helped their overall analysis. This chapter attempts to juxtapose the two.

Specifically, I draw from the Drapers' unique accounting of academic-industrial relations and work to extend their analysis by accounting for race in the events that unfolded since the fomenting of settler rurality during the latter half of the 19th and early 20th century. The Drapers' analysis of the university and its role in bolstering big agribusiness, especially after World War II, facilitated future critiques by Emmett Fiske, William Friedland, and Jim Hightower that would approach the land grant university as a site where the privileging of big agribusiness over the family farmer occurred and was perpetuated in California and the broader United States.[81]

By juxtaposing the Drapers' analysis with specific racialized effects of agricultural and industrial development within the United States, this chapter argues that the university served as one of the most important facilitators of a political economic landscape and geography in California that relied upon the settlement of indigenous lands to further produce the racialized geographies that were rooted within ideals of a free-enterprising and largely scientific and mass-produced form of agricultural development. This specific form of agricultural development took on a new meaning after World War II as various regions in California like Los Angeles experienced agricultural decline as compared to the San Joaquin Valley, which experienced the inverse.

[81] For more about Fiske's, Friedland's, and Hightower's work, please see: Fiske, Emmett Preston. "The College and Its Constituency : Rural and Community Development at the University of California, 1875-1978." Thesis (Ph. D.)--University of California, Davis, 1979., 1979; Friedland, William H., and Tim Kappel. "Production or Perish: Changing the Inequities of Agricultural Research Priorities." Project On Social Impact Assessment and Values. Santa Cruz: University of California, Santa Cruz, 1979; and Hightower, Jim. *Hard Tomatoes, Hard Times: The Original Hightower Report, Unexpurgated, of the Agribusiness Accountability Project on the Failure of America's Land Grant College Complex and Selected Additional Views of the Problems and Prospects of American Agriculture in the Late Seventies*. Cambridge, Mass: Schenkman Pub. Co, 1978.

The New Deal, the Farm Bureau & the Fight Over the Political Economy of Agriculture

The Drapers identified different university structures and services that have historically led the university towards opposing farmworkers' attempts to organize. The first structure that they examined was the historical connections between the University of California and the California Farm Bureau Federation. By narrating the historical connections between the two in "The Dirt on California", Anne Draper and Hal Draper demonstrated how one of the largest lobbying groups that supported big growers' interests was actually the California Farm Bureau Federation. For the Drapers, farm bureaus in California and across the country had a specific political function. In order to understand the function of the farm bureau, it is important to first understand how they were created and why.

One of the main ways that the University of California served its land grant missions was by creating different outreach programs to farmers. The earliest of these programs started in 1891 under the direction of Eugene Hilgard. Hilgard's programs were called farmers' institutes.[82] During this time, Hilgard and other agricultural experts from the University of California would traverse the state and provide education in farming techniques, home economics, and children events at some institutes. By 1921, these early practices were discontinued and replaced with outreach performed through the University of California's Agricultural Extension Service (AES). While the University of California's AES was first funded by the state, later federal funding came with the Smith-Lever Act of 1914. The Smith-Lever Act of 1914 approved the use of federal funds for

[82] Firkus, Angela. "The Agricultural Extension Service and Non-Whites in California, 1910–1932." *Agricultural History* 84, no. 4 (Fall 2010), 509.

land grant colleges across the country in order to bridge the university's agricultural research with practical instruction organized for rural farmers and residents through cooperative extension services.

While the various extension services at land grant colleges across the country worked differently, California's extension services had its own unique history. In California, the main way to access to the AES's services was by creating a county farm bureau. The bureaus were organized on a county-wide level, whose organization then created the state bureau, and whose state bureaus formed the national farm bureau. This requirement was an imposition by B.H. Crocheron, who ran the AES from 1919 until 1948.

William Friedland, who was a professor of Community Development at UC Santa Cruz, echoed much of the Drapers' analysis when he described the creation of Farm Bureaus as an organization that "was not conceived by farmer groups" but "was adopted by them".[83] In a much later published article, William Friedland describes the creation of state agricultural extension services and its relation to the Smith-Lever Act of 1914. Characterizing it as a "classic example of land-grant universities developing a constituency and becoming captured by it", he goes on to further outline the impacts of the 1914 Act:

> Smith-Lever created a 'cooperative' relationship between federal, state, and county governments. Local extension agents, recognizing the difficulties in

[83] Mayhew, Davis N. "The Agricultural Inquiry." *Report of the College of Agriculture and the Agricultural Experiment Station of the University of California From July 1, 1916 to June 30, 1917.* **quoted in** Emmett Preston. "The College and Its Constituency", 97.

> reaching the large population of farmers operating at the time in the U.S., decided to create a new farmer organization which would consist of 'progressive' farmers, i.e., those more open to new techniques of production. The organization was called the 'Farm Bureau.'

While these farmers were labeled "progressive", Friedland goes on to define what this progressive form of farming means in this context:

> The progressive farmers constituted the capital-accumulators of their time in agriculture. Having created farm bureaus around the country, within a single year, the newly formed American Farm Bureau Federation and its state and local bureaus, became the controlling elements of Agricultural Extension. Located, in most states, directly on the campuses of the land-grant colleges of agriculture, formal separation of Extension and the Farm Bureaus did not occur until after the second world war [sic].[84]

By detailing the development of the Farm Bureau, Friedland's analysis demonstrates how the farm bureaus reflected the political and economic interests of the wealthy. By linking "progressive" farming to the implementation of "new technologies of production", the farm bureaus also ensured that their constituency would encompass primarily of those who possessed the material and economic wealth to embrace these new methods. In effect, the organization of the farm bureau along the lines of being open to and actually adopting new technologies rendered the farm bureau constituency primarily white, echoing older models of organized agricultural interests like those of the Grange. While

[84] Friedland, William H. "Agricultural Research and Development and State Policies." University of Missouri, Columbia: Unpublished, 1987, 23.

both models of organized agriculture relied upon a white constituency, an important distinction between the two, however, is how the farm bureaus also represented white capital-accumulators as opposed to the white working class composition of the Grange's more populist-leaning constituency.

Tracing the historical class disposition of the farm bureaus is important to the Drapers because of the California State Farm Bureau's effect on the struggle being waged between big growers and farmworkers in the 1960s. In "The Dirt on California", the Drapers describe how the bureau's organizational structure was a response by the federal government to curtail various agricultural populist movements that had arisen in the preceding decades. At the University of California, this curtailing of agricultural populist movements had negative effects for the Grange. While the UC under Hilgard and Carr had tapped on the Grange, the farm bureau's diverted attention from the Grange in order to tap on a different constituency. Ann Scheuring et al account for this shift when they discuss how the University of California looked towards "un-controversial" constituents and actively did not choose members from the Grange as a result.[85] In choosing against the Grange and towards larger-scale and wealthier farmers, the composition of the farm bureaus came to function as a safeguard against white populism. We see this diagnosis reiterated by David Houston, then Secretary of Agriculture for the United States, in 1921 who stated that "[t]he Farm Bureau was formed as a bulwark against unrest amongst farmers".[86]

[85] Scheuring, Anne et al. *Science and Service*, 80-81.
[86] Draper, Anne and Hal Draper. "The Dirt on California", 2-3.

The Farm Bureau was also deeply connected to the California legislature and the University of California campus. Despite being founded under the guise of an educational organization, the California Farm Bureau Federation, the Drapers reveal, "openly engaged in business affairs and legislative lobbying".[87] This close proximity between the two institutions was also literally represented in the Federation's physical location. The California's Farm Bureau Federation was housed at UC Berkeley's campus in Hilgard Hall until 1938 and had an office at the edge of campus until the 1960s.

The close ties between the Farm Bureau and the state through the University of California showcases how white supremacist investment in agriculture not only blocked non-"progressive" farmers from joining this organization. It was also used to squash the unrest that many economically disenfranchised farmers embraced. By 1934, the Drapers noted that the California Farm Bureau Federation and the State Chamber of Commerce had worked together to create a new group: the Associated Farmers of California.

While the California Farm Bureau Federation continued to lobby and spread anti-union propaganda during the 1930s and onwards, the Associated Farmers of California used a flurry of strategies to quell political unrest and unionization efforts. The Drapers go on to detail what these strategies meant, including tactics such as "armed storm-troop mobilizations, burning crosses, lynch-mob tactics, a highly developed espionage system in cahoots with the state 'law enforcement' agencies; even actually constructed a concentration camp or two with all the trimmings" to crush farmworker mobilizations

[87] Ibid, 2.

across the state.[88] The Drapers astutely noted that the Associated Farmers and their activities "more closely resembled the Ku Klux Klan than a Nazi-type party".[89]

While Anne Draper and Hal Draper's analysis on the creation of the farm bureaus by the AES explains the class struggle taking place in California's fields from the early 1900s to the 1960s, their analysis unfortunately missed important linkages between the AES and the longer history of white supremacist thought in the University of California. For this section, I am particularly interested in supplementing their analysis with how the AES furthered a racial vision of 'harmonious hierarchy' that relied upon the perpetual use of certain populations for agricultural labor exploitation.

The Agricultural Extension Service was central to propagating a racial vision. While this vision was different than other racial visions being propagated at the time like Mead's, the AES's vision was an inherently white supremacist one. While people like Elwood Mead were idealizing a California agriculture that was primarily made up of whites only through state-sponsored agricultural colonies, the AES propagated a vision of

[88] Ibid, 3. For more about the fascism of big agriculture in California, see Davis, Mike, and Mike Davis. "'What Is a Vigilante Man?' White Violence in California History." In *No One Is Illegal: Fighting Racism and State Violence on the U.S.-Mexico Border*, edited by Justin Akers Chacon, 2nd Edition., 7–88. Chicago, IL: Haymarket Books, 2006; and Marez, Curtis. *Farm Worker Futurism: Speculative Technologies of Resistance*. Difference Incorporated. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2016. In addition, the Drapers cited Carey McWilliams' descriptions of "farm fascism". For more, see McWilliams, Carey. *Factories in the Field: The Story of Migratory Farm Labor in California*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2000; and Judt, Tony. *Ill Fares the Land*. 1st ed. Westminster, London, England: Penguin Books, 2011.

[89] Draper, Anne and Hal Draper. "The Dirt on California", 3. While their reference to the Ku Klux Klan might harken to the racial politics of the California State Farm Bureau, it is important to note that the Drapers never explicitly explored that metaphor in other parts of their text.

racial order premised on the idea of a "harmonious hierarchy".[90] Historian Angela Firkus details the way the AES propagated racial visions during this time:

> It was no surprise that the AES in California supported the aims of agribusiness in general and specifically reflected the attitudes of race held by the influential growers. In fact, even California progressives held view similar to the growers' attitudes about race and the economy. All Californians understood that growth in their state would rely on cheap farm labor, and they saw the non-whites in the state – and by World War II specifically Mexicans – as the most likely source of that labor. They used economic and political forces to create a 'harmonious hierarchy,' a situation where non-whites would work for low wages and presumably accept their low economic and social status happily because it was in the best interests of the state as a whole.[91]

As demonstrated in Firkus' detail about the politics of this harmonious hierarchy, the AES did not simply impact class relations. It also implicated a classed and racial order.

One example of the AES's impacts through both class and race lines can be noted in how the AESs impacted California Indians. In particular, the AES's propagation of a harmonious hierarchy furthered the continual dispossession of California Indians from their lands. The AES specifically encouraged white settlement to the detriment of Native peoples "by aiding agribusiness to appropriate the few resources (namely land and water)

[90] Firkus, Angela. "The Agricultural Extension Service and Non-Whites in California, 1910–1932." *Agricultural History* 84, no. 4 (Fall 2010), 508.
[91] Ibid, 510.

[California Natives] still held by 1910, thus turning them into low cost rural laborers".[92] By appropriating land and water, Elwood Mead's agricultural colonies, which worked with farm advisors to form the AES, changed California's landscape through farming and, in effect, cut Native people from their food sources.[93] Moreover, irrigation projects starting in 1915 also further hurt California Indians, historian Angela Firkus notes, by diverting water sources that they had relied on to the farms and their water needs.[94]

In this class and racially stratified configuration, the propagation of a harmonious hierarchy envisioned a different vision of settler rurality than Mead's vision. Mead's vision of a rural civilization, as discussed in chapter one, was premised on the fact that both white farmers and white farmworkers could live in harmony if the economic conditions and social standing of the farmworkers were equal to that of the farmers. In Mead's vision, the practices of big growers and land tenantry should be criticized for how they unfairly treat white farmworkers and growers; its rectification would be made when an all-white labor force populated farm work as opposed to the increased desire and reliance to use people of color labor in the fields. Moreover, for Mead, the two different class of laborers could become equal by leading coherent social lives where they would be mutually respected, and by placing their children in the same schools.

---

[92] Ibid, 513.
[93] Ibid.
[94] For more information on this, see Firkus, Angela. "The Agricultural Extension Service and Non-Whites in California, 1910–1932." *Agricultural History* 84, no. 4 (Fall 2010): 514-515; and Ballis, George. *The Dispossessed*. VHS Video. Sun Mt. Production, 1970. Moreover, for a sustained engagement on how irrigation projects impacted the San Joaquin Valley, please see William L. Preston's discussion of the draining of Tulare Lake in: Preston, William L. *Vanishing Landscapes: Land and Life in the Tulare Lake Basin*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981.

While premised on this idea of mutual respect, Mead's vision eschewed the racialized communities who had left job discrimination in the city to work in the fields as farmworkers during the 1920s. Firkus' account of farmworkers attests to the opposite since she notes that the majority of people who were imagined as the ideal cheap laboring farmworkers during this time were people of color, particularly Mexicans.[95] While these were two competing visions for agriculture's social and material divisions, Mead's project with the agricultural colonies eventually failed. Its failure cost the state tons of money, leaving the AES's and the grower's vision of a harmonious hierarchy as a vision that would guide agriculture away from Mead's failed agricultural colonies and into the rest of the 20th Century.

By not including the longer history of white supremacy that affected the University of California and its agricultural outreach and extension programs, the Drapers missed an important point about labor. Mead's vision wanted a harmony between whites based off the resolving of class differences between white farmers and white farmworkers, amounting to a white iteration of agriculture that denied racialized labor. The vision of harmonious hierarchy did the opposite, instead advocating that non-white races would fulfill the lowest rungs of labor for the benefit of the 'progressive' white growers who were the capital accumulators amongst the farmers.

As demonstrated in the discussion between the agricultural ideals of the "harmonious hierarchy" and Mead's vision for a white iteration of agriculture, the undeniable role of race helps to explain these class politics. As Cedric Robinson argued,

[95] Firkus, Angela. "The Agricultural Extension Service and Non-Whites in California, 1910–1932." *Agricultural History* 84, no. 4 (Fall 2010), 510.

capitalism is inherently racial in nature and emerged from a European world that was rife with racialisms.[96] While Mead's vision for California agriculture ultimately failed, its successor whose rationales were rooted in this harmonious hierarchy ensured a continual racial capitalist order to be latched onto agriculture. Years later, we still have mainly workers of color performing farm work while most farm owners in California are white.

Agricultural Intensification: Economic Efficiency Through the Guise of Free Enterprise

While an understanding of the AES's role in promoting a racial vision for California's agriculture helps build on Anne Draper and Hal Draper's analysis, it only explains one component of the larger complex that made big agriculture so commonplace in California. National changes in agricultural policy alongside changes in California's political economy following World War II resulted in the continuation of the same divisions in agriculture between primarily farmworkers of color and a majority of white growers. Accounting for the racial life of federal agricultural policies from 1925 onwards will help us contextualize the role of race in the creation of the Bracero Program, which was central to the Drapers' "The Dirt on California".

Another big change occurred before the 1930s with the passage of the Purnell Act of 1925. The Purnell Act allocated money to land grant institutions to allow them to embrace and develop the emerging fields of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology. After the passage of this act, the University of California received a 1.5-million-dollar donation from the Bancitaly Corporation of San Francisco, whose president was A.P. Giannini. This donation, adjusted for inflation, is equivalent to 22.5

[96] Robinson, Cedric J. *Black Marxism: The Making of the Black Radical Tradition*. Chapel Hill, N.C: University of North Carolina Press, 2000, 2-3.

million USD as of May 2019. Of the 1.5 million, a third of it went towards the building of Giannini Hall at UC Berkeley. The remaining 1 million was used to establish the Giannini Foundation, which provided funds to hire the first agricultural economist at the University of California.[97]

This political economic investment by the Giannini Foundation in tandem with the institutionalization of the Farmer's Bureau would converge to create conditions that led to the eventual privileging of big agribusiness over smaller farms. The establishment of the Giannini Foundation as we will see not only gave rise to a new type of disciplinary apparatus to the UC's agricultural services, which also began to use agricultural economics to prioritize the creation of higher production yields and efficiency over everything else. It also continued the vested interests of big agribusiness in the future even when the UC formally split with the Farmer's Bureau after World War II.

The establishment of those two institutional manifestations of big agribusiness (e.g. the California Farm Bureau Federation and the Giannini Foundation) were instrumental to the difficulties that farmworkers would continually experience over the next few decades in California. Situated within a national context, these events also occurred simultaneously with political and economic shifts on a national scale emblemized by Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal.

During the 1930s, Franklin D. Roosevelt rallied the legislature to pass a series of legislations that would culminate into the New Deal. Despite how many scholars and journalists today tout it as a potential solution for our times, the New Deal deeply

[97] Fiske, Emmett. "The College and its Constituency", 214-215.

reflected and upkept a racial order that was largely informed by the nation's interfacing with Southern Democrats. Ira Katznelson discusses how Southern Democrats were content with passing the New Deal series of legislations so long as "subjects sensitive for the South, such as labor relations, would be adapted to meet the test of not disturbing the region's racial structure".[98] Katznelson's book *Fear Itself: The New Deal and the Origins of Our Time* goes on to discuss how this Southern investment in a Jim Crow system was further accommodated by giving the funds from several New Deal programs to local administrators or the state as much as possible. When these funds went to local and state administrators, there was less accountability in determining racial equity when distributing the funds.

