



2018 HAWAII UNIVERSITY INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES
ARTS, HUMANITIES, SOCIAL SCIENCES & EDUCATION JANUARY 3 - 6, 2018
PRINCE WAIKIKI HOTEL, HONOLULU, HAWAII

OH BROTHER, WHERE ART THOU?:
LULAC, THE 1946 EL PASO COPPER STRIKE,
AND THE START OF A LEGACY



CANNON, LAURA
DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
UNIVERSITY OF THE INCARNATE WORD
SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS

Dr. Laura Cannon
Department of History
University of the Incarnate Word
San Antonio, Texas

Oh Brother, Where Art Thou?: LULAC, the 1946 El Paso Copper Strike, and the Start of a Legacy

Synopsis:

After WWII, LULAC earned a reputation as an out-of-touch, middle-class, assimilationist organization. When copper workers in El Paso struck in 1946, the local LULAC council did not respond. This paper uses the strike, and LULAC's lack of response, as a case study to examine how the negative characterization of LULAC emerged in the post-war period.

Oh Brother, Where Art Thou?: LULAC, the 1946 El Paso Copper Strike, and the Start of a Legacy

This paper examines League of United Latin American Citizens' (LULAC) activities during the 1946 copper workers strike in El Paso, Texas. This case study illustrates how LULAC earned a reputation as an out-of-touch middle-class organization.

Throughout the 1930s, local LULAC councils actively pursued community campaigns that matched the Mexican American civil rights organization's larger agenda by opposing educational, social, and economic discrimination. World War II interrupted LULAC's civil rights efforts both nationally and locally. After the war, the organization regrouped under a unified national agenda that made access to equal education LULAC's top priority. Therefore, when El Paso copper workers struck for national wage standards, El Paso Local Council No. 132 had other civil rights concerns. Mexican American workers, in turn, looked to the Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO) and other unions for support.

LULAC's lack of response to the El Paso strike helps explain why many scholars have characterized LULAC as an out-of-touch middle-class organization focused on "the politics of accommodation." Traditionally, the LULAC historiography has overlooked both the organization's early commitment to workers and dynamic civil rights activism by local LULAC councils before World War II. Instead, scholarship has focused on post-war activities and delivered a sometimes-negative analysis of LULAC as an ineffective top-down organization.¹

LULAC was founded in 1929 by 175 Mexican American civil rights activists in Corpus Christi, Texas. Their goal was to form a single group that would represent the Mexican American community in its fight for civil rights. LULAC's civil rights agenda built upon a legacy of activism that had emerged in the Mexican American community after World War I.

Most LULAC founders had served during the war and were proud of their military records. These veterans returned to Texas with an increased political consciousness about the benefits and duties of U.S. citizenship. But these veterans faced the same discrimination that had existed before the war. In fact, racial segregation and discrimination against Mexicans increased after nativist attitudes were codified into law. Mexican American veterans found that the United States offered them the chance to die for their country but would deny them the right to eat at certain restaurants, take particular jobs, or go to “white” schools.²

LULAC founders were successful, middle class, and professionals, but they had not always been so. Nor had they always lived privileged lives. Most were born in the U.S. to working-class families and recognized the struggles workers and immigrants faced. Many LULAC founders were college educated. Their education had exposed them to Americanization efforts in Texas schools. The men were bilingual and conceptualized themselves as Mexican and American. They recognized American citizenship was the banner under which Mexican Americans could legally demand constitutional and civil rights.³

Some critics have suggested that LULAC’s emphasis on citizenship meant the organization encouraged members to abandon their Mexican heritage. But LULAC’s founders were clearly proud of their multicultural backgrounds. These leaders chose to refer to themselves as “Mexican Americans.” LULAC’s constitution reflected the founders’ understanding of their identity, the variety of challenges their community faced, and the role these men wanted LULAC to play in that community. “Lulackers” used patriotic language and the political privileges of citizenship to integrate Mexican Americans fully into American society. Article 2 of the LULAC Constitution listed the organization’s “Aims and Purposes.” This list made clear that LULAC was founded as a civil rights organization. It understood the political and social climate of Texas

and therefore sought to use citizenship as a strategy to fight for rights. Aim One was “to develop within the members of our race the best, purest, and most perfect type of a true and loyal citizen of the United States of America.”⁴