As the New Deal passed, domestic workers and farm workers were not afforded protections. In his analysis of the New Deal, Katznelson details how this lack of protections was crafted to reflect the political and economic interests of the Southern legislators. Katznelson states:

> Southern legislators understood that their region's agrarian interests and racial arrangements were inextricably entwined. Farm labor dominated the economy of the South as in no other region of the country … By excluding these persons from the New Deal legislation, it remained possible to maintain racial inequality in Southern labor markets by dictating the terms and conditions for African-American labor.[99]

[98] Katznelson, Ira. *Fear Itself: The New Deal and the Origins of Our Time*. New York, NY: Liveright | W. W. Norton & Company, 2014, 163.
[99] Ibid.

In Katznelson's analysis of the Southern legislators, we can see how a Southern Jim Crow system that was set up to continually oppress African Americans was legislatively extended to other regions as a result of federal laws. In the coming decades, as this chapter will discuss, this lack of protections nationally would become another battleground for farmworkers who were attempting to get better working conditions in California.

While there were ways that Southern-inspired racialized laws impacted the way labor was understood, connections between the South across other United States regions also inform the agricultural practices and visions in California. One example of this can be seen with J.G. Boswell. In the context of the San Joaquin Valley, J.G. Boswell, California's biggest grower, was the son of plantation owners and is oftentimes credited for pioneering big agribusiness in California. While his biography and impact is beyond the scope of this dissertation for now, it is important to note how his pioneering efforts in big agribusiness came to in turn affect the rest of the nation as the decades went on.[100] While Boswell's farmlands were mostly located in the San Joaquin Valley, he is but one example of people from the South whose movement to the San Joaquin Valley demonstrate the inter-regional connections between different yet co-constitutive racial logics that operate in both regions.

Another example of how Southern racism came to constitute the struggles over farm labor in the San Joaquin Valley is the Smith-Lever Act of 1914, which created the Agricultural Extension. The Smith-Lever Act was a joint legislative effort between

[100] For more, please see Arax, Mark, and Rick Wartzman. *The King Of California: J.G. Boswell and the Making of A Secret American Empire*. New York, New York: PublicAffairs, 2005.

Senator Hoke Smith of Georgia and Congressman Asbury Lever of South Carolina. The Smith-Lever Act, while oftentimes lauded as one of the key land grant legislations, was specifically written to avoid having the funds go to Black Land Grant Colleges.[101] Other legislators at the time tried to slip in provisions that would secure some sort of equity in the distribution to these funds. However, it's been noted that:

> Senator Hoke Smith explicitly argued that the administration of funds should be left in white hands, as they would 'do more for the negro than the negro could do for himself,' and by James Vardaman of Mississippi, who insisted that the agricultural extension work could be performed properly only by 'the Anglo-Saxon, the man of proven judgement, initiative, wisdom, and experience'.[102]

In effect, Senator Hoke Smith's rationale is reminiscent of Ronald Reagan's rhetoric on trickle-down legislation as it relates both to race and class. At the end, the various attempts to secure equity in the distribution of these funds were all outvoted. The Smith-Lever Act and its resultant extension center that organized farm bureaus became the birthing legislation of organizations that would uphold the position of white farmers, and thus uphold white supremacy, within agriculture for years to come.

After white supremacy came to be codified in various pieces of legislation during this time, there was a continual increase in the need for agricultural productivity. The Agricultural Extension which provided farm advisors was continually funded on productivity, which was incentivized to help big farmers over small ones. The American

[101] Katznelson, Ira. *Fear Itself: The New Deal and the Origins of Our Time*. New York, NY: Liveright | W. W. Norton & Company, 2014, 147.
[102] Ibid.

Farm Bureau Federation on a national level began to advocate the end of various agricultural subsidies that helped small farms. By the time of the election of Dwight Eisenhower, these shifts would register into a larger debate over the New Deal's more centralized agricultural programs. Whereas the New Deal had operated on controlling the food supply via subsidies, storing excess foodstuffs, and paying to have farmers not grow on certain lands, there was an increasing interest in shifting agricultural policy to an alleged free enterprise system. Eisenhower's second Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, "was recommended by Allan Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation", who was described politically as "an ultra-right winger".[103]

Benson wouldn't be the last Secretary of Agriculture to push free enterprise, but probably one of the last few who expressed his ideological stances as openly as he did. Benson's general statements on agricultural policy "drew inspiration from the ideas of the "two Smiths, Joseph and Adam, and from Thomas Jefferson". Schapsmeier et al quoted his general statement as follows:

> Freedom is a God-given, eternal principle vouchsafed to us under the Constitution … It is doubtful if any man can be politically free who depends upon the state for sustenance. A completely planned and subsidized economy weakens initiative, discourages industry, destroys character, and demoralizes the people.[104]

The irony of Benson's statement was how centralized agricultural economics was key to prevent food shortages in the United States during World War II. More importantly,

[103] Schapsmeier, Edward L., and Frederick H. Schapsmeier. "Eisenhower and Agricultural Reform: Ike's Farm Policy Legacy Appraised." *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 51, no. 2 (April 1992), 150.
[104] Schapsmeier, Edward L., and Frederick H. Schapsmeier. "Eisenhower and Agricultural Reform", 151.

many of the farm subsidies that Benson wanted to eradicate were more likely to go to big farmers over smaller ones. Benson's love of free enterprise never fully became realized as subsidies for agriculture continue today.[105] What this guise of free enterprise usually signaled in the years following Benson's appointment was continued economic support for big growers in exchange for their support for various political candidates. As Anne and Hal Draper will later come to criticize, the way big agribusiness and politicians were financially entangled with one another politically disadvantaged farmworkers of color. In this way, we can see how American agriculture was based on white supremacist formations that advantaged white farmers and farmworkers' upward mobility while hurting farmworkers of color. After the white supremacist roots of agriculture were codified, these other policies hurt small farmers leading to a more and more concentrated agricultural system.

One of the largest contradictions, between these coded white supremacist ideals and free enterprise, came to the forefront when the U.S. entered the Korean War. During the war, the United States began the Bracero Program, a guest worker program between the United States and Mexico, which growers wanted to thwart the AFL-CIO's efforts to unionize farmworkers in the 1950s. On top of the program's terrible record of violating the braceros' human rights and withholding pay till this day, the program also embodied the growers' thirst for cheap non-white labor. No other industry in the United States had their workforce supplied to them in this way, especially during a moment of intense union activity. A decade later, Anne and Hal Draper's "The Dirt on California:

[105] Many of the big agribusiness farmers who voted for Trump would have been economically devastated by his trade war with China if it wasn't for the approval of more subsidies from them.

Agribusiness and the University" sought to expose the UC's role in continuing this program and it is within that pamphlet that we can see the continued propagation of big agribusiness with its underside of racial exploitation.

Mutual Reinforcement: Agribusiness and the University

Through the University of California, Anne Draper and Hal Draper's "The Dirt on California" was able to trace a whole host of business and financial interests that were entangled with the university, providing a theorization of the productive relationship between the university and agribusiness. While it will not be able to account for all of the specific details within the pamphlet, this section describes some of the key points from the Drapers' analysis of the University of California and the Bracero Program from "The Dirt on California". It does this in order to demonstrate how the University of California helped to codify a white supremacist form of agricultural industry, while reinforcing the racial exploitation of farmworkers in the state.

One of the main points that the Drapers emphasized was how the University of California and agribusiness operated to reinforce one another. While some aspects of the university were in open debate through movements like the Ethnic Studies student strikes during the 1960s, the University of California, as the Drapers reveal, was a massive institution with high-ranking officials and deep-pocketed donors whose visions were often politically and economically aligned with interests of big agribusiness. In "The Dirt on California", the Drapers began to advance a critique of agribusiness and the University of California by demonstrating how big agribusiness biases functioned in the University of California through university-embedded units such as the Giannini Foundation and the

University's College of Agriculture. While they revealed the role that campus units had in cementing big agribusiness bias, the Drapers also implicated many high-level administrators and appointed officials like the University of California Board of Regents who had benefitted greatly due to their deep entanglement with both big agribusiness and other financial industries. By tracing the connections between industry and high-level university officials, "The Dirt on California" provided an account of how the University of California systematically maintained an investment in a white supremacist vision for California's agricultural industry within the 20th Century.

One example that the Drapers describe was the incident concerning the then University of California President Charles Hitch and the purchase of grapes. On October 11, 1968, UC President Charles Hitch sent a strongly-worded memo to the nine University of California campuses, decreeing that grapes must continue to be bought in accordance to demand despite the multi-year boycott called for by farmworker unions. Hitch sent this memo largely in response to a decision made by a UC Berkeley Housing and Food business manager that effectively stopped the purchase of grapes because the manager wanted to avoid trouble. While the university administration had often acted in what the Drapers described as a "snail-pace of sedate deliberation", Hitch's response was almost immediate, suggesting a pressure point within the university's interests as it related to agricultural sales and production. This quick response, to the Drapers, was questionable. Within a context of alleged commitments to campus autonomy, Hitch's

unilateral decree to buy on demand challenged some of the core tenants regarding the university's respect for campus autonomy.[106]

While his memo provided a rationale to purchase more grapes, Hitch and his call to purchase was not met without resistance. The debacle with President Hitch continued three days later as students, part of the Mexican-American Student Confederation, staged a sit-in protest at Hitch's office, resulting in the arrest of eleven of the protesting students. Instead of quelling dissent, these student arrests erupted into more organized marches that expressed outrage in this administrative response. Concurrent to the concerns raised by these students about Hitch's memo, students were also voicing dissent to other actions taken on the UC Berkeley campus. At this time, the University of California Berkeley was also trying to cancel a course called, "Social Analysis 139X", since a prominent Black Panther, Eldridge Cleaver, was slated to deliver ten of the course's lectures. Caught between two different student populations, President Hitch decided to "beat a retreat on one front, according to the West Point textbooks – in order to smash the other front". [107] Hitch decided to bargain with the Mexican-American student organizers to release their arrested students. While he gave into some of their demands following this bargain, Hitch ultimately did not concede when it came to his support of grape purchasing or when it came to the student protestors who were calling for Social Analysis 139X to still be taught. Instead, after he settled with one group of student protestors, the Drapers recount

[106] The Drapers write more about this dynamically, relating it to the Byrne Report, which focused on the Free Speech Movement. For more, see Draper, Anne and Hal Draper. "Dirt on California", 1.
[107] Ibid.

that he then proceeded to call "out an army of police twice in a week to arrest hundreds of sit-in protestors on the "139X" issue".[108]

In writing about Hitch's decision to continue purchasing grapes amidst student protests, nation-wide protests and labor strikes, and the increased reports on the exploitative dimensions of agribusiness, the Drapers provided a prism to inquire about certain contradictions that exist between and within the University of California's rhetoric and its practices. The Drapers' presentation begged the question of how a university administrator can dictate the socioeconomic and political dealings of a public university system like the University of California and especially one that is premised on the promise of autonomy for all its member campuses. By tracing agribusiness's connections, Anne and Hal Draper ultimately illuminate the role that the grape boycott played within the eyes of the university administrators, characterizing the boycott as "a declaration of war against the mightiest power elite in the state, the four billion dollar agricultural industry – "Agribusiness" – by far the biggest industry in the state". [109]

Moreover, the Drapers demonstrate how deeply California agribusiness is embedded within the political and institutional structures in California. Noting how California agribusiness shades into areas of corporations that implicate figures like "the Bank of America (biggest bank in the world), … the Kern County Land Company, … Cal Pack, Hunt Foods and Industries", the Drapers also link how the state capital whether

[108] Ibid, 2.
[109] Ibid.

Democrat or Republican responds to the interests of the grower lobby.[110] In their words, the Drapers describe the extent to which agribusiness embeds itself into the socioeconomic and political structure of California, and the institution of the University of California:

> It would be an exaggeration to say that Agribusiness is the master of the social order in California, but it would be an exaggeration only because Agribusiness shades into the financial power structure so neatly, and it is the combination which is the master.
>
> In this state, the university would be under this shadow even at the best. But the fact is that the University of California has had a long and deepgoing relationship to the Agribusiness power from its very beginning.[111]

Understanding big agribusiness' ties to the financial power structure of California and thus the university was particularly crucial for the Drapers during this time period. As agribusiness was still the most profitable industry in the state and Ronald Reagan was governor of California, examining the "shadows" provided a means to understand the productive ties between agribusiness, the state, and the university.

In particular, the intimate relationship between the state and agribusiness also financially benefitted parts of the University of California's overall budget. In one part of

---

[110] In their critique, the Drapers also depict the role of agribusiness on Jerry Brown's election campaign in 1958. While he was on the campaign trail, Governor Brown had "promised farm workers a state minimum wage, [and an] extension of unemployment insurance to cover them. Farm workers were then averaging under $1 an hour; their annual income stood at around $1000; and some half million farm workers in the richest agricultural state of the richest nation". However, instead of fulfilling this promise, the Drapers report that Brown had publicly admitted he would not be able to pass protections and minimum wage laws that applied to almost every other class of workers, except domestic workers, due the growing pressure from the growers lobby. For more, see Draper, Anne and Hal Draper. "Dirt on California", 11.

[111] Ibid, 2.

"The Dirt on California", the Drapers characterize the relationship between the university and California Agribusiness as a grateful one. Being grateful to the university, the Drapers discuss, was a tricky business. While agribusiness was grateful for the UC's research into agricultural matters, their gratitude was expressed financially when the growers lobby were able to successfully protect the University of California's research department, specifically those "of the university's Ag Sciences Division…from Gov. Reagan's budget cutting knife".[112] Particularly, the Drapers go on to discuss how Reagan cut the university's organized research budget by $3 million, which amounted to roughly 10% of the total $33 million original budget. Out of that $30 million original budget, $19 million of that budget was reserved for agricultural research due to the grower's lobbying groups' efforts. Rather than excise parts of the agricultural research division budget, the Drapers demonstrate that the grower's lobbying groups' efforts resulted in cuts to the Institutes of Industrial Relations at UC Berkeley and UCLA instead. In effect, the cuts to the Institutes of Industrial Relations on both campuses ensured that both institutes would need to cut a quarter of all their activities.[113] In this scenario, the Drapers demonstrate not only agribusiness's gratitude for the research performed at the University of California. In doing so, they trace the ways that the growers lobby and agribusiness more broadly played an active role in how the university's budget was divided, administered, and shaped.

This isn't to say that their budgetary privileges were unchallenged. The Drapers pointed out that there were also some state legislators who advocated for policies that

[112] Ibid, 9.
[113] Ibid.

would make Agribusiness pay for its own research and some others who wanted to cut the university Ag Research and Extension budget like the rest of the university. However, as might be expected, "the industry screamed blue murder".[114] For example, the editor of the *California Farmer* named Jack Pickett expressed his disdain for these advocates of slashing the agricultural research and extension budget in an article, stating:

> It's frightening how quickly these legislators forget that agriculture is the state's biggest business and that agricultural research has returned to this state millions more than its cost…. The function of the Extension Service is to take the technical information developed in the university and carry it out to the farm where it is put to practical, money-making, tax-producing use.[115]

Pickett's efforts to remind legislators of the financial benefit of agricultural research and the work of the extension services were critiqued in "The Dirt on California". While they conceded that the state's funding of agribusiness' research might have yielded some good, the Drapers incisively illuminate that such collectivist ideals is only palatable and desirable if the collective is constructed as yielding good and *goods* "for the rich".[116] Moreover, Jack Pickett's rationale here also links the broader operationalized logic of gratitude as manifest in agribusiness's affairs to specific political and economic units. In this example, Pickett's rationalizes the protection of the agricultural research and extension budgets due to the fact that agribusiness provides the state with revenue through taxable income and provides farmers with practical information.

---

[114] Ibid.
[115] Pickett, Jack **quoted in** Draper, Anne and Hal Draper, "Dirt on California", 9.
[116] Ibid, 9.

Similarly, this warped logic of gratitude is operationalized within financial sectors as a means of winning over corporations like Safeway Stores and International Harvester to the growers lobbying interests. [117] In "The Dirt on California", the Drapers quote an article published in October 1968 in the *San Francisco Business*, entitled "Agribusiness in California". Drawing on this article, the Drapers discussed how much of the Bay Area's financial heart was tied to agribusiness and their profits. Corporations like Safeway Stores and International Harvester who made massive amounts of money off agribusiness' exploitation also financially benefited San Francisco's Wall Street – Montgomery Street. In mobilizing these economic ties, agribusiness reminded these other businesses, the Drapers recount, of the financial repercussions of "being under the gun":

> The rest of business was being told that if the growers were under the gun, *their* pockets were not safe either. There was a lecture in class solidarity behind the statistics…. California leads the nation in total cash farm income of almost $4 billion. It grows over 40% of the nation's vegetables, fruit and nut crops. It raises 90-100% of the total U.S. product in 15 crops, including grapes, which is the seventh largest cash crop. By the time the 200 commercial crops are harvested, transported, processed, and packaged, their market value reaches $16 billion. *One out of every three jobs in California is dependent on agriculture or a closely related industry*. This is the power that overshadows both Sacramento and University Hall.[118]

---

[117] Ibid.
[118] *San Francisco Business* (October 1968) **quoted in** Draper, Anne and Hal Draper. "Dirt on California" 10, emphasis added.

Rather than denote their distinction from each other, agribusiness—as the Drapers demonstrate—attempted to rally corporate interests within the broader growers lobbying interests by noting their class solidarity and reliance upon agriculture as a means of employing workers. In doing so, the Drapers were able to demonstrate some of the ways that agribusiness solidified allies within disparate but interconnected sectors.

The Drapers highlight this point even more clearly by revealing how these financial interests operate at every level of the University of California. For instance, during Jerry Brown's government administration, the Democratic governor appointed Jesse Tap who was the board chairman of the Bank of America. Prior to being named the Bank of America, this entity was formerly called the Bank of Italy and had donated massive amounts of money to the University of California to create the Giannini Foundation of Agricultural Economics. Emblemizing what the Drapers described "as thus officially representing the Agribusiness/ financial axis", Tap's appointment was but one instantiation of this axis.[119] The Drapers went on to name multiple Regents and appointees with deep financial ties to agribusiness. These individuals included the likes of Dorothy Chandler who was Vice-President and director of the Times-Mirror Co., which is also the publisher of the Los Angeles Times. [120] Chandler, the Drapers report, owned "a variety of companies, including 40% of the giant Tejon Ranch Co., controlling 285,000 acres in Kern and LA Counties". [121] Another individual named was W. Thomas Davis who was "President of Blue Goose Growers and of its parent company, Western

[119] Ibid.
[120] Ibid, 10-11.
[121] Ibid.

Fruit Growers Sales Corporation".[122] While the Drapers note that these financial interests represented within the Board of Regents was only the beginning. "[H]alf of the food-packing industry; and hundreds of thousands of acres of irrigated farmland" were either partially or fully owned by various Regents.[123] These deep financial ties reared their head in the University of California when unionization of farmworkers was met with one of its more difficult challenges – the United States' Bracero Program.

Giannini and the Bracero Program: An Institutional Response

While the first part of the Drapers' pamphlet focused on the late 1960s, the second half discusses unfolding contestations `around the Bracero Program in the early 1960s. While the Bracero Program was originally initiated in August 1942, the Drapers primarily focused on the program after it was modified by Public Law 78. Public Law 78 was signed in July 1951 and represented negotiations between the Mexican and United States governments. Planned to last only two years, the program was created based on the assumption that adopting the program would alleviate an alleged labor shortage in the United States due to the Korean War. During its roughly two-decade run until its formal end in December 1964, the program was ultimately extended six times.

While premised on a logic of providing laborers, the Bracero Program as many writers have pointed out was not a politically neutral program. In "The Dirt on California", the Drapers joined other writers at the time to criticize the Bracero Program. While their critique was not aimed at the Braceros themselves who were oftentimes just trying to seek stable employment and a livable wage, the Drapers' critique sought to

[122] Ibid.
[123] Ibid, 11.

point out how the growers utilized the program to bust strikes and undermine conditions for United States domestic and undocumented farm laborers.[124] In effect, the extension of the Bracero program ensured that many Mexican laborers were exposed to harsh conditions, little protections, and in many cases underpayment or no payment at all.[125]

Whereas previous sections sought to establish the role that the growers lobby had on the broader state and the University of California, this section examines the Drapers' incisive reports on the Giannini Foundation's role in shaping state programs, research agendas, and labor conditions. In particular, I draw from the Drapers' discussion about the Giannini Foundation's centrality to agricultural politics and research in two different venues: a 1959 report from the Senate Fact-Finding Committee on Labor and Welfare; and erroneous newspaper reports on the causes and effects of the Bracero Program on the public. In doing so, I illuminate how the Drapers conveyed some of the key ties between the University of California, farmworker labor conditions, and the Giannini Foundation.

In 1959, the Senate Fact-Finding Committee on Labor and Welfare performed "the most comprehensive inquiry into the agricultural labor situation in California in nearly 10 years".[126] This committee was headed by then California State Senator James A. Cobey from Fresno, causing many to call the report the Cobey Commission. Overall, the process spanned over a two-year period where the committee held hearings and surveys from Sacramento to El Centro. Despite a "mountain of investigation, study,

[124] It is important to keep in mind that the negotiations around the 1951 instantiation of the Bracero Program coincided with a crackdown on undocumented immigrants, such as Operation Wetback in June 1954. The Bracero program created a division between immigrants that were authorized and belonged and those who didn't.
[125] Draper, Anne and Hal Draper. "Dirt on California", 13.
[126] Ibid, 11.

research, and talk", the committee's recommendations, the Drapers report, did not yield any substantial legislative changes in favor of farmworkers.[127]

Given Fresno County's role as one of the most profitable agricultural counties in California, it should be no surprise that the Fresno-based Senator might have had an active role in what the committee conveyed about California's 'agricultural labor situation'. Rather, as the Drapers demonstrate, "university experts who testified are greatly responsible for this outcome".[128] In particular, they reveal that the report relied heavily on statements by university agricultural experts.

> The other important recommendation of the Cobey committee, here again leaning heavily on the ammunition provided by the university's Ag experts, *urged the indefinite continuation of the bracero program*, that is, the importation of a 'captive' labor force of Mexican Nationals driven by poverty to seek work in the fields and farms of California and other states, and used by the growers to keep down the wages and working conditions of domestic labor.[129]

What emerges from the Cobey committee's endorsement of an "indefinite continuation of the Bracero Program" is a central contradiction in the organizing logics of the program. If it was to supplement a domestic workforce due the general lack of laborers who are fighting in the Korean War, this contradiction, the Drapers reveal, of requiring a captive labor force of Mexican Nationals driven by poverty and used by the growers presents a

[127] Ibid.
[128] Ibid.
[129] Ibid, 12.

differing goal and effect of the Bracero Program. In effect, the goal revealed itself as one of *supplanting* rather than supplementing domestic labor.

This mode of supplanting domestic labor was particularly productive for the Giannini Foundation since low paid workers helped aid the proliferation of the academic-industrial ties between agribusiness and the university. Quoting from the Cobey report, the Drapers draw attention to the Director of the Giannini Foundation's denial of any forms of exploitation in the fields. At one of the State Fact-Finding Committee's hearings, the Director, Dr. George L Mehren states that, "[t]here is no compelling indication of exploitation of hired domestic agricultural labor anywhere in any agricultural industry for any protracted period".[130] Moreover, Anne and Hal Draper both also highlight how Dr. Mehren tried to justify low paying farmworking jobs by deflecting to how shares to labor have increased along with increases in worker productivity, while ignoring the average wage of about $1 dollar an hour, which was 1/3 of what the average industrial worker was earning.[131]

Dr. Mehren's rhetoric would also be echoed in later testimonies from other agricultural experts. A closer look at who was interviewed revealed that those interviewed for the report were largely connected to the University of California's agricultural divisions, and especially with the Giannini Foundation. When looking into the Cobey committee's report, the Drapers stated that the State Fact-Finding Committee on Labor and Welfare had expressed an indebtedness to various University of California units: the University of California College of Agriculture, the Giannini Foundation of

[130] Ibid.
[131] Ibid, 11-12.

Agricultural Economics, the Agricultural Extension Service, and the Department of Agricultural Engineering. In effect, the majority of the data and analyses supplied by the university's staff members primarily discussed in the fields of agricultural economics, mechanization, and agricultural labor-management relations.[132]

Yet, much like the agricultural research and extension budget, these narratives too were not unchallenged. "The Dirt on California" details that unaffiliated researchers to the University of California had reported a different social landscape. They note Thomas Brigham, associate professor of Sociology at Fresno State College, who painted a picture of Fresno County farm labor as "underprivileged, underpaid, improperly fed, ill-housed, poorly clothed, [and] inadequately socially protected".[133] In addition, they note that two other researchers, Earl Raab and Hugh Folk, were tasked by then California Governor Brown with discussing the farmworker's labor conditions. Following the completion of their research report entitled "The Pattern of Dependent Poverty in California", Raab and Folk had reported that farmworkers were indeed dealing with high rates of poverty and recommended that it would be important to undertake certain steps to reduce poverty among farm workers. Some of the steps outlined involved providing farmworkers with "unemployment insurance; some form of medical insurance coverage; and a minimum wage".[134] While there were these challenging accounts, as noted in the Drapers, none of these suggestions or assessments were privileged in the final use of the Cobey

[132] Ibid, 11.
[133] Ibid, 12.
[134] Ibid.

Commission report, continuing a pattern that would manifest in later battles about the extension and termination of the Bracero Program.

In December 1963, the Bracero Program was undergoing debate about whether or not the state should extend its reach. The Drapers identified Dr. Eric Thor and Dr. John Mamer, agricultural economists of the Giannini Foundation and Ag Extension, as key players who successfully pushed for the renewal of the Bracero program at the end of 1963. Following their involvement, Congress yielded to the force of the growers and allowed one last extension, pushing the termination of the Bracero program from December 1963 to December 1964.

Dr. Eric Thor and Dr. John Mamer both became key figures during the fight over continuing the Bracero program in both 1963 and again in 1964. In a published article in the *Western Fruit Grower*, Thor had been interviewed about the continuation of the Bracero Program. If the Bracero Program was ended, he warned, then he "fully expects a migration that could result in conditions similar to the thirties".[135] Invoking the images of Dust Bowl migration and Great Depression era social life, Thor went on to predict how this migration of domestic workers across the nation would also cost the taxpayers money since he projects that these domestic workers, seeking a better wage, would also bring their wives and kids with them.

Thor's rhetoric was taken up rather quickly. The Drapers were quick to distill how this line of rhetoric, first manifest in grower magazines, spread to more popular news

[135] *Western Fruit Grower* (August 1963) **quoted in** Draper, Anne and Hal Draper. "Dirt on California", 13.

outlets like *The San Francisco Examiner* in later iterations. The Drapers were incisive in their critique of Thor's logic. They stated:

> So here was Thor envisioning hordes of farm workers pouring into California if the bracero program was ended – incidentally forgetting the argument that braceros were needed in the first place because there was a shortage of domestic farm workers. Now the pitch was that, as the horde swept in, wages would drop. So *the Giannini scare stories had something for everybody*: a threat of higher taxes for taxpayers; of lowered wages for workers; of another "Grapes of Wrath" for liberals; and of racial-integration problems for conservatives to get frightened over.[136]

Rather than accept Thor's "doom-and disaster warnings", the Drapers insisted that the events be interpreted differently. They realized that the panic created from Thor's warnings enabled agribusiness's interests, especially those of the Giannini Foundation, to be pushed through.[137] Taking the presses to task, the pamphlet also criticized the presses for uncritically engaging with Thor's statements, mentioning how none had "mentioned that the predictions themselves exposed the lying basis of the alleged shortage in domestic farm labor."[138]

What the Drapers had correctly identified was the way that the Giannini Foundation's Thor had utilized fear, panic, and warnings as rhetorical strategies that lend themselves useful to producing the political and economic results that big agribusiness

[136] Ibid, 13, emphasis added.
[137] Ibid, 14.
[138] Ibid.

needed. For example, in 1963, Thor and Mamer produced a report that was published through the University of California entitled "Seasonal Labor in California Agriculture." This report then became a key document that helped win over United States senators to renew the Bracero Program in 1963, since it was the main report used by US senators during their deliberations.[139] The Drapers' analysis of Thor and Mamer's connections to the Giannini Foundation, then, help illuminate how the Giannini and the University of California were pivotal in advising on policy changes on a national political scale.

In 1964, the growers continued their efforts to solidify yet another extension. Similar reports headed by Dr. Eric Thor that preached doom and gloom prophecies if the Bracero Program were to end flooded newspapers. Governor Brown had announced during this time that he supported the use of Public Law 414 to bring in Braceros if Public Law 78 was to not be extended. Relatedly, Governor Brown's President of the State Board on Agriculture Jesse Tapp, who was also on the University of California Board of Regents and on the board of directors for Bank of America, supported this idea. The legislative push to use Public Law 414 if Public Law 78 was revoked was spurred on by what was called the "Giannini report". The Giannini report stated that California's needs for farm labor were only going to increase in the coming years and that the alternative option, mechanized picking, would not be available for another five years. Coincidentally, the Drapers noted, this five-year gap between their current moment and when mechanization would be possible correlated with Governor Brown's proposed plan to phase-out the Bracero Program after five years. By attempting to extend the Bracero

[139] Ibid.

Program for another five years, the Drapers illuminated how the growers wanted to tide the Bracero program over until mechanization could replace many farmworkers in field.

Despite the growers' efforts to extend the Bracero Program, Congress ultimately voted to terminate the Bracero Program by December 1964. In response, the growers revolted and "demanded Federal assurance that they be allowed to import Mexican farm hands next year, despite the death of the bracero program".[140] Moreover, the growers also demanded that Congress create a more informal Bracero Program, thereby asking for a loophole so that the growers could "break the law".[141] The Drapers were quick to point out that this call for a legal exception in creating an informal bracero program, which was in violation of what Congress voted for, would simply receive a "wink" from the authorities.[142] These winking authorities, the Drapers quipped, were also the same people that were abhorred when Black people from the inner city attempted to "invent an 'informal program' to equalize the blessing of civilization" just two years prior and who would also call for "law and order" in response.[143] The event that the Drapers were referring to was the infamous protest by the Black Panther Party in 1967, where 30 of its members brought guns and protested at the state capitol, causing a massive uproar.

Despite the uneven responses to growers as compared to other groups, agribusiness interests would remain to define the rules and parameters for how the state and the University of California would look like. In the document's last section entitled

[140] Ibid, 16.
[141] Ibid.
[142] Ibid.
[143] Ibid.

"Name of the Game," Anne Draper and Hal Draper clearly define what the game is. They state that:

> The enemy is one. From the brutal methods of the Associated Farmers enforcing Law and Order with pickax handles and vigilantes, to Roger Heyns' very legal mass jailings of student protestors, to the 'scholarly' statistics of the Giannini hired hands, they are defending a social citadel. At the heart of this citadel is not merely a "power structure," but, rather, that which the power structure is created to defend. Its name is profit – capitalist profit. That is the name of the game.[144]

Both during the Drapers' time and now, this quote becomes especially illuminating if one thinks of the university as not a monolithic actor, but as an actor who is always and already contested.

The Drapers believed that the way power functions in the university and through the administration and professors like Dr. Eric Thor was not always intentional, but many decisions that disadvantaged marginalized communities like students and farmworkers were due to administrative responses to "the men who hold the pursestrings" that "will otherwise punish the university".[145] The administrators "do what is necessary to appease them. But they do not need these motives of rationalized idealism. It is enough for them to know their status quo is in danger; and their understanding of what is quo comes out of the ledger books in the last analysis".[146] The function of the ledger on university administration is powerful, and for the Drapers opposing capitalistic influences of the

[144] Ibid, 31.
[145] Ibid.
[146] Ibid.

university could be a key to link together various social struggles, and more importantly a new social order.

It is not a surprise that the Drapers made connections between racialized communities such as linking student of color organizing efforts or inner-city organizing by Black communities to their concerns. This was in large part because of their longer commitments to anti-racist organizing struggles. While sometimes it could appear that the Drapers might not fully offer a racial analysis, their solutions deeply understood the connections between white supremacy and capitalism. The type of coalitional politics they espoused at the end of the "Dirt on the University" reflected their own organizing efforts to help farmworker unionization efforts. The Drapers from their analysis of the University and big agribusiness were honest when they claimed that "Agribusiness has the trumps. Rambunctious *Daily Cal* editors or the occasional inconvenient researcher can be brushed aside or smothered with silence,"[147] but hope and organized struggle did not disappear amid these powerful organizations and institutions. The Drapers insisted:

> Agribusiness may have all the trumps – except one: the half million workers in the fields, who are organizing sure as fate, together with their brothers in the packing sheds and in the canneries and on the trucks, and their friends in the rank of other unions, plus their supporting troops in the cities, like students and housewives and concerned citizens who do not like blood on their lettuce or sweat on their tomatoes.[148]

[147] Ibid, 30.
[148] Ibid.

By invoking the figures of field workers, laborers in packing sheds and canneries, union leaders, students, housewives, and other concerned citizens, Anne Draper and Hal Draper emphasized their belief in the ability of farmworkers and their allies to organize in the face of adversity and inequities that historically structured the state's agricultural industry.

Race played a central role in historical structuring and restructuring of the state's agricultural industry, especially given the earlier histories of a harmonious hierarchy or Mead's white-only idyllic agricultural colonies that the Drapers were not able to account for. While not acknowledging those histories directly, the Drapers did state that many actors in society have failed the farmworker, such as the intellectuals of societies, including students, politicians – neither Democrat or Republican – or "the fat-cats of the labor establishment, who negotiated their juicy contracts for skilled workers time and again at the expense of ignoring the most exploited of the working class".[149] For the Drapers, "[t]hat liberating force has, once again, come only out of the farm workers themselves, out of the Mexican-Americans and Filipinos primarily, who are doing what their 'betters' said was impossible".[150] In noting the role of farmworkers themselves, the Drapers asserted that farmworkers were the key to their own liberation; and moreover that this liberation relies upon an understanding of the university as a place that could not only suppress farmworkers, but nurture resistance to those suppressions.

By approaching the university as a site where resistance could be fostered, the Drapers were able to depart from other critiques of big agriculture that preceded them.

[149] Ibid, 31.
[150] Ibid.

For the Drapers "the farm workers' natural ally is the militancy of the student rebels, who also, from a different side, suffer from the university's integration into the power structure of capitalist society".[151] These sentiments echoed Hal Draper's critique of Clark Kerr in "The Mind of Clark Kerr." In this pamphlet, Draper critically engages with how Kerr's rhetoric quite literally discusses how the university must increasingly function like a factory:

> The university and segments of industry are becoming more alike. As the university becomes tied into the world of work, the professor – at least in the natural and some social sciences – takes on the characteristics of an entrepreneur ... The two worlds are merging physically and psychologically.[152]

"The Dirt on California: Agribusiness and the University" was such an incisive and productive synthesis precisely because it was able to bridge together Hal Draper's critiques of Kerr and Anne Draper's experience in supporting farmworker organization. Their interest and opposition to the physical and psychological merging of industry and the academy provides helpful conceptualizations about the university in later decades as well.

While the Drapers would not produce another document examining the university and big agribusiness like the "Dirt on California" before Anne Drapers death in 1973, their document remains a powerful analysis of the relationship between industry and its influence on the university. While this section was not able to cover all the various

---

[151] Ibid.
[152] Kerr, Clark. *The Uses of the University*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972 **quoted in** Draper, Hal. "The Mind of Clark Kerr." Berkeley, CA: Independent Socialist Club, 1964.

connections that the Drapers' made in their pamphlet, it tried to illuminate their scathing critique of the university and big agribusiness and those who suffer because of them – like farmworkers.

Through the Drapers' critique and a tracing of the racialized nature of agricultural transformation in early to mid-20th century America, a more radical understanding of agriculture and the university can emerge. This section ends with the last paragraphs of the "The Dirt on California", where the Drapers share their labor organizing sensibility with a call to action to help the doubly exploited workers who were Black and Brown.