Throughout the 1930s and '40s, state and national board members traveled across the Southwest to established local councils. These councils served the unique political needs of their communities. Once in place, local councils independently interpreted how to implement LULAC's civil rights agenda to best address local concerns. LULAC councils in Texas regularly supported local striking workers. For example, members of Del Rio Council No. 18 led workers in a strike against the sheep and goat shearing industry in 1934. Council No. 12 in Laredo fought along-side striking onion workers in 1935. When 12,000 pecan shellers went on strike in San Antonio in 1938, Local Council No. 2 championed the strikers' cause. But the council waited until after accusations of Communist involvement had dissipated before coming forward.⁵

World War II disrupted LULAC's work at the local, state, and national levels. Many Lulackers joined the war effort. As a result, membership dues dried up and councils went dormant. By 1945, only fifteen councils were still active.⁶ To rejuvenate the organization, National President General Arnulfo Zamora proposed to unite LULAC's local councils under a single civil rights agenda that focused LULAC's activities on education. Workers' concerns were pushed to the side. Therefore, when El Paso copper workers struck in 1946, LULAC Council No. 132 did not respond in way other councils had in the past.

El Paso was the center of the multi-million-dollar international operation for the American Smelting and Refining Company (ASARCO). The Phelps Dodge copper company moved its headquarters to El Paso in 1902 and built a private rail line to connect the company's mining properties in Arizona, New Mexico, and northern Mexico to El Paso.⁷

The copper industry drew large numbers of workers – both Mexican and Anglo – to El Paso. Job discrimination and job segregation were common at both ASARCO and Phelps Dodge. Generally, the more skilled the job, the fewer Mexicans hired for the position. Wages reflected the racial division of work. Anglo workers at ASARCO averaged \$3.75 a day in 1929. Mexican workers averaged \$2.03 a day. Mexican workers received no health benefits.⁸

The two most significant responses to growing racial segregation in El Paso were the establishment of civil rights organizations and labor unions. The first local LULAC council was chartered in 1932 to address discrimination. Council No. 8 initially had thirty-four members, several of whom were community leaders.⁹ The League stayed active in El Paso throughout the 1930s. Council No. 8 regularly announced meetings in the *El Paso Herald-Post*. The council campaigned for repeal of prohibition, worked with the school board to clean up schools in the South El Paso barrios, hosted dances, helped delinquent children, established a Boys Club of America chapter, fought against Mexicans being classified as “colored” in state birth and death records, funded a new playground in South El Paso, advocated child labor laws, sponsored health weeks, ran poll-tax drives, and generally protested discrimination against Mexican Americans.¹⁰

When World War II broke out, Council No. 8, like others in Texas, saw its membership decline as men joined the military. As a result, Council No. 8 lost its charter. LULAC members were reorganized in 1942 as Council No. 132. Although the council had a new number, several of the same men were active members.¹¹

The El Paso council attempted to reach out to local workers. In 1944, Council No. 132 partnered with the Committee on Fair Employment Practices to investigate job discrimination at the ASARCO smelter. The probe found “little or no” discrimination against Mexican Americans. This report conflicted with the testimony of Mexican American employees. Therefore, workers

sought other means of addressing discrimination.¹² Instead of emphasizing constitutional rights, workers interpreted civil rights in economic terms. They sought elimination of job and wage discrimination. They saw economic equality with other U.S. workers as a means of joining mainstream U.S. society. Many turned to labor unions, instead of LULAC, to achieve this goal.