> Thus there is a transmission belt set up, from "the men who get things done" – i.e. the central beneficiaries of the capitalist system, the corporate profit-makers – to the various levels of social managers and ideological manipulators who run interference.
>
> The university – more systemically on the part of its administrators, less systematically on the part of some faculty, rebelliously on the part of some students – operates as a section of this transmission belt. Its personnel are housebroken by its masters, and it works to housebreak its critics.
>
> This is the role of the university: not in the textbooks but in the ledger books; not in the ideal world of educational theory, but in the "real world" to which chancellors go when they die – as educators.
>
> The enemy is one. The struggle against this enemy is one, also, when it is a struggle for a new social order, in which production for profit is replaced by production for use under the control of the workers who do the producing. In this

> struggle, students can help farm workers, intellectuals can join with militant labor, dissident GIs with the doubly exploited workers of the Black and Brown minorities.[153]

Conclusion: Emergent Critiques of the Land Grant Complex

After the events in the 1960s, there was also a subsequent change in the type of research being done about the ties between big agribusiness and the universities. In 1973, the Agribusiness Accountability Project on the Failure of America's Land Grant College Complex, which was directed by Jim Hightower, released "Hard Tomatoes, Hard Times".[154] The report, which reflected much of what the Drapers had covered in California and the UC system, looked at the broader failure of the land grant system to serve not simply the needs of big agribusiness but other rural constituencies. Harking to mechanization research, "Hard Tomatoes, Hard Times" confronts how mechanization was directly related to busting unions – specifically the United Farm Workers. The report even states that "There is another contributing factor to the Extension's failure to serve the small farmer, rural poor and farmworker – institutionalized racism".[155] The report continues by stating that

> Again, those who need assistance most are getting the least. In 1950, there was 560,000 black operated farms. Today there are only 98,000. In the same period,

[153] Draper, Anne and Hal Draper. "Dirt on California", 32.
[154] Add note about the similar report that came out focusing on Cornell college
[155] Hightower, *Hard Tomatoes, Hard Times*, 127.

> total black farm population fell from 3,158,000 to 938,000. The average annual loss was 10.5 percent compared to 3.9 percent among the whites.[156]

In presenting these damning statistics, Hightower provided concrete evidence of the intense impact that Ezra Benson's policy had on smaller farmers, specifically African American ones.

This acknowledgement of racial discrimination ended up informing one of the main recommendations coming out of the report. The recommendation was the ending of all discrimination within the land grant complex. Hightower's report took a different vantage point than that of labor, although there are some connecting thoughts between the two. For instance, Hightower's report is very focused on accountability and the idea of what the government should be doing and for who.

While both the Drapers and Hightower focused on the role of public universities and their agricultural research arms to aiding big agribusiness, they ultimately went through different channels to substantiate their arguments. The disparities that Hightower discussed regarding Black farmers were reflected in lawsuits filed by various groups of Black farmers during that time.[157] The Hightower report is the first of many such interventions into agribusiness and universities during this time. It would be followed by other scholars such as William Friedland, Emmett Fiske, and Isao Fujimoto. One of the distinctive aspects of these new projects was the focal shift from labor to other means of

---

[156] Ibid, 128.

[157] Grim, Valerie. "The 1890 Land-Grant Colleges: From the New Deal to the Black Farmers' Class-Action Lawsuit, 1930s-2010s." In *Service as Mandate: How American Land-Grant Universities Shaped the Modern World, 1920–2015*, edited by Alan I. Marcus, 80–111. NEXUS 2. Tuscaloosa, AL: University Alabama Press, 2015.

intervening. Hightower chose to critique the land grant system, but others went after the enforcement of laws.

One of the groups that took a judicial approach was the National Land for the People (NLFP). The NLFP was an activist group in the Central Valley that fought for small family farms and sought to empower farmworkers to become small farm owners. One of the founders of the NFLP was George Ballis, who originally was the UFW's videographer.[158] Ballis had an extensive history of filmmaking and had worked on a documentary before helping the UFW called *The Dispossessed* that focused on how a Native nation was being dispossessed of their water rights in northern California.

One of the main actions that Ballis and the other members of the NLFP pursued was to sue the federal government over their use of irrigation water. The lawsuit was premised around the 1902 Water Reclamation Act, which set limits on the total acreage of farms who utilized federally funded irrigation projects. The 250-acre limit to farms who rely in federally funded irrigation projects would have massively overturned big agribusiness in California and other parts of the nation. While they had won their suit, this victory was eventually overshadowed and unfortunately undone by the election of Ronald Regan as president in 1981. Despite the result of this contestation, progressive forces continued to make different moves in the San Joaquin Valley.

The fact that the National Land For the People emerged from Fresno in the Central Valley should not be surprising given California's changing economic landscape post-World War II. Places like Los Angeles County, which used to be the biggest

[158] Sifuentez, Mario. "Land, Water, and Labor: Farmworkers, the National Land for People and the Westlands." presented at the UC Junior Faculty Lecture Series, Riverside, CA, April 25, 2018.

agricultural producing county in the state, were transformed by suburbanization and urbanization into a county whose economic composition no longer privileged agriculture, but other emerging industries instead. The advent of the Cold War and the concurrent rise of the defense industry aligned with a shift that made agriculture no longer as predominant across the whole state. Rachel Surls and Judith Gerber discuss these changes in their book *From Cows to Concrete: The Rise and Fall of Farming in Los Angeles*, stating that:

> In the USDA's 1949 farm census, L.A. still ranked as America's number one agricultural county. By 1954, though, it had fallen to third place, after Fresno and Kern Counties in California's Central Valley. Five years later, in 1959, it was in sixth place, trailing not just Fresno and Kern, but also Tulare and Imperial counties...[159]

The massive shift from Los Angeles County being California's number one agricultural producing county was never undone. In 2017, seven out of the ten top agricultural producing counties were in the San Joaquin Valley. The seven were Kern, Tulare, Fresno, Stanislaus, Merced, San Joaquin, and Kings counties. The other three were Monterrey, Ventura, and Imperial counties.[160]

When thinking about the history of agriculture and how it has created inequities on the basis of race, this shift around the mid-20th century is important to take note of. These racial acts that the University of California and big agribusiness had taken a key

[159] Surls, Rachel, and Judith Gerber. *From Cows to Concrete: The Rise and Fall of Farming in Los Angeles*. Santa Monica, CA: Angel City Press, 2016, 155.
[160] Ross, Karen. "California Agricultural Statistics Review 2017-2018." Sacramento, CA: California Department of Food and Agriculture, 2019, 5.

role in spreading would facilitate waning agricultural influence in places like Los Angeles County. Relatedly, they would also see the simultaneously growing importance and influence on the counties that still stayed heavily dependent on agriculture. The next chapter will explore these changes and what the impact on the San Joaquin Valley looked like by starting with the NLFP and the result of their lawsuit.

Chapter Three

Introduction

One of the biggest changes that would happen within the San Joaquin Valley in the 20th century would begin in 1983 with the appointment of David Gardner as the new President of the University of California system. Alongside the then Republican governor of California George Deukmejian, Gardner and Deukmejian successfully advocated to the University of California Board of Regents for a passed resolution that approved the construction of a tenth research university in the San Joaquin Valley. Part of the public discourse about this decision cited the contemporary demographic changes that characterized California and particularly the San Joaquin Valley in the 1980s. The state population was rising exponentially, putting pressure on the administrators within the University of California system to contend with how the university campuses could grow to further house and accommodate more students.

This process eventually ended with the creation of UC Merced, the tenth campus of the University of California system, and the only public research university situated in the San Joaquin Valley. Many of the people who write about the creation of UC Merced talk about the various pitfalls and challenges that had sometimes delayed the project for years. For instance, Lindsay A. Desrochers, who was part of the planning team and administration of the new university, wrote about the experiences of working towards the creation of UC Merced in a chapter entitled “Fragile Birth”. In that chapter, Desrochers describes the creation of UC Merced as a process that embodied the key public issues in

California between the years of 1983 and 2005.[161] While she herself questioned whether the creation of UC Merced could embody the key public issues in California, Desrochers argues that UC Merced could indeed embody these key issues. Desrochers reports that, instead of pointing at UC Merced, people would discuss other events that characterized the period of 1983-2005 instead, such as:

> … the end of the Berlin Wall and its impact on the California defense industry, or the initiative process that enabled the taxpayers' revolt of 1978 trumping representative government, or the passage of the anti-affirmative action Proposition 209 reflecting fear and resentment of immigrants and its galvanizing effect on the political participation of Hispanic/Latins, or backlash against population growth by not-in-my-backyard environmentalists.[162]

While she projected what forms of public opinion would define this period, Desrochers advances that UC Merced could be understood as a lightning rod in which the broader socioeconomic and political pushes and pulls of the time—and thus all of these political trends—were being made.

This chapter draws on Desrochers' question and argument to inquire about what political trends and stakes were embodied through the creation of UC Merced. While it draws from Desrochers' argument that UC Merced was a lightning rod for political events at the time, this chapter begins by revisiting the period where Desrochers begins her timeline: the 1980s. Descrochers' timeline is productive for accounting for the

[161] Desrochers, Lindsay A. "A Fragile Birth". In *From Rangeland to Research University: The Birth of the University of California, Merced*, edited by Merritt, Karen, and Jane Fiori Lawrence. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass, 2007, 27.
[162] Ibid.

University of California's history especially since her periodization accounts for the new appointment of David Gardner as UC President and for the Regents' decision to explore the option of creating and opening a new campus in the San Joaquin Valley. However, as this chapter will demonstrate, Desrochers' timeline confines a potentially critical examination of UC Merced's centrality within California's and the nation's broader sociopolitical and economic trends to those of a post-1983 era. As detailed by Desrochers' list of central public issues, Desrochers' discussion of California's broader political turmoil misses a key public issue that preceded and lasted long after Gardner's tenure as UC President: mechanization in agricultural harvesting.

Mechanization as a farming practice and within research agendas had deep effects for the San Joaquin Valley. In 1979, a group called the Californian Agrarian Action Project Incorporated along with 19 farmworkers filed a lawsuit against the University of California and the UC Regents around the impacts of mechanization.[163] The lawsuit focused on the research priorities of the University of California, alleging that the agricultural research performed by the UC largely benefitted big agribusiness to the detriment of farmworkers, small farmers, and the California consumer. The legal rationale for their lawsuit was based on the federal Hatch and Bankhead-Jones Acts. What would later be characterized as the Tomato Harvester case or mechanization case was a watershed moment in understanding how the UC would respond to various challenges of injustice after the close of the supposed Golden Era of higher education.

[163] The farmworkers named in the suit were Felix Gonzalez, Ramona Espinoza, Manuel Castillo, Miguel Ochoa, Isidro Robledo, Salvador Curiel, Henry Zuniga, Juan Ramirez, Salvador Bustamante, Jesus Reyna, Armando Ruiz, Virginia Yniguez, Juan Miguel Yniguez, Paul Gusman, Rafael Garcia, Gregorio Rico, Rafael Guzman, Rodolfo v. Margarito, and Ricardo Villapondo

By approaching the creation of UC Merced as a lightning rod of sorts, what needs to be asked are two guiding key questions: How did these different sociopolitical matters like those of mechanization become of concern for the University of California; and relatedly, as these matters came to become a larger concern for the University of California, why did the UC system choose the San Joaquin Valley as the region where it would place its tenth campus? While the broader site selection process can reveal part of this rationale, this chapter will look at the relationship between a privatizing university and big agribusiness in order to reveal certain compelling reasons for why the creation of the tenth University of California was located within the San Joaquin Valley.

To do this, the chapter will be organized into three sections. It begins by first accounting for some of the factors that structured California's and the United States' larger sociopolitical and economic context. In doing so, it suggests that larger factors such as the growth of California's population, the adoption of neoliberal economic and political policies, and the spreading acceptance of liberal multicultural ideologies informed the creation of UC Merced.

The chapter then begins a closer examination of the CAAP v. UC case in its second section by examining the academic work of one of the case's clear inspirations and supporters: William Friedland of UC Santa Cruz. His earlier works provide a prism, much like the kind offered by Anne Draper and Hal Draper in the previous chapter, to critically account for agribusiness's role in the University of California and to try to construct alternative methods of research. Ultimately, as the section will demonstrate, Friedland's vision for a more socially just research methodology for agricultural science

research would inspire the claims and calls in the 1979 CAAP v. UC lawsuit. By juxtaposing his vision's echo in the CAAP v. UC case with the University of California's response, this section forwards a consideration of how academic freedom was juxtaposed against the social impacts of agricultural research.

Drawing on the insights from the earlier sections, the third section attempts to understand neoliberal multiculturalism in agriculture and aspects of the San Joaquin Valley by extension. With the lawsuit in mind, this chapter then shifts to discuss Melamed's concept of neoliberal multiculturalism to question the strategic motivations that could fuel a conceptualization and actualization of a research university in the San Joaquin Valley. It asks: if CAAP rendered visible the role that the University of California played in further economic and racial inequities, how do we reckon with official histories about UC Merced's creation that claim its placement in the San Joaquin Valley was largely for the purposes of enacting justice?

It is important to make clear that the criticisms that arise in this chapter are not meant to detract from the real disparities that UC Merced helps to address or to disparage UC Merced. Nor is it to say that dispossession through prisons and universities are commensurate since both institutions have vastly different ways of dispossessing and oppressing. Rather it asks a key question: how can an educational institution work against historic injustices that are experienced by communities negatively impacted by deep-seated historic racialized and economic marginalization? If UC Merced was narrated as a university that was meant to correct economic injustice, then what should that justice look like? By accounting for how UC Merced originated and was posed as a solution to

other injustices facilitated by the UC system, this chapter will interrogate how these questions emerge by examining the conditions that made UC Merced's creation possible.

Contesting Creation: Why Another University, Why Now?

While there were controversies in the past about opening new campuses in the UC system,[164] there were three standout points that specifically contextualized the creation of UC Merced. One of main reasons that enabled the creation of the UC's tenth campus was the perception of a demographic crisis. While California was experiencing a growth in population, the question emerged for the University of California about if and how the public land grant institution would be able to best serve those students within the long term.

The second reason was also largely a matter of the racialized dimensions of population growth. Many policy makers and legislators at the time were starting to become more aware of the growing Latinx and Chicanx population in California and the United States more broadly. This second demographic concern, while having a heavy emphasis on the Chicanx/Latinx community, also encompassed other racialized groups as well. In a New York Times article that described the approval for a tenth UC campus published in 1988, it described how the creation of a University of California campus in the San Joaquin Valley could better serve Southeast Asian refugee communities and also the valley's growing Black community. Based on demographic studies at the time,

[164] John Aubrey Douglass demonstrates the history of how the creation of new universities and colleges in California was constantly contested throughout the 20th Century. For more, please see Douglass, John Aubrey. *The California Idea and American Higher Education: 1850 to the 1960 Master Plan*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 2000.

researchers estimated that half the state's Hispanic, black, and Asian population would be housed specifically within the Central Valley.[165]

The third and potentially most salient reason cited for the creation of UC Merced was also how underserved students from the San Joaquin Valley were by the University of California system. For many that advocated that the tenth UC campus be placed within the San Joaquin Valley, they often noted that the number of students served by the University of California in Northern and Southern California was severely disproportionate to those of Central California. For example, when the fight over the campus was well underway in the 1990s, the San Joaquin Valley had half the representation in UC freshman admissions compared to other regions of California.[166]

Concerns around how to address these population trends were well underway as the 1990s saw the continued rise of free trade agreements and other neoliberal economic policies. The fact that these neoliberal economic policies were embraced can be understood as a sociopolitical and economic response to years of enduring stagflation within the United States since the 1980s. Bolstered by energy crises and a blocking of wheat exports to the Soviet Union, many farmers went out of business during this time, plummeting the value of agricultural land. As Ruth Wilson Gilmore argues, the

---

[165] Reinhold, Robert. "Battle for California Campus Waged Far From Urban Glow." *The New York Times*. November 26, 1988.

[166] This trend largely continues today. While it is true for the undergraduate student population and the UC's admission profile, the underrepresentation of Central California constituents is also reflected within the University of California Board of Regents. To date, there has only been a couple of Regents who had been from the Central Valley within the University of California Board of Regents. For example, Fred Ruiz, co-founder and chairman of Ruiz Foods, was a member of the UC Board of Regents from 2004-2016. For more about him and his time as part of the Board of Regents, see: Ellis, John. "Fred Ruiz Isn't Reappointed to the UC Board of Regents." *Fresno Bee*. July 21, 2016. https://www.fresnobee.com/news/politics-government/politics-columns-blogs/political-notebook/article91114877.html.

'development' of cheap formerly agricultural land largely became the condition of possibility for the state's rapid development and creation of prisons during the turn of the century.[167]

This political and economic context also impacted another institution in California as well: the University of California system. Amid policies that called for severe budget cuts, different chancellors and, at points, even the presidents of the UC system swayed in their support for the creation of a tenth UC campus in general. This apprehension to the development of a tenth campus was due in part to an economic model of scarcity that had characterized the UC system's budget; many of the already existing campuses were experiencing and dealing with budgetary cuts from the state. Within this context of a diminishing state budget, the nine other UC campuses were not the most enthused about the prospect of an already limited and rapidly depleting pool of resources being shared with *another* university.

Amid haphazard responses by some of the University of California campuses and administrators, prominent Latino lawmakers from the San Joaquin Valley were playing pivotal roles in pushing for the creation of the campus in Merced. Alongside very salient points about how the University of California system was not serving the region directly, these lawmakers and many advocates like them were quick to point out the disparity across many sectors between the Valley and California's other regions. For example, the San Joaquin Valley was shaped by California's growing prison industry much more than other regions of California. This disparity was also reflected in the certain manifestations

[167] Gilmore, Ruth Wilson. *Golden Gulag: Prisons, Surplus, Crisis, and Opposition in Globalizing California*. American Crossroads 21. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007.

of environmental racism that impact the Valley more than other regions of California, such as the increased human-exposure to agricultural pesticides, high instances of premature death, and one of the highest poverty rates in the state. These points drove home the precarious condition of life in San Joaquin Valley, with the hope that rooting a land grant university within the Valley could help alleviate some of these concerns on a state-wide and regional-level.