Union organizing among Mexican workers at the ASARCO smelter and Phelps Dodge refinery gained momentum in the 1930s and 1940s with the emergence of the CIO and its affiliated International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers (IUMMSW). The CIO treated all workers, regardless of job or skill, as equals. The approach appealed to Mexican American workers in El Paso's copper industry. Unionizing strengthened collective bargaining at the El Paso plants by uniting unskilled workers for the first time. Humberto Silex and J.B. Chávez worked with the IUMMSW to organize Mexican workers at Phelps Dodge refinery into Local No. 501. Ignacio Tovar was president of Local No. 509 at the ASARCO smelter. IUMMSW worked with the Confederación de Trabajadores Mexicanos (CTM) in Juárez to organize Mexican nationals employed in the El Paso copper industry. This cooperation was unique in the Texas labor movement. However, leaders of El Paso locals were Mexican Americans. This leadership was significant because U.S. citizens had greater legal and constitutional protections than Mexican nationals working at the plants. Nevertheless, union success depended on organizing workers from both sides of the border.¹³

ASARCO and Phelps Dodge officials attempted to undermine unionization efforts. Companies monitored which employees attended union meetings. Workers who signed with the union were sometimes fired. The El Paso Chamber of Commerce blacklisted those who were fired as "troublemakers," which made finding other work difficult. Company management worked with local immigration officials. They threatened to deport workers who were Mexican

nationals if they joined the union. Companies used red baiting to undermine the union.

During World War II, rather than striking and hindering the war effort, Locals 501 and 509 appealed to federal regulatory agencies to negotiate new contracts with Phelps Dodge and ASARCO.¹⁴ After the war, the IUMMSW sought higher wages for all members. The drive led to the first significant strike by Mexican American union members in El Paso. The ASARCO and Phelps Dodge plants were two of the city's largest industrial employers. The strikes involved more than 1,000 workers.¹⁵ The walkout interrupted copper production across the country for three months. Newspapers nationwide published stories on the strike.

In February 1946, IUMMSW announced that unless ASARCO agreed to increase wages at all eighteen of its plants and to accept industrywide bargaining, the union would call a nationwide strike. ASARCO refused. The walkout began peacefully in El Paso at 7 a.m. February 25. ASARCO workers walked off the job at the same time in Arizona, California, Colorado, Illinois, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, New Jersey, Utah, and Washington.¹⁶ On February 26, the IUMMSW gave notice that a strike of all Phelps Dodge copper refineries was to begin the next Monday. The demands were similar to those at ASARCO – a national contract and higher wages.¹⁷ When the company refused to meet the demands, the walkout was called. On Monday, March 4, more than 500 members of Local 501 joined Phelps Dodge workers in New Jersey, New York, and Illinois on strike.¹⁸

ASARCO plant manager R.D. Bradford maintained the strike was not justified because the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) had ruled the previous year that contracts should be made with individual plants, not nationally. Therefore, he said, the union had no right to demand industrywide standards. Bradford argued that the union's wage demands did not account for regional cost of living differences. Bradford offered an eight-and-a-half-cent-per-hour raise for

workers in the lowest wage bracket and a five-cent-per-hour raise for those in higher wage brackets.¹⁹ The offer would raise wages from sixty-one-and-a-quarter-cents per hour to seventy-cents per hour for the lowest wage earners.²⁰ The union refused the offer on grounds that the national officers called the strike to get a national contract.²¹

Striking workers found support from a variety of sources. On February 26, the CTM voted to back ASARCO strikers by not allowing workers from Mexico to serve as strike breakers.²² El Paso labor groups and businesses also backed the strikers. The United Bakery Workers local sent boxes of donuts and bread to the union hall. The Hollywood Café treated all sixty-eight women in the union to a free lunch.²³

On March 7, the union hosted a mass meeting. IUMMSW National President Reid Robinson addressed about 1,500 attendees. He announced that 500 workers at the Phelps Dodge refinery in Los Angeles would join the general strike March 18. He called for support from the El Paso community and noted that smelting was the city's largest industry. Therefore, the industry set wage patterns for El Paso, which he called the nation's lowest pay city.²⁴ Robinson praised local and national organizations that had already pledged support for strikers. These groups included the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, the CIO, CTM, the Latin American Federation of Labor, and the World Federation of Labor. He called for more support from the local Mexican American community. He declared that "business and professional men should be behind the strike 100 percent" as a sound business investment and to support members of their community who were fighting wage discrimination.²⁵

After Robinson's remarks, J.B. Chavez, president of Local 501, and Ignacio Tovar, president of Local 509, sent letters to El Paso community members to ask for support. Union leaders reminded the community that the strike was "your fight, as well as ours" because better

wages meant more transactions for merchants, doctors, dentists, and all other businesses. The letter recalled struggles of the Great Depression, when overproduction caused industries to fail and Americans to suffer. The letters argued that people needed higher wages and better purchasing power to prevent overproduction from crippling the nation's businesses again.²⁶

Because LULAC members were local merchants, lawyers, teachers, and businessmen, Lulackers were likely part of Chavez and Tovar's desired audience. In November 1936, outgoing LULAC Council No. 8 President J.E. Amador had claimed in a year-end activity summary that the local group's greatest achievement was the unquestioned recognition by city and county authorities, leading businessmen, and the community of LULAC's leadership in civic affairs.²⁷ In 1946, however, the local council ignored Chavez and Tovar's calls for strike support. Instead, Council No. 132 focused on the school board election later in March. Ernesto Valdes, council chaplain, was running for a board position to represent the south and east sides of El Paso. Teachers were underpaid, and the south-side schools were overcrowded. Local LULAC members were focused on fighting educational discrimination, even with an active fight in their city against economic discrimination.²⁸

Despite LULAC's lack of interest, several other organizations aided strikers. The IUMMSW ran a soup kitchen. Members of the local bakery union donated bread to it. According to Chavez, several unnamed businesses made "appreciated contributions" to the strike effort. The Citizens' Committee to Aid CIO Strikers bought ads in the *El Paso Herald-Post* to ask for contributions from the community. The ad presented "facts" of the strikers' case. These facts included current wages paid to El Paso smelter and refinery workers compared to wages paid elsewhere and information on the profits of companies that had violated the National Labor Relations Act. The ad noted that the strike outcome would affect everyone in El Paso. Winning

the strike would mean greater prosperity for all people of El Paso, greater buying power, and a better standard of living.²⁹ The ad helped raise more than \$300 to help the strikers.³⁰

Negotiations between industry and union representatives continued throughout March and April. In March, the U.S. Secretary of Labor appointed a fact-finding board to investigate the strike and industry conditions. The three-man board heard testimony from both sides.³¹ On April 30, the federal fact-finding board endorsed an eighteen-and-a-half-cent-per-hour pay increase for all workers at all ASARCO and Phelps Dodge operations, including the 1,050 men on strike in El Paso. ASARCO and Phelps Dodge representatives deemed the board's recommendations "foolish" and said they would not agree to them; therefore, the strike continued into May.³²

Workers in El Paso renewed calls for community support and picketed the copper refinery and smelter to remind employers that workers were still on strike and determined to win. An orderly crowd of about 150 men – and one woman – was stationed outside the plant entrance. Pickets held signs that read "We Stand for the Roosevelt Bill of Rights."³³

Despite the active work by the union and the publicity the strike was receiving, LULAC still did not publically support the strike. Instead, LULAC No. 132 focused on helping to host an "I am an American" Day program in El Paso for 434 newly naturalized American citizens. The council did the celebration in cooperation with U.S. Immigration officials, the local bar association, and several religious leaders.³⁴

By June 1, 1,050 workers at the El Paso ASARCO and Phelps Dodge operations had lost a combined 97,250 man-days and \$510,000 in wages.³⁵ Both sides were eager to settle the strike, but ASARCO and Phelps Dodge officials were still ignoring recommendations of the federal fact-finding board and holding out for a copper price increase by the Office of Price Administration (OPA) to offset increased