Alongside these demographic shifts, increasingly cut state budgets, and the precarious social conditions for life in the San Joaquin Valley, another factor that was at play was the uptake of multiculturalism. While the creation of UC Merced was under debate in the 1990s, the United States also witnessed the concurrent rise of institutionalized forms of multiculturalism in government, non-profits, and universities across the United States. While multiculturalism was heralded as an important factor within U.S. institutions, some scholars have also questioned whether or not the more dominant institutionalization of multiculturalism might offer radically antiracist policies and practices within these institutions.

One salient critique of multiculturalism comes from Jodi Melamed. In *Represent and Destroy: Rationalizing Violence in the New Racial Capitalism*, Melamed examines how the teaching of multiculturalism can come to delink antiracist critiques from material practices. By tracing three different instantiations of what she calls "official anti-racisms" (e.g. racial liberalism, liberal multiculturalism, and neoliberal multiculturalism), Melamed provides an account for how administrative moves to absorb antiracist critique on the one hand and race radical traditions that attempt to change material practices on

the other come to provide a contested ground around the political and economic dimensions of institutional cultures. Melamed's critique of these modes of official anti-racisms comes to strongly suggest that many forms of official anti-racisms can provide lip service to anti-racist discourse while maintaining the material racial structure that disproportionately disadvantages communities of color.

Melamed's critique of multiculturalism is particularly salient since her investigation provides a useful framework to track national investments in liberal economics and policies towards its more neoliberal manifestations as noted through spaces that are intrinsically tied up with politics, economics, and cultural representation. This logic functions by propping up symbolic representations around equality for marginalized groups without really addressing the material wealth inequities that oppressive systems of power cause. This is particularly true when it comes to race and, thus, useful for the purposes of this chapter. While Jodi Melamed studied the rise of neoliberal multiculturalism in universities by focusing for instance on the contestations of women of color writers on English syllabi, this chapter will focus on the ways that neoliberal multiculturalism might have functioned in the agricultural sectors of the university, especially when it comes to the UC's relationship to the San Joaquin Valley.

The Mechanization Lawsuit: Plowing the Roots of Privatization

In 1979, the California Agrarian Action Project Incorporated (CAAP) along with the California Rural Legal Fund filed a lawsuit against the University of California and its Regents at the time. The lawsuit alleged on multiple counts that the University of California violated the Hatch Act, one of the main legislative acts that oversaw extension

centers and land grant universities. In their Complaint for Injunctive and Declaratory Relief, the group brought attention to how the University failed to comply with the mandates of these acts, which required that the University "conduct its research to promote 'the maintenance of maximum employment,' 'the improvement of the rural home and rural life,' and 'the welfare of the consumer'."[168] In noting the UC's failures to comply to these mandates, the lawsuit attempted to reveal the University's role in researching agricultural mechanization that resulted in massive job losses, consolidation amongst farms, and higher food prices. In pointing out the failures of the University of California to uphold certain practices that could ensure the livelihoods of California's consumers, workers, and farmers, CAAP's grievance illuminated a central contradiction in the development of capitalism within the United States' ongoing Cold War.

As Ruth Wilson Gilmore narrates, the period of the early 1970s was a period when the state began to enact the first rounds of dismantling Keynesian economics that effectively shifted the state's needs to ensure full employment. Under the New Deal, social welfare programs had been introduced to work against the tide of social ills by investing in social programs based on a model of Keynesian economic policies. However, as Gilmore argues, matters of the social good began to become individualized in ways that attempted to "focus on capital's needs, particularly on how to minimise impediments and maximise opportunities for capital recruitment and retention".[169] In this light, we might be able to interpret agribusiness's appeals to mechanization as emblemizing a shift

[168] Complaint for Injunctive and Declaratory Relief. M0750: CRLA. RG: 5, Box 195, Folder 3. UC Regents, Mechanization. 1/16/79, 4.
[169] Gilmore, Ruth Wilson. "Globalisation and US Prison Growth: From Military Keynesianism to Post-Keynesian Militarism." *Race & Class* 40, no. 2–3 (March 1, 1999): 183.

within agricultural production that shifts from the Keynesian calls for full employment to a post-Keynesian effect of increased profit margins for the growers. In this context, the amassing of unemployment, staggering inflation, and capitalist consolidation within the late 1970s marked a shift in how the U.S. economy functioned to move away from its previous imperative to fully employ its citizens and towards the larger neoliberal abandonment of that Cold War imperative in order to maximize profits for capitalist interests.

In effect, Gilmore suggests that while capital was "the object of desire" for much of the power bloc that emerged from the 1980s onward, a problem emerged from this contradiction of having abandoned the Keynesian full employment/aggregate guarantee approach to downturns. In part, part of this political problem was how to carry out capitalist agendas, while winning the hearts and minds of the polity: "how, in other words, to go about its post-Keynesian state-building project in order to retain and reproduce victories. Capital might be the object of desire, but voters mattered".[170] The CAAP v. UC case emerges from this post-Keynesian shift.

By contextualizing, examining, and tracing the CAAP v. UC case, this section will contend with the racial implications of the University of California's position by examining the mechanization lawsuit. While the University's lawyers made many arguments, one of their central points focused on academic freedom. In effect, two competing and contrasting logics were juxtaposed within this lawsuit: the first by the University of California on academic freedom and the second by CAAP on the impact of

[170] Ibid.

UC research on small farmers, farmworkers, and the California consumer. Later in this chapter, it will be argued that this contrast is an example of competing logics – one institutional and the other community based – that struggled for dominance in how the University of California's agricultural research is to be done. As the chapter will demonstrate, these two logics provide us with another map from which to read how privatization efforts in the University of California were sowed and developed, creating much of the racial and economic injustices we see in the Valley today.

Socializing Science: William Friedland, Agricultural Yield, and His Legislative Approach

While the lawsuit was originally filed in 1979, the different goals that the lawsuit outlined also drew inspiration from individuals within the University of California system itself. In particular, UC Santa Cruz professor William Friedland was particularly crucial to the ideas proffered by the lawsuit. Coming to UC Santa Cruz in 1969, Friedland was interested in reanimating publicly funded agricultural sciences by moving them away from serving the needs of agribusiness and towards benefitting much less powerful constituents. Having also founded the Community Studies program at Santa Cruz, William Friedland studied the effects of mechanization among other things. Alongside many other like-minded thinkers, Friedland wrote many articles and thought pieces on how mechanization was a symptom of larger problems in agricultural research. His interest in rural spaces brought him to publish brilliant critiques on how political and economic factors biased the research coming out of the UC system. Trained in rural sociology, he notes how those political-economic factors and academic biases resulted in the concentration of agricultural growers in California and the broader United States.

His work would bring him to forward critiques of scientific and technological research. In an article published in 1974 and entitled "Social Sleepwalkers: Scientific and Technological Research in California Agriculture," Friedland draws on Arthur Koestler's argument that scientific discovery is more a series of accidents than logical and theoretical development.[171] While this point tends to be true of scientific discovery, Friedland draws on Koestler as a reminder that scientific discovery is more like a process of sleepwalking than a "conscious process of rational deliberation".[172] As such, the researcher becomes less a deliberately rational and conscious being; Koestler's work within the history and philosophy of science positions the researcher effectively as a sleepwalker.

By drawing on Koestler's discussion of sleepwalking, Friedland offers a secondary meaning to the sleepwalking metaphor by conceptualizing the notion of "social sleepwalking" insofar as "most scientific discoveries are made with little or no recognition that they may have staggering effects on society".[173] By taking up the sleepwalker metaphor, Friedland sought to socialize the often-individualized narratives of scientific research that did not necessarily attend to the ramifications and impacts of research. In doing so, Friedland's use of the sleepwalker metaphor attempts to provide a broader point about scientific research. He explains that, "[e]ven today, when scientific

[171] Friedland. "Social Sleepwalkers", 1.
[172] Ibid.
[173] What's also interesting here is that Friedland references the impacts of technological developments around petroleum and how it largely benefitted Ford and the petroleum industry to illustrate this point. He writes, "Thus, not only did Henry Ford and other pioneers in the development of the automobile fail to consider the effects their work might have on the structure of cities and the international economies of the petroleum industry, but most of us would regard it as perfectly natural for such a consideration to be ignored." Ibid.

research continues to represent a major social investment, scientists and technologists go about their work socially unconcerned, largely indifferent to the social effects of their discoveries".[174] With few to no existing checks to weigh the consequences of their success on society, [175] Friedland's conceptualization of social sleepwalking reveals an interest within his early writings about the real ramifications of research. What started in "Social Sleepwalkers" as a preliminary argument about the social dimensions to scientific and technological research would be continually refined in Friedland's later publications.[176]

It is important to note that this article was published within a national context that witnessed selective attention to the impacts of social research. For instance, during this time, universities and researchers were still dealing with the deadly consequences of the Tuskegee Syphilis study conducted between 1932 and 1972. In the same year as when Friedland's report was published, the mistreatment of marginalized people as research subjects were also undergoing institutional address with the passage of the National Research Act, which effectively created the now-commonplace existence of the Institutional Review Board.

---

[174] Ibid, 5.
[175] Ibid.
[176] For more on Friedland's work, please see: Friedland, William H. "Agricultural Research and Development and State Policies." University of Missouri, Columbia: Unpublished, 1987; "'Engineering' Social Change in Agriculture," The University of Dayton Review, 21 (1991): 25–42; "Social Sleepwalkers. Scientific and Technological Research in California Agriculture. Research Monograph No. 13." Davis: University of California, Davis College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences Department of Applied Behavioral Sciences, 1974; and Friedland, William H., and Tim Kappel. "Production or Perish: Changing the Inequities of Agricultural Research Priorities." Project On Social Impact Assessment and Values. Santa Cruz: University of California, Santa Cruz, 1979.

Instead of exceptionalizing the agricultural sciences as somehow isolated from the social world, Friedland argued that the agricultural sciences were no different than other sciences in its ability to enact massive impacts on society. In this article, Friedland demonstrated how the similar lack of social considerations in agricultural research caused lasting impacts on rural communities. These impacts, Friedland outlined, enacted various effects by wrecking rural communities, further stratifying farmworkers from other laborers in agriculture, and maintaining the heavy concentration of big growers who intensively used environmentally destructive materials such as petroleum and pesticides.

While Friedland notes that the agricultural sciences were embedded within social networks just like any other study, Friedland also emphasizes in another article that there is something about the agricultural sciences that distinguishes them from other units in the University of California system.[177] Unlike other departments and divisions within the university whose budgets are molded and constructed by the university administration and faculty, the division responsible for agricultural research, the University of California's Agricultural and Natural Resources division (UC ANR), is funded directly by the state legislature. In having this funding structure, Friedland suggests, there requires a different level of answerability to the public for UC ANR as compared to other departments and divisions within the University of California system.

Historically, the level of answerability that Friedland accounts for was characterized by processes that require that the agricultural sciences justify their use of

[177] Friedland, William H., and Tim Kappel. "Production or Perish: Changing the Inequities of Agricultural Research Priorities." Project On Social Impact Assessment and Values. Santa Cruz: University of California, Santa Cruz, 1979. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED187511.pdf.

state funding. In effect, UC ANR's justifications were utilized to help convince California politicians that their agricultural research is necessary and justifiable for continued state investment. As this process is open to public scrutiny, Friedland notes that this requirement is what fundamentally distinguishes agricultural research performed by the University of California from other departments in the system since the others are not required to undergo the same level of review.

What gets valued and understood as justifiable reasons become a point of interest for Friedland. While a range of other justifications could exist, agricultural researchers and their funders often documented their progress and valued their outcomes in terms of agricultural yield. Defining budgetarily justifiable value through the terms of yield, ultimately, rewarded those whose research produced an increase in the number of crops grown and produced. This logic based in enumerating value also echoed in other areas of agricultural research as well. The advisors from the agricultural experiment stations would also be required to prove their effectiveness to the federal government, again, through the *hard facts* of numbers! By focusing on pure agricultural output, research and the expertise of advisors continued to favor larger agricultural operations over smaller ones since, the logic goes, that agricultural output is one of the only justifiable reasons for state and federal expenditure on agricultural research. This logic would ultimately privilege bigger farms over smaller ones. Coupled with the fact that larger farmers had more money to take technological risks and adopt new methods, the focus on more efficient and larger agricultural outputs ultimately resulted in the eventual concentration of big farm operations in agriculture.

Friedland's discussion about the valuation of research based on yield is largely critical. Citing Heather Johnston Nicholson's article "Autonomy and Accountability of Basic Research", Friedland's article suggests his interest in the different roles that values could play within discussions of research accountability within agricultural and biomedical research. He quotes Nicholson's discussion of where research values are oriented in the 1970s when it came to agricultural research: "[t]hus, research within the land-grant complex has developed *a values orientation aimed at large-scale enterprises, capital intensity, and concentration* even though individuals involved may have deplored this trend".[178]

By focusing on the contradictions of agricultural research, state and federal policies, and their impacts on rural communities, this initial article and his later engagement with Nicholson's could also be understood as prefiguring his interest in addressing how research is valued and how different valuations could be made and enforced. While Friedland's interest in agricultural research could have stopped at creating protocols that could protect research subjects from abusive dynamics, Friedland's engagement with the structure of agricultural research at land grant institutions extended past this initial step. He was also invested in how agricultural research could be accountable to other constituents besides those of big agribusiness. By considering *both* the impact on research participants *and* the impact of research on social communities and constituents, Friedland's arguments provide an important premise to frame publicly funded research.

[178] Ibid, 14.

In particular, his early arguments in “Social Sleepwalkers” would also become echoed in “Production or Perish: Changing the Inequities of Agricultural Research Priorities”. There, Friedland wrote his most straightforward critiques of the land grant agricultural research systems with suggestions on how to potentially remedy the issues impacting agricultural research. In “Production or Perish”, the strategy that Friedland develops is a legislative one. Friedland envisioned that the legislative branch would be able to pass a statement that described the type of social values that agricultural research should center and would benefit from. Some of the social values and actionable strategies that Friedland lists involved reducing pesticide and petroleum usage, creating more equitable pay and labor conditions for farmworkers, decreasing the size of farms while increasing the number of small farms, and increasing the objective and subjective quality of crops both in terms of looks and taste without seeing a significant rise in price for the end consumer. For Friedland, legislating these values could work in tandem with other efforts to create a public funding schema within the agricultural sciences that did not infringe on academic freedom but, like the current system, incentivize and push researchers to contribute to these goals within and as a result of their research.

By proposing a plan that legislates values for agricultural research, Friedland attempted to create an assessment mechanism to examine the social impacts of research. Friedland detailed how this would both require the creation of a new methodology and a shift in how agricultural research was publicly funded. Part of Friedland’s proposed methodology required that researchers produce a “societal impact statement” when proposing research projects that are or would be publicly funded. These societal impact

statements would require that the researcher detail what the social impact of their research would be. In order to make this possible, Friedland's plan also proposed the hiring of specialists from the social sciences and interdisciplinary fields that would have more expertise in assessing and considering what the practical societal effects of any given research plan could be.

The production of these statements was part of what Friedland considered to be, in his words, the "predictive aspect" of this different form of methodology.[179] As the research would progress, this predictive report would then be combined with a related document that asks the researcher to evaluate their work after a certain amount of time has passed. The evaluation would allow the researcher and university to understand the resultant effects and compare them to the predictive social impact statement. The idea was that these processes could be reflected on and refined over time into a scientific methodology that could help to ensure that the research done with public funds did not negatively impact certain communities or groups.

For Friedland, not only would a process that combines predictive and evaluative components develop a whole new inquiry into understanding the social impacts of scientific research. It could also help ensure that the legislatively-endorsed values are enforced and are closer to being met. While Friedland made clear that these ideas needed to be refined and revised over time, what Friedland's vision for agricultural research advanced was an understanding, reminiscent of the Drapers' critique in "The Dirt on

[179] An important thing to note about the word predictive was its eventual replacement by Friedland with projected. He discusses this change in "Production or Perish" on footnote 8. For the purposes of this dissertation I have chosen to go with the word predictive since it was used longer and eventually coheres with the language used in the lawsuit.

California", of the importance of land grant institutions and their impacts on rural areas. His vision is astounding especially when we consider that it emerged in the 1970s around the same time as when various struggles were being waged over race, class, gender, and sexuality in the United States.

When evaluating the creation of UC Merced for the San Joaquin Valley, this longer history of imperiled rural areas due to deliberate state policy, big agribusiness interests, and University of California collaboration is of central importance. I engage in this lengthy discussion of Friedland's work because his initial strategies to appeal to the legislative branch shifted significantly after he spoke with the members of the California Rural Legal Assistance Fund (CRLA). When reflecting on his ideas, Friedland at the time also realized that attempting to get the legislature to pass a funding bill that promoted certain values in agricultural research would take an entire lifetime at the Capitol. The question was what strategies might be able to produce a similar effect without as much time. In later conversations with Ralph Abscal, who was one of the main lawyers with the CRLA, Friedland and Abscal found another way. By examining the existing land grant legislation, Abscal suggested that Friedland and the CRLA pursue judicial review. Drawing on these strategies outlined in Friedland's work alongside other strategies mobilized by the CRLA, they moved to work on and file what would become the CAAP v. UC lawsuit.

Academic Freedom and the People

Much like the other power movements that resulted in the creation of fields like Ethnic Studies and Women's Studies at the time, the CAAP v. UC lawsuit represented an

organized group of people who acted based on their vested interest in rural areas and the belief that they could potentially and effectively correct historic injustices. While not always organized around identity, the work of William Friedland, Isao Fujimoto, Emmett Fiske, and other UC researchers who critiqued the state of agriculture, all brought a challenge to state configurations that proliferated oppressive labor and living conditions for working class and racialized communities.[180]

Like many formations during this time that attempted to reconsolidate aspects of state power, the people behind the CAAP v. UC lawsuit had their own challengers. While the lawsuit was originally filed during the tenure of UC President Charles J Hitch, it lasted throughout the terms of two additional UC Presidents: David S. Saxton and David P. Gardner. David P. Gardner, whose tenure as UC President started in 1983, is the same UC President usually accredited as one of the original proponents of UC Merced's creation and had served as UC President for most of the lawsuit's legal life and battles.

While antagonistic towards the lawsuit, Gardner perceived the lawsuit as embodying extremely important stakes. In effect, the CAAP v. UC becomes a perfect example of racial liberalist discourse since it reveals the contradictions between advocating for the wellbeing of people of color and other marginalized communities

[180] Interestingly, the mode of thinking embodied by these individuals found expression in the creation of academic programs and departments, like other interdisciplinary fields emerging at the time. In fact, Isao Fujimoto was instrumental for the founding of Community and Regional Development Department and the Asian American Studies Department at UC Davis. The Applied Behavioral Science department housed Asian American Studies and Native American Studies before they would go on to form their own departments. The Department of Applied Behavioral Sciences eventually became the Department of Community and Regional Development. At UC Santa Cruz, William Friedland was a founder of the Community Studies program. Oftentimes these community-based programs that tied together social justice social scientific inquiries and sometimes even interdisciplinary ones are forgotten in descriptions of new fields that emerged out of the 1960s and 1970s.

while still being complicit within the structural processes that rely upon these communities' exploitation. During President Gardner's tenure, there was a massive uptake of diversity related initiatives in the University of California. For example, in his autobiography, David Gardner recounts his involvement and oversight of various programs to diversify the graduate student body in the University of California campuses, specifically as they relate to communities of color and women:

> The university had made a sustained effort over the previous twenty years to attract young people from California's minority communities to its undergraduate student body, …. Much less effort, however, had been made in recruiting graduate students holding special promise and potential for enrollment in UC's Ph.D. and postdoctoral programs, especially from the minority communities; and the same was true for women, who were nearly as poorly represented in many fields of study.
>
> As this issue was part of my "need to improve" agenda, I decided to move as soon as possible, not only to maximize the educational opportunities at the graduate level for women and minorities, but to do so on our initiative and not wait to react to the pressures of others.

In this self-narration, Gardner goes on to discuss what his "need to improve agenda" encapsulated. In particular, Gardner alongside Eugene Cota-Robles and William Frazer, had proposed a plan to actualize these goals. Gardner's autobiography discusses how he oversaw the creation of the Graduate Outreach and Recruitment Program, the Graduate Research Assistanceship/Mentorship Program, the President's Postdoctoral Fellowship

Program, the Dissertation-year Fellowship Program, and the Eugene Cota-Robles Fellowship Program. In effect, these programs would provide many women and students of color avenues to pursue graduate degrees at the University of California.

Yet, what is a fundamental tension about the potential usefulness of his work in helping establish these programs is also in how he dealt with the CAAP v. UC's challenge to university research and big agribusiness. In his autobiography, he recounts a conversation he had with Donald Reidhaar, the university's general counsel, over the lawsuit and its recommendation for a social impact statement. Gardner's conversation goes as follows:

> At that point the issues in this litigation had been narrowed to one major demand, namely, that UC research in agriculture be made subject to an existing procedure that would require UC to do a "socioeconomic impact report," as Reidhaar described it to me, "akin to an environmental impact study, on any agricultural research if it drew, in whole or in part, on funds derived from the Hatch Act." While Reidhaar did not advocate that we settle the suit on these grounds, neither did he seek to dissuade me.
>
> Our meeting did not last very long. I pointed out that the demand was, in principle, no different than insisting that we carry out such an analysis on any research before its publication or on any class before we offered it to our students. '*This condition strikes at the very core of the intellectual freedoms the academic community worldwide had struggled for over nine hundred years to ensure, and*

> *we will not be a party to such an agreement, however long the litigation takes or whatever it costs*.'
>
> Reidhaar seemed somewhat surprised at the finality of my instructions but was understanding. He and his colleagues battled long and hard for six more years before the issue was finally settled by the courts, in our favor and on every count.[181]

By invoking academic freedom, the University of California deployed a logic that sought to undermine CAAP and CRLA's reading of the Hatch Act and other related pieces of legislation. As demonstrated by his lack of engagement here, Gardner's narration embarrassingly glossed over very important points of the lawsuit. Without a clear engagement with CAAP's call that researchers construct a social impact statement, Gardner's assertion—that this lawsuit threatened to undo nine hundred years of academic freedom—reads more like administrative melodrama than sustained engagement with their concerns.[182] In doing so, Gardner's recounting demonstrates a certain lack of good faith that the UC President held towards the lawsuit. Moreover, his account also shows how ill-informed he was around the intentions behind the social impact statements since

[181] Gardner, David Pierpont. *Earning My Degree: Memoirs of an American University President*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2005, 253. Emphasis added.

[182] In reflecting on President Gardner's outrage due to his faulty assessment that the social impact statements would challenge academic freedom, it is important to situate President Gardner in relation to the California Farm Bureau Federation. Prior to his employment as the President of the University of California system, Gardner's first job after graduating college was as an assistant to the head of California's Farmers Bureau. He speaks very fondly about his time there in his autobiography. Situating President Gardner's ties to the California Farm Bureau troubles his dramatic invocation of nine hundred year of academic freedom, allowing us to reflect on how these ties might influence his impassioned disinterest in and repulsion to the social impact statement.

much of the lawsuit also drew from Friedland's discussion of academic freedom and these social impact statements.

When Friedland published "Production or Perish", he particularly addresses academic freedom at length. The predictive and evaluative methodology that was the core of societal impact statements did not intend to stop research from being done, but instead to set up informal push and pull factors over the years that incentivized certain research over others. For Friedland, if the predictive and evaluative reports were going to undermine academic freedom by providing incentives for scientists to align with the goals passed by the state legislature, then it was no different than the current system that was rife with informal pressure from big agribusiness influence, especially through organizations like the Farmer's Bureau. Friedland and others had already reported on how agribusiness informally holds a lot of sway with agricultural researchers. He reminds:

> Again, the intention here is to utilize the budgetary process to direct the overall thrust of research without becoming involved in the specification of research projects. In this way the academic freedom of researchers can be protected while encouraging them as a collectivity to begin work on projects that will have social outcomes variant from those which have been produced in the past.[183]

Friedland's vision, then, was not to restrict or direct researchers or to necessarily strongarm researchers through the budgetary process. Its focus was to begin thinking about how their research could produce results different from what University of

[183] Friedland. "Production or Perish", 29.

California research had produced historically. In doing so, Friedland actually provides a corrective to Gardner's assertion that the social impact statements would threaten academic freedom; quite inversely, Friedland's social impact statements would in some ways preserve academic freedom.

Yet, despite Gardner's retorts that providing social impact statements threaten academic freedom, Friedland's work also undermines Gardner's 900-year genealogy of unfettered academic freedom within the University of California. Friedland notes that an idealized academic freedom that was not constrained by federal or other research funding initiatives never really existed in the University of California. He wrote:

> Clarity should be maintained between the differences in academic freedom, which deals with the right of faculty members to present material within the classroom in the manner they believe to be appropriate and to have clear rights to delineate their own research agendas and the availability of funds through many different mechanisms that can "pull" research in distinctive directions. Thus, clear recognition must be given to the fact that the interests of the nation or the state have influenced the development of academic research. While the work of a considerable number of scholars may remain "untainted" by direction from external sources, a variety of structural factors have been developed over the past century to shape research decisions.
>
> It is important to note that the entire enterprise of agricultural research has been shaped by the clear and conscious orientations of policy-makers, on the one hand, and researchers and administrators within the agricultural segments of the

> university on the other. The need for agricultural research to be "useful" to society by dealing with concrete and practical problems encountered by farmers has long been recognized as a legitimate reason for intervention in decision-making about research. To the extent that researchers as a collectivity within a publicly-supported institution feel constrained to justify their existence this has surely had influences on the research process and therefore on academic freedom.[184]

In pointing this out, Friedland attends to the various contradictions that exist within the UC system around academic freedom, especially as it relates to academics having had been able to decide their own research directions without any external influence. Rather, Friedland demonstrates that there were often structural factors across the University of California's existence where certain national and political interests were justifiable reasons for structuring researchers towards clearly defined and oriented research directions.

From California legislative incentives for studying mechanization after the end of the Bracero Program to the close relationship that the Farm Bureau had with the University of California (while even having an office in the agricultural sciences building at UC Berkeley for a time), the UC and other political bodies have always had a hand in what gets researched. Moreover, political, economic, and cultural reasons also often shifted the direction that state-funded researchers could and would take. In this context, the University of California's idea of academic freedom in some ways is limited in what and whose rights its calls for academic freedom actually aspired to protect.

---

[184] Ibid, 36-37.

Political-Economic Constraints and the Lawsuit's Outcomes

The CAAP v. UC lawsuit had received a favorable decision at first. As the original lawsuit was filed in the Alameda Superior Court in 1979, it was assigned to judge Spurgeon Avakian.[185] Avakian, after limiting the scope of the lawsuit in 1980, oversaw the discovery period lasting until 1984 where he had to step down due to illness.[186] He was replaced with Judge Raymond L. Marsh who issued his decision in March 1986 in favor of CAAP. William G. Hoerger, one of the lawyers who worked on the case for the California Rural Legal Assistance, summarized the judge's conclusion, which occurred on November 17, 1987, as follows:

1. The Court Determined that the Hatch Act is intended to benefit the identifiable constituencies of:
    - small family farmers
    - rural residents
    - consumers

    The court further determined that small family farmers were intended by Congress to be the primary beneficiary.
2. The court ruled that the University's Agricultural Experiment Station, in its system-wide program of selecting research projects for Hatch designation and of allocating Hatch funds to these projects, must consider the needs of these

[185] It is interesting to note that Judge Spurgeon Avakian was born in Fresno, CA and was a well-known figure in Berkeley, CA due to his involvement with advocating for the successful desegregation of the city's junior highs.
[186] The timeline here is based on Emmett Fiske's research into the CAAP v. UC lawsuit. For more, please see the Emmett P. Fiske Papers at UC Davis.

Congressionally-intended beneficiaries, and must give primary consideration to the needs of small family farmers.

3. The Court found that the University of California has no process for undertaking these considerations and, thus, is in violation of the Hatch Act.
4. The Court ordered the University to submit back to the Court, within 90 days, a plan for developing a decision-making process which would bring the University in compliance with the Act. The University's proposed plan will be subject to review, criticism and counter-proposals by the parties. Once the court has approved a plan, the court will retain jurisdiction over the University for 5 years to monitor the University's progress in implementing and the potential need for modifications. In this regard, the Court will require the University to submit detailed annual reports.[187]

This win was a welcome one since those involved spent countless hours working on the case despite continued sets of budget cuts to CRLA's operating budget. These budget cuts came as a result of larger political and economic moves that sought to effectively defund one of CRLA's main funders, the Legal Services Corporation (LSC). The Legal Services Corporation (LSC) was a non-profit established by Congress in 1974. Emerging from the Office of Economic Opportunity, which was part of Lyndon B. Johnson's Great Society, LSC provides funding to organizations that provide legal services to people who would otherwise be unable seek legal advice.

[187] "Hoegland's Speech". Box 2. Emmett P. Fiske Collection at UC Davis.

While the organization provided great services to underserved communities, Ronald Reagan attempted to completely defund LSC when he assumed the Office of the President. In January 1981, Ronald Reagan gave the LSC a line item budget of zero. Reagan's move to completely defund LSC failed to materialize thanks to the efforts of the then American Bar Association president W. Reece Smith, Jr. and the U.S. House Judiciary Committee;[188] however, LSC's budget was cut extensively in the following years and eventually led to the full replacement of its board of directors by Reagan appointees. [189] It shouldn't be surprising that these appointees represent Reagan's more conservative and corporate interests. In effect, this defunding limited the financial resources and people power that could be put behind CRLA's CAAP v. UC case. Despite this lack, the CRLA successfully had a ruling in their favor by 1986.

The University of California moved forward after this decision by filing an appeal. During the trial, the University contested Judge Marsh's decision, claiming that he did not have the authority to rule that the UC needed to create a way to regulate Hatch Act research. William Friedland, while reflecting on this period in an interview with Sarah Rabkin, stated that the decision had ultimately been based on political interests. Those political interests would culminate with CRLA's decision to not continue pursuing the case. Friedland noted that:

---

[188] Taylor, Stuart. "House Panel Rebuffs Reagan and Backs Keeping Legal Aid for Poor." *The New York Times*. May 14, 1981. https://www.nytimes.com/1981/05/14/us/house-panel-rebuffs-reagan-and-backs-keeping-legal-aid-for-poor.html.

[189] Taylor, Stuart. "Coast Lawyer Reported as Legal Aid Choice." *The New York Times*. November 8, 1981. https://www.nytimes.com/1981/11/08/us/coast-lawyer-reported-as-legal-aid-choice.html. During Reagan's time as California governor, the CRLA had many run-ins with the then governor.

> On appeal, the judge's ruling was knocked down. And the question became you go up to the next stage, the California Supreme Court, and at that stage we would be dealing with a Republican governor's [George Deukmejian] appointees. He had the majority of appointments on the State Supreme Court. Reagan was the president; he had the majority of appointments in the U.S. Supreme Courts. So CRLA dropped the case. It would have been knocked down at the state level, and go to the U.S. Supreme Court – maybe they would have accepted it; maybe not, but CRLA didn't see a prospect of winning this case, for political reasons.[190]

Friedland's narration of the events that transpired and led to the end of the CAAP v. UC lawsuit are particularly productive for troubling the early histories about the creation of UC Merced that treated the placing the university in the region as a move towards doing the San Joaquin Valley justice. Friedland's narrations caution against a purely celebratory tone with the creation of UC Merced in the valley. His description of the CAAP v. UC lawsuit's outcomes push us to complicate parts of this narrative. After all, while UC President Gardner and Governor Deukmejian were central to the original push of the university, Gardner and Deukmejian were also key players that stacked a political landscape that ensured the hostile defeat of any potential moves from the CAAP v. UC case to advocate for social justice for embattled rural communities.

If part of the official reasons for the creation of UC Merced within the San Joaquin Valley is to deal with past injustices, the CAAP v. UC case and mechanization more broadly serves as a reminder to the desires embodied in the operation and creation

[190] Friedland, Williams. Community Studies and Research for Change: An Oral History with William Friedland. Interview by Sarah Rabkin. Oral History, 2013, 104. https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6zq1v27w.

of universities. The lawsuit and creation of UC Merced spanned a particular period in U.S. history where articulations of official anti-racisms were intricately becoming linked with emerging neoliberal economic and social policies. LSC's budget cuts and the eventual sabotage of its board are all aspects of how the downsizing of public services under the Reagan administration came to hurt marginalized communities.

When it comes to CRLA's efforts in the lawsuit, we saw the arrested development of social organizing against a stubborn institution – the University of California – by a collective interested in presenting alternatives to the UC so that it could start prioritizing other groups of people beyond those of agribusiness's interests. This is not to say that multiple programs didn't appear in UC agricultural research that helped marginalized communities or focused on environmental impacts in subsequent years. However, these subsequent programs did not fundamentally alter the deep structural issues that directed agricultural research funding sources in ways that Friedland and others had envisioned for the University of California.

There is no way to know what would have happened if Judge Marsh's decision had not been overturned, especially when it comes to how it would affect those who are marginalized on the axis of race. It would not be outrageous to predict that changes in agricultural research could have fostered a different type of San Joaquin Valley. The region, while now being influenced by other industries like shipping and logistics, is still impacted by the effects of agricultural research in a racial capitalist economic system; you can see that in the various disparities that still exist. Much like the lawsuit's time,

there are still those within the UC system who are actively working against the disparities that exist in the San Joaquin Valley.

Coda

Far from Marginal

By looking at manifestations of agriculture and agribusiness since 1862, my dissertation, "Reckoning the Rural: Racial Capitalism, the San Joaquin Valley, and the University of California" has attempted to write a regional narrative of race, capitalism, and knowledge production in California's San Joaquin Valley. It offers a history of the present that seeks to contribute to emerging interdisciplinary conversations that consider the Valley as a pivotal feature of California's political economy.

As noted in this dissertation's individual chapters, the University of California's relationship to California's San Joaquin Valley has been a site that has witnessed many political reconfigurations on a local, regional, state, and national level. Whether that was with the UC's early reliance on white populist sentiments as seen through their work with the Grange, the UC's replacement of the Grange with the various farm bureaus, or the UC's production of research reports and findings that fueled agribusiness's political and economic interests, this dissertation argues that this largely productive and generative relationship between the University of California and agribusiness had produced detrimental effects for California's San Joaquin Valley, communities of color, small farmers, and other farmworkers. In doing so, "Reckoning the Rural" attempts to contribute to a view of racial capitalist logics through the lens of agriculture.

What's been particularly useful about Cedric Robinson's theorization of racial capitalism and Jodi Melamed's later discussion of neoliberal multiculturalism has been their capacity to discuss how racial disparities are sown deeper through a rhetoric of

racial liberalism across various institutions and industries. Jodi Melamed has discussed how state sponsored attempts at embracing official anti-racist discourses become commensurate with the erasure of a continued racial capitalist system that fundamentally obscures the continued wealth dispossession of communities of color in the First World and Global South. In these ways, Jodi Melamed's discussion is particularly productive for examining the dynamics in agribusiness and agricultural research insofar as key players from the University of California, like UC President David P. Gardner, had been able to provide limited strategies to address racial inequities while perpetuating certain functions of agricultural research that further deepened these racial inequities such as playing a key role in countering the California Agrarian Action Project's and the California Rural Legal Assistance's claims in the CAAP v. UC lawsuit.

Since the lawsuit was settled in 1989, this was also the same year that marked the end of the Cold War with the falling of the Berlin Wall. For scholars like Melamed, this period also saw the shift of racial liberalisms, which sought to counter Soviet critiques of U.S. racism, to an eventual embrace of neoliberal multiculturalism. While neoliberal economic policies were slowly implemented since the Carter administration, these policies shot off with Ronald Reagan and Bill Clinton in the 1980s and 1990s. In the 1990s, these types of policies further called for several budgetary setbacks especially within the UCs. Scholars like Ruth Gilmore have discussed how these shifts gave rise to the proliferation of prisons on the San Joaquin Valley's mainly agricultural lands.

These cuts to the national, state, and institutional budgets especially as they relate to public expenditure had produced conditions where people were asked to take on

increased financial burdens to seek out services and resources once assured through more Keynesian economic policies. This had an interesting relationship for California's students. While there was an advent of increased loan burden on students, especially those who were not able to finish their degrees because of academic or personal hardships, another California institution also negatively impacted the broader California population, and communities of color more specifically, during that time. While many students of color saw non-dischargeable debt as a weight to any upward social mobility, especially for first generation and low-income students of color, California's prison regime was also dispossessing people of color through the carceral regime.

In this way, neoliberalism's ability to culturally code racial differences comes into play. While students of color in the UC system were being dispossessed in the 2000s, UC Merced had its first graduating class. Graduating right after the Great Recession hit, Merced's first full graduating class and others who graduated from the UCs in that year were left with more debt than most other UC students historically. Moreover, they experienced some of the lowest job prospects that we have seen in California for decades. Prisoners of color were dealing with the dehumanization that incarceration still uses as its core operation. In addition to dehumanization, some prisoners were also robbed of their ability to enjoy time with their families or work after being released, since some were contracting Valley Fever as a result of incarceration – something that many of them might have never been exposed to if they weren't shuttled around the state for surplus population control.

In these ways, we can see how racial oppression's co-constitution with capitalism is made most bare. As Melamed has stated before, neoliberal multiculturalism also created good and bad figurations of people of color. In California, students of color who could represent the university's multicultural ethos could either elevate to the multicultural cosmopolitan elite class or have the debt siphon away any social mobility. Comparatively, imprisoned peoples were often viewed monoculturally, and experienced a much different yet interlinked form of dispossession through incarceration. The old organizer adage of "more schools, less prisons" ironically misses how education in this neoliberal multicultural era has become another way that dispossession and debt could be leveraged against those who were marginalized, albeit with a chance at upward mobility.

By noting these shifts in multiculturalism, liberalism, and racial capitalism as it relates to the San Joaquin Valley, California, and the broader United States, the San Joaquin Valley demonstrates itself as being a far from marginal space; rather, the Valley is a fundamentally and historically central site to how the region's industrialized agriculture has transformed to a new pivotal industry in the state's carceral regime. As Ruth Wilson Gilmore demonstrates, the move from the mass production of foodstuffs to the mass production of human unfreedom has served to manage and conceal the dimensions of racial and class inequality in the rest of California.[191] While the connections to California's prison system was not a focus in this current work, my dissertation's contribution to these conversations examines how public research

[191] For more on these ideas, please see: Gilmore, Ruth Wilson. "Globalisation and US Prison Growth: From Military Keynesianism to Post-Keynesian Militarism." *Race & Class* 40, no. 2–3 (March 1, 1999): 171–88; and *Golden Gulag: Prisons, Surplus, Crisis, and Opposition in Globalizing California*. American Crossroads 21. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007.

universities—specifically those of the University of California system—have worked to consolidate this transition between agricultural and carceral production within the Valley. Thus, my dissertation tries to attend to the shaping of San Joaquin Valley as a knowledge geography, one directly informed by the criminal legal industry as much as by agriculture. Whether some of these points are successful is up for further refinement, reflection, and constructive critique.

Gesturing Forward

In looking forward, there are many directions that this project can pursue. While maintaining a central interest in the San Joaquin Valley, one of the directions this work will take is to examine how the region's relationship to knowledge making institutions and racialization operates across two new scales. Drawing on some of the trans-regional connections between the Valley and other parts of the U.S., a potentially fruitful direction for my research would be to pursue a trajectory that seeks to interrupt the stability of the distinction between the transnational and the regional. What I want to consider is whether a regional lens can illuminate different renderings of scale by highlighting very specific traffics and transactions of knowledge, commodities, and power. I aim to do so by turning to the racialized rural geographies of the San Joaquin Valley as a site for trans*regional*—rather than transnational—management of region.

Transregionality in this context helps to illuminate the dynamic nature of legislation such as California's 1917 Land Settlement Act, where the regionality of the Valley's relation to the state (rather than the nation) becomes exported as a model for the

racial-colonial management of space.[192] This act, which created a board of directors chaired by UC Professor Elmwood Mead, created two agricultural colonies that were to serve as models for colonization of the West. Mead's connection to these acts also extend into his longer history with settler colonial projects in Australia and other parts of the U.S.[193]

In a similar vein, further examples of the San Joaquin Valley's transregionality can be found in how California's agriculture industry and UC agricultural economists contributed to free trade agreements and broader global trade patterns, like those of the North American Free Trade Agreement and the World Trade Organization in the 1990s. Relatedly, UC agricultural research also operates transregionally by way of its recent work with the state of Israel. For instance, on July 16, 2018, UC ANR signed a research agreement with the state of Israel. This research agreement came after more than 18 years of student activists calling on the University of California to join the movement of Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions (BDS) against the state of Israel for its continued human rights violations and illegal occupations of Palestinian lands.

Examining these situations gives us insight not only into the way that racial capitalism functions in a University system, but in a way that might not be surprising when considering the past. While UC ANR upholds diversity on its website, it is also involved in these agreements that support the continual occupations of lands in different parts of the globe and that embody the quintessential definition of settler colonialism at

[192] Hayden-Smith, Rose. "Connecting Veterans to Farming Is Part of Our History." *UC Food Observer*, 24 Nov. 2015, ucfoodobserver.com/2015/11/10/connecting-veterans-to-farming-is-part-of-our-history/.
[193] J. M. Powell, 'Mead, Elwood (1858–1936)', Australian Dictionary of Biography, National Centre of Biography, Australian National University, http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/mead-elwood-7543/text13159, published first in hardcopy 1986, accessed online 1 November 2018.

its core. Studying the transregional connections between different areas and the San Joaquin Valley would be particularly illuminating here as well for what it can reveal about the role of land grant colleges, contemporary settler colonial practices, and the active production of agriculturally rural areas.

The second aspect of this research seeks to examine different scales of insurgent knowledge production that work against racial capitalist geographies that are within and outside of the university. To do this, I aim both to create and to broaden the contents of an archive of insurgent knowledge producers rooted in the San Joaquin Valley. Through oral history and cultural analysis, I seek to document various oppositional stances by activists, labor organizers, artists, and others from the community.

These bottom-up perspectives can offer insight into how the Valley has also been a region where resistance to exploitation and social marginalization has always existed, albeit not always documented. Building on some of the preliminary work from this dissertation on figures such as William Friedland, Anne Draper, and Hal Draper, I would also like to expand this work to examine others like them who were concerned about rural communities to, in some ways, illuminate the cultivation and organic production of a race radical tradition or a radical genealogy within the San Joaquin Valley. An example of the people that I would like to conduct oral histories with are people like Dr. Isao Fujimoto whose work at UC Davis led him to pursue San Joaquin Valley-focused projects. His work exemplifies one of the various actors within the UC system that worked against the broader institution's exploitative ties with agriculture. Doing this, I hope, will broaden my dissertation to show that the UC was not simply an institution that

provided support for big agribusiness and thus stoked the development of neoliberal multicultural practices. Most importantly, I seek to establish how the University of California has been, at the same time, a site where community-based and community-focused knowledges were formed and nurtured to provide a people's reckoning of, from, and through the rural.

Bibliography

Almaguer, Tomás. *Racial Fault Lines: The Historical Origins of White Supremacy in California*. Berkeley, Calif.; London: University of California Press, 2009.

Arax, Mark, and Rick Wartzman. *The King Of California: J.G. Boswell and the Making of A Secret American Empire*. New York, New York: PublicAffairs, 2005.

Armbruster, Walter J. "The Future of Land Grant Universities and Agricultural Economists." *Review of Agricultural Economics* 15, no. 3 (1993): 591–602. https://doi.org/10.2307/1349491.

Avila, Eric. *The Folklore of the Freeway: Race and Revolt in the Modernist City*. A Quadrant Book. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014.

Ballis, George. *The Dispossessed*. VHS Video. Sun Mt. Production, 1970.

Barns, William D. "Oliver Hudson Kelley and the Genesis of the Grange: A Reappraisal." *Agricultural History* 41, no. 3 (1967): 229–42.

Bell, D J. "[Screw]ING GEOGRAPHY (Censor's Version)." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 13, no. 2 (1995): 127–31.

Benedict, Murray R. *Farm Policies of the United States, 1790-1950: A Study of Their Origins and Development*. 2nd ed. New York: Octagon Books, Inc., 1953.

Burd-Sharps, Sarah, Kristen Lewis, and Eduardo Borges Martins. *The Measure of America: American Human Development Report, 2008-2009*. A Columbia/SSRC Book. New York: Columbia University Press : Social Science Research Council, 2008.

California. Department of Agriculture. Division of Land Settlement., and Charles W. Cleary. *Final Report, June 30, 1931*. [Sacramento]: The Division, 1931.

Carlson, Leonard A. *Indians, Bureaucrats, and Land: The Dawes Act and the Decline of Indian Farming*. Contributions in Economics and Economic History, no. 36. Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press, 1981.

Chatterjee, Piya, and Sunaina Maira, eds. *The Imperial University: Academic Repression and Scholarly Dissent*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014.

Chávez, Sergio. "Community, Ethnicity, and Class in a Changing Rural California Town." *Rural Sociology* 70, no. 3 (September 1, 2005): 314–35. https://doi.org/10.1526/0036011054831224.

"Chronicle of the University of California: A Journal of University History." *Chronicle of the University of California: A Journal of University History*, Chronicle of the University of California: A Journal of University History, 1–9 (n.d.).

Cohen, Robert. *When the Old Left Was Young: Student Radicals and America's First Mass Student Movement, 1929-1941*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Collins, John. "West Coast Grange Wars: A Reborn Farmers' Movement Takes on Corporate Agriculture." News. In These Times, June 14, 2015. http://inthesetimes.com/rural-america/entry/18029/a-grange-war-what-goes-around-comes-around-the-west-is-wild.

Commonwealth Club. "Our History." History | Commonwealth Club, n.d. https://www.commonwealthclub.org/about/history.

Cousino, Nicole, and Jon Mattox. *Concrete & Sunshine*. Documentary. National Film Network, 2002.

Cowan, Tadlock., and Library of Congress. *California's San Joaquin Valley: A Region in Transition*. CRS Report for Congress., [11], 353 p. [Washington, D.C.]: Congressional Research Service, Library Congress, 2005. //catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/102372582.

Davis, Mike. *Planet of Slums*. Paperback ed. London ; New York: Verso, 2007.

Davis, Mike, and Mike Davis. "'What Is a Vigilante Man?' White Violence in California History." In *No One Is Illegal: Fighting Racism and State Violence on the U.S.-Mexico Border*, edited by Justin Akers Chacon, 2nd Edition., 7–88. Chicago, IL: Haymarket Books, 2006.

Day, Iyko. *Alien Capital: Asian Racialization and the Logic of Settler Colonial Capitalism*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2016.

Douglass, John Aubrey. *The California Idea and American Higher Education: 1850 to the 1960 Master Plan*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 2000.

Downey, Sheridan. *They Would Rule the Valley*. San Francisco, 1947.

Draper, Anne, and Hal Draper. *The Dirt on California: Agribusiness and the University*. Berkeley, CA: Independent Socialist Clubs of America, 1968.

Draper, Hal. "The Mind of Clark Kerr." Berkeley, CA: Independent Socialist Club, 1964.

Dymski, Gary. "What Has Never Happened before and Is Happening Again: Development and Discrimination in the San Joaquin Valley The New Face of California: The Great Central Valley." - *Asian American Law Journal*, n.d., 169.

Eddy, Edward Danforth. *Colleges for Our Land and Time: The Land-Grant Idea in American Education*. Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press, 1973.

Edmond, J. B. *The Magnificent Charter: The Origin and Role of the Morrill Land-Grant Colleges and Universities*. 1st ed. An Exposition-University Book. Hicksville, N.Y: Exposition Press, 1978.

Ellis, John. "Fred Ruiz Isn't Reappointed to the UC Board of Regents." *Fresno Bee*. July 21, 2016. https://www.fresnobee.com/news/politics-government/politics-columns-blogs/political-notebook/article91114877.html.

Ferguson, Edwin E. "The California Alien Land Law and the Fourteenth Amendment." *California Law Review* 35, no. 1 (1947): 61–90.

Ferry, David. "How the Government Put Tens of Thousands of People at Risk of a Deadly Disease." *Mother Jones*. February 2015. Mother Jones. http://www.motherjones.com/environment/2015/01/valley-fever-california-central-valley-prison.

Firkus, Angela. "The Agricultural Extension Service and Non-Whites in California, 1910–1932." *Agricultural History* 84, no. 4 (Fall 2010): 506–30. https://doi.org/10.3098/ah.2010.84.4.506.

Fiske, Emmett Preston. "The College and Its Constituency : Rural and Community Development at the University of California, 1875-1978." Thesis (Ph. D.)--University of California, Davis, 1979., 1979.

Fitzgerald, Deborah. *Every Farm a Factory: The Industrial Ideal in American Agriculture.* New haven: Yale University Press, 2010.

Floyd, Kevin. *The Reification of Desire: Toward a Queer Marxism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2009.

Friedland, William H. "Agricultural Research and Development and State Policies." University of Missouri, Columbia: Unpublished, 1987.

———. Community Studies and Research for Change: An Oral History with William Friedland. Interview by Sarah Rabkin. Oral History, 2013. https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6zq1v27w.

———. "'Engineering' Social Change in Agriculture," The University of Dayton Review, 21 (1991): 25–42.

———. "Social Sleepwalkers. Scientific and Technological Research in California Agriculture. Research Monograph No. 13." Davis: University of California, Davis

College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences Department of Applied Behavioral Sciences, 1974. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED116843.pdf.

Friedland, William H., and Tim Kappel. "Production or Perish: Changing the Inequities of Agricultural Research Priorities." Project On Social Impact Assessment and Values. Santa Cruz: University of California, Santa Cruz, 1979. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED187511.pdf.

Fujimoto, Isao, and Gerardo Sandoval. "Central Valley Partnership: A Collaborative Multiethnic Approach to Organizing Immigrant Communities Symposium: Immigration and Civil Rights After September 11: The Impact on California." - *U.C. Davis Law Review*, n.d., 1021.

Gardner, David Pierpont. *Earning My Degree: Memoirs of an American University President*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2005.

Geier, Joel. "Hal Draper's Contribution to Revolutionary Marxism: Socialism from Below." *International Socialist Review*, Features, no. 107 (2018). https://isreview.org/issue/107/hal-drapers-contribution-revolutionary-marxism.

Geiger, Roger L., and Nathan M. Sorber. *The Land-Grant Colleges and the Reshaping of American Higher Education*. New Brunswick, NJ; London: Transaction Publishers, 2013.

Gilmore, Ruth Wilson. "Forgotten Places and the Seeds of Grassroots Planning." In *Engaging Contradictions: Theory, Politics, and Methods of Activist Scholarship*, edited by Charles R. Hale, 31–62. Global, Area, and International Archive. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008.

———. "Globalisation and US Prison Growth: From Military Keynesianism to Post-Keynesian Militarism." *Race & Class* 40, no. 2–3 (March 1, 1999): 171–88. https://doi.org/10.1177/030639689904000212.

———. *Golden Gulag: Prisons, Surplus, Crisis, and Opposition in Globalizing California*. American Crossroads 21. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007.

Glenn, Evelyn Nakano. "Settler Colonialism as Structure: A Framework for Comparative Studies of U.S. Race and Gender Formation." *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity* 1, no. 1 (January 2015): 52–72. https://doi.org/10.1177/2332649214560440.

Goeman, Mishuana. *Mark My Words: Native Women Mapping Our Nations*. First Peoples: New Directions in Indigenous Studies. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013.

González, Cristina. *Clark Kerr's University of California: Leadership, Diversity, and Planning in Higher Education*. New Brunswick, N.J: Transaction Publishers, 2011.

Grim, Valerie. "The 1890 Land-Grant Colleges: From the New Deal to the Black Farmers' Class-Action Lawsuit, 1930s-2010s." In *Service as Mandate: How American Land-Grant Universities Shaped the Modern World, 1920–2015*, edited by Alan I. Marcus, 80–111. NEXUS 2. Tuscaloosa, AL: University Alabama Press, 2015.

Hahn, Steven, and Jonathan Prude, eds. *The Countryside in the Age of Capitalist Transformation: Essays in the Social History of Rural America*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985.

Hall, Stuart. "MARX'S NOTES ON METHOD: A 'READING' OF THE '1857 INTRODUCTION.'" *Cultural Studies* 17, no. 2 (March 2003): 113–49. https://doi.org/10.1080/0950238032000114868.

Harvey, David. *The Limits to Capital*. New and Fully updated ed. London ; New York: Verso, 2006.

Heinzen, James W, and University of Pittsburgh Press. *Inventing a Soviet Countryside: State Power and the Transformation of Rural Russia, 1917 - 1929*. Pittsburg, Pa.: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2004.

Herring, Scott. *Another Country: Queer Anti-Urbanism*. Sexual Cultures. New York: New York University Press, 2010.

———. "Southern Backwardness: Metronormativity and Regional Visual Culture." *American Studies* 48, no. 2 (2007): 37–48. https://doi.org/10.1353/ams.0.0042.

Hightower, Jim. *Hard Tomatoes, Hard Times: The Original Hightower Report, Unexpurgated, of the Agribusiness Accountability Project on the Failure of America's Land Grant College Complex and Selected Additional Views of the Problems and Prospects of American Agriculture in the Late Seventies*. Cambridge, Mass: Schenkman Pub. Co, 1978.

Hundley, Norris. *The Great Thirst: Californians and Water -a History*. Rev. ed. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.

Hurtado, Albert L. *Indian Survival on the California Frontier*. Yale Western Americana Series. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 2010.

JACL National Staff. "California State Grange Apologizes to Japanese Americans for Discriminatory Past." Pacific Citizen: The National Newspaper of the JACL,

October 20, 2014. https://www.pacificcitizen.org/california-state-grange-apologizes-to-japanese-americans-for-discriminatory-past/.

Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies San Joaquin Valley Place Matters Team. "Places Matters For Health in the San Joaquin Valley: Ensuring Opportunities for Good Health for All A Report on Health Inequities in the San Joaquin Valley." Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, March 2012.

Judt, Tony. *Ill Fares the Land*. 1st ed. Westminster, London, England: Penguin Books, 2011.

Karuka, Manu. *Empire's Tracks: Indigenous Nations, Chinese Workers, and the Transcontinental Railroad*. Oakland, California: University of California Press, 2019.

Katznelson, Ira. *Fear Itself: The New Deal and the Origins of Our Time*. New York, NY: Liveright | W. W. Norton & Company, 2014.

———. *When Affirmative Action Was White: An Untold History of Racial Inequality in Twentieth-Century America*. First published as a Norton paperback. New York London: W.W. Norton & Company, 2006.

Kellogg, Charles E. *The College of Agriculture: Science in the Public Service*. Carnegie Series in American Education. United States of America: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

Kerr, Clark. *The Uses of the University*. 5th ed. The Godkin Lectures on the Essentials of Free Government and the Duties of the Citizen. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001.

Kerr, Norwood Allen. *The Legacy: A Centennial History of the State Agricultural Experiment Stations, 1887-1987*. Special Report / Missouri Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Missouri-Columbia 350. Columbia, Mo.: Missouri Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Missouri-Columbia, 1987.

Key, Scott. "Economics or Education: The Establishment of American Land-Grant Universities." *The Journal of Higher Education* 67, no. 2 (1996): 196–220. https://doi.org/10.2307/2943980.

King, Anthony D. *Urbanism, Colonialism, and the World-Economy: Cultural and Spatial Foundations of the World Urban System*, 2016.

King, C. Judson. *The University of California: Creating, Nurturing, and Maintaining Academic Quality in a Public University Setting*. Berkeley: Center for Studies in Higher Education, 2018.

Kuhn, Thomas S. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Fourth edition. Chicago ; London: The University of Chicago Press, 2012.

Lefebvre, Henri. *Critique of Everyday Life: The Three-Volume Text*. Translated by Gregory Elliott. London: Verso, 2014.

———. *The Production of Space*. Translated by Donald Nicholson-Smith. Nachdr. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2011.

Leslie, W. Bruce. *GENTLEMEN AND SCHOLARS: College and Community in the Age of the University.* S.l.: ROUTLEDGE, 2018.

Lowe, Roy. *A Western Acropolis of Learning: The University of California in 1897*. Chapters in the History of the University of California, no. 5. Berkeley: Center for Studies in Higher Education and Institute of Governmental Studies, University of California, Berkeley, 1996.

Madley, Benjamin. *An American Genocide: The United States and the California Indian Catastrophe, 1846-1873*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 2016.

———. "Op-Ed: It's Time to Acknowledge the Genocide of California's Indians." *Los Angeles Times*. May 22, 2016. https://www.latimes.com/opinion/op-ed/la-oe-madley-california-genocide-20160522-snap-story.html.

Marcus, Alan I. *Agricultural Science and the Quest for Legitimacy : Farmers, Agricultural Colleges, and Experiment Stations, 1870-1890*. Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1985.

———. *Engineering in a Land-Grant Context : The Past, Present, and Future of an Idea*. West Lafayette, Ind.: Purdue University Press, 2005.

———. *Science as Service : Establishing and Reformulating American Land-Grant Universities, 1865-1930*, 2015.

———. *Service as Mandate : How American Land-Grant Universities Shaped the Modern World, 1920-2015*, 2015.

Marez, Curtis. *Farm Worker Futurism: Speculative Technologies of Resistance*. Difference Incorporated. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2016.

Marks, Paula Mitchell. *In a Barren Land: The American Indian Quest for Cultural Survival, 1607 to the Present*. New York: Perennial, 2002.

McCain, James A. "DESIGNED FOR RELEVANCE: THE LAND-GRANT UNIVERSITIES." *The Centennial Review* 14, no. 1 (1970): 91–107.

McConnell, Grant. *Decline of Agrarian Democracy*. Antheneum Paperbacks 150. Scribner, 1969.

McDonnell, Janet A. *The Dispossession of the American Indian, 1887-1934*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991.

McDowell, George R. *Land-Grant Universities and Extension into the 21st Century: Renegotiating or Abandoning a Social Contract*. 1st ed. Ames: Iowa State University Press, 2001.

McWilliams, Carey. *Factories in the Field: The Story of Migratory Farm Labor in California*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2000.

Mead, Elwood, Mortimer Fleishhacker, Prescott F. Cogswell, Frank P. Flint, and E.S. Wangenheim. "Report of the State Land Settlement Board of the State of California." Sacramento: State Land Settlement Board, September 30, 1920.

Mead, Elwood, Mortimer Fleishhacker, Frank P. Flint, E. S. Wangenheim, and California State Land Settlement Board. "Information Regarding Progress under the Land Settlement Act of the State of California and about the Plans for Soldier Settlement in the Future." Sacramento: California State Land Settlement Board, May 30, 1919. https://archive.org/details/informationregar00caliiala/page/n1.

Mead, Elwood, Harris Winstock, David P. Barows, Mortimer Fleishhacker, and Chester Rowell. "Report of the Commission on Land Colonization and Rural Credits of the State of California. November 29, 1916." Sacramento: Commission on Land Colonization and Rural Credits, November 29, 1916. https://archive.org/details/reportofcommissi00caliiala/page/6.

Melamed, Jodi. "Racial Capitalism." *Critical Ethnic Studies* 1, no. 1 (2015): 76–85. https://doi.org/10.5749/jcritethnstud.1.1.0076.

———. *Represent and Destroy: Rationalizing Violence in the New Racial Capitalism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011.

Merritt, Karen, and Jane Fiori Lawrence. *From Rangeland to Research University: The Birth of the University of California, Merced*. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass, 2007. http://rave.ohiolink.edu/ejournals/issn/02710560.

Mitchell, Don. *The Lie of the Land: Migrant Workers and the California Landscape*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996.

———. *They Saved the Crops: Labor, Landscape, and the Struggle over Industrial Farming in Bracero-Era California*. 1st ed. Geographies of Justice and Social Transformation 10. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2012.

Mitchell, Timothy. *Rule of Experts: Egypt, Techno-Politics, Modernity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.

Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. *Feminism without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity*. Durham ; London: Duke University Press, 2003.

Moore, S. A. W. "'We Feel the Want of Protection': The Politics of Law and Race in California, 1848-1878." *California History* 81, no. 3–4 (January 1, 2003): 96–125. https://doi.org/10.2307/25161701.

Moraga, Cherríe. *Heroes and Saints and Other Plays*. 6. print. Albuquerque, NM: West End Press, 2007.

Morrill, Justin S. *Speech of Hon. Justin S. Morrill, of Vermont, on the Bill Granting Lands for Agricultural Colleges: Delivered in the House of Representatives, April 20, 1858*. Washington: Printed at the Congressional globe office, 1858. http://www.archive.org/details/cu31924013061282.

Muñoz, Manuel. *The Faith Healer of Olive Avenue*. 1st ed. Chapel Hill, N.C: Algonquin Books Of Chapel Hill, 2007.

———. *Zigzagger*. Latino Voices. Evanston, Ill: Northwestern University Press, 2003.

Nash, Linda Lorraine. *Inescapable Ecologies: A History of Environment, Disease, and Knowledge*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006.

———. "The Fruits of Ill-Health: Pesticides and Workers' Bodies in Post-World War II California." *Osiris*, 2nd Series, 19, no. Landscapes of Exposure: Knowledge and Illness in Modern Environments (January 1, 2004): 203–19. https://doi.org/10.2307/3655240.

National Monument of America Nebraska. "Homestead: State by State Numbers." National Park Service: Homestead, 2015. https://www.nps.gov/home/learn/historyculture/statenumbers.htm.

North, Caroline P. "The Land Grant Universities: The First Centennial." *Marriage and Family Living* 24, no. 2 (1962): 187–88. https://doi.org/10.2307/347011.

Office of University Relations. "A Brief History of the University of California." Berkeley, CA: University of California, 1974.

Okihiro, Gary Y. *Third World Studies: Theorizing Liberation*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2016.

Panter, John. "Central California Colony: 'Marvel of the Desert.'" *The Journal of the Fresno City and County Historical Society* 36, no. 2 (1994): 1–11.

Paschal, Mark Randall. *The Failure of Reform : A History of Higher Education in the United States.* 2016.

Pasour, E. C. *Agriculture and the State: Market Processes and Bureaucracy*. Oakland, Calif.: Independent Institute, 1990.

Perkins, Tracy. "Voices from the Valley — Environmental Justice in California's San Joaquin Valley." Voices From the Valley. Accessed May 25, 2015. http://www.voicesfromthevalley.org/.

Perkins, Tracy, and Julie Sze. "Images from the Central Valley." *Boom: A Journal of California* 1, no. 1 (March 2011): 70–80. https://doi.org/10.1525/boom.2011.1.1.71.

Pisani, Donald J. *From the Family Farm to Agribusiness: The Irrigation Crusade in California and the West, 1850-1931*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.

Powell, J. M. "Mead, Elwood (1858-1936)." In *Australian Dictionary of Biography. Volume 10. 1891-1939, Lat-Ner*, by Bede. Nairn and Geoffrey Serle. Carlton, Vic.: Melbourne University Press, 1986.

Pratt, Mary Louise. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. London ; New York: Routledge, 1992.

Preston, William L. *Vanishing Landscapes: Land and Life in the Tulare Lake Basin*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981.

Pulido, Laura. *Environmentalism and Economic Justice: Two Chicano Struggles in the Southwest*. Society, Environment, and Place. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1996.

Pyle, Kevin, and Craig Gilmore. *Prison Town: Paying the Price*. The Real Cost of Prisons Comix 1. Canada: The Real Cost of Prisons Project, 2015. http://www.realcostofprisons.org/materials/comics/prison_town.pdf.

Readings, Bill. *The University in Ruins*. 4. print. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1999.

Reinhold, Robert. "Battle for California Campus Waged Far From Urban Glow." *The New York Times*. November 26, 1988. https://www.nytimes.com/1988/11/26/us/battle-for-california-campus-waged-far-from-urban-glow.html.

Ritchie, Robert Welles. “Rural Democracy at Delhi: It Is Changing a Sandy Waste into Another Durham Colony.” *Country Gentleman*, November 27, 1920.

Robinson, Cedric J. *Black Marxism: The Making of the Black Radical Tradition*. Chapel Hill, N.C: University of North Carolina Press, 2000.

Ross, Karen. “California Agricultural Statistics Review 2017-2018.” Sacramento, CA: California Department of Food and Agriculture, 2019. https://www.cdfa.ca.gov/Statistics/PDFs/2017-18AgReport.pdf.

Ruiz, Fred. “Why the next UC Regent Should Be from the Central Valley.” *The Sacramento Bee*, January 17, 2018. http://www.sacbee.com/opinion/california-forum/article195004704.html.

Ruppel, Kristin T. *Unearthing Indian Land: Living with the Legacies of Allotment*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2008.

Schapsmeier, Edward L., and Frederick H. Schapsmeier. “Eisenhower and Agricultural Reform: Ike’s Farm Policy Legacy Appraised.” *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 51, no. 2 (April 1992): 147–59.

Scheuring, Ann Foley. *Tillers : An Oral History of Family Farms in California*. New York, N.Y.: Praeger, 1983.

———. *Valley Empires : Hugh Glenn and Henry Miller in the Shaping of California*. Rumsey Calif.: Gold Oak Press, 2010.

Scheuring, Ann Foley, Chester O McCorkle, and James Lyons. *Science & Service: A History of the Land-Grant University and Agriculture in California*. Oakland, Calif.: ANR Publications, University of California, 1995.

Scheuring, Ann Foley., and Davis. University of California. *Abundant Harvest : The History of the University of California, Davis*. [Davis, Calif.]: UC Davis History Project, 2001.

Scheuring, Ann Foley., and University of California (System). *A Guidebook to California Agriculture*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.

Scheuring, Ann Foley., University of California (System)., and Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources. *“A Sustaining Comradeship” : The Story of University of California Cooperative Extension, 1913-1988 : A Brief History Prepared for UCCE’s 75th Anniversary*. Berkeley, Calif.: Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources, University of California, 1988.

Seib, Kenneth. *The Slow Death of Fresno State: A California Campus under Reagan and Brown*. Palo Alto, Calif: Ramparts Press, 1979.

Shah, Nayan. *Stranger Intimacy: Contesting Race, Sexuality, and the Law in the North American West*. American Crossroads 31. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011.

Shippey, Mervyn G. "A Short History of the Visalia Colored School." San Francisco: R and E Research Associates, Publishers and Distributors of Ethnic Studies, 1970.

Sifuentez, Mario. "Land, Water, and Labor: Farmworkers, the National Land for People and the Westlands." presented at the UC Junior Faculty Lecture Series, Riverside, CA, April 25, 2018.

———. *Of Forests and Fields: Mexican Labor in the Pacific Northwest*. Latinidad : Transnational Cultures in the United States. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 2016.

Smith, Neil. *Uneven Development: Nature, Capital, and the Production of Space*. 3rd ed. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2008.

Smith, Stacey L. *Freedom's Frontier: California and the Struggle over Unfree Labor, Emancipation, and Reconstruction*. Chapel Hill, NC: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 2013.

Sorber, Nathan M. *Farmers, Scientists, and Officers of Industry: The Formation AndReformation of Land-Grant Colleges in the Northeastern UnitedStates, 1862-1906*, 2011.

———. *Land-Grant Colleges and Popular Revolt: The Origins of the Morrill Act and the Reform of Higher Education*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2018.

Sorber, Nathan M., and Roger L. Geiger. "The Welding of Opposite Views: Land-Grant Historiography at 150 Years," 2014.

Stadtman, Verne A., ed. *Berkeley at Mid-Century: Elements of a Golden Age*. Berkeley, Calif: Berkeley Public Policy Press, 2002.

———. *The University of California, 1868-1968*. 1st ed. United States of America: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

State Colonization and Rural Credits Commission, Elwood Mead, Chester Rowell, Harris Weinstock, H Fleishhacker, David P. Barrows, and David N. Morgan. "Land Settlement and Rural Credits: The Need for an Investigation in California:

Abstract of Statement of State Colonization and Rural Credits Commission." Sacramento: State Colonization and Rural Credits Commission, October 1916.

State Land Settlement Board. "Food First: How One Western State Is Staking the Farmers | Rural Democracy at Delhi: It Is Changing a Sandy Waste into Another Durham Colony." Sacramento: State Land Settlement Board, December 1920.

Stein, Sharon. "Confronting the Racial-Colonial Foundations of US Higher Education." *Journal for the Study of Postsecondary and Tertiary Education* 3 (2018): 077–096. https://doi.org/10.28945/4105.

———. "Higher Education and the Im/Possibility of Transformative Justice." *Critical Ethnic Studies* 4, no. 1 (2018): 130. https://doi.org/10.5749/jcritethnstud.4.1.0130.

Stock, Catherine McNicol, and Robert D. Johnston, eds. *The Countryside in the Age of the Modern State: Political Histories of Rural America*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001.

Surls, Rachel, and Judith Gerber. *From Cows to Concrete: The Rise and Fall of Farming in Los Angeles*. Santa Monica, CA: Angel City Press, 2016.

Taylor, Stuart. "Coast Lawyer Reported as Legal Aid Choice." *The New York Times*. November 8, 1981. https://www.nytimes.com/1981/11/08/us/coast-lawyer-reported-as-legal-aid-choice.html.

———. "House Panel Rebuffs Reagan and Backs Keeping Legal Aid for Poor." *The New York Times*. May 14, 1981. https://www.nytimes.com/1981/05/14/us/house-panel-rebuffs-reagan-and-backs-keeping-legal-aid-for-poor.html.

Teisch, Jessica B. *Engineering Nature: Water, Development & the Global Spread of American Environmental Expertise*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2011.

Tilden, Freeman, Robert Emmett Jones, and California State Land Settlement Board. "How California Helps Men Own Farms and Rural Homes." Sacramento: California State Printing Office, June 1920. https://archive.org/details/howcaliforniahe00jonegoog/.

University of California. *Free Enterprise and University Research*. University of California Press, 1954.

Watson, Kent, Peter S. Van Houten, University of California, Berkeley, and University of California, Berkeley, eds. *The University in the 1870s*. Chapters in the History of the University of California, no. 6. Berkeley, Calif: Center for Studies in Higher

Education and Institute of Governmental Studies, University of California, Berkeley, 1996.

Weber, Devra. *Dark Sweat, White Gold: California Farm Workers, Cotton, and the New Deal*. 1. paperback print. Berkeley, Calif.: Univ. of California Press, 1996.

Weffer, Simón E., James J. Mullooly, Dari E. Sylvester, Robin M. DeLugan, and Marcia D. Hernandez. "Partnerships Across Campuses and Throughout Communities: Community Engaged Research in California's Central San Joaquin Valley." In *Community Quality-of-Life Indicators: Best Cases VI*, edited by M. Joseph Sirgy, Rhonda Phillips, and Don Rahtz, 119–41. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands, 2013. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-6501-6_6.

Why Braceros?, 1959. https://archive.org/details/WhyBrace1959.

Wilder, Craig Steven. *Ebony & Ivy: Race, Slavery, and the Troubled History of America's Universities*, 2013.

Williams, Raymond. *The Country and the City*. 1. issued as an Oxford Univ. Press paperback, repr. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1975.

Wolfe, Patrick. "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native." *Journal of Genocide Research* 8, no. 4 (2006): 387–409. https://doi.org/0.1080/14623520601056240.

Woods, Clyde Adrian, and Ruth Wilson Gilmore. *Development Arrested: The Blues and Plantation Power in the Mississippi Delta*. Paperback edition. London : New York: Verso, 2017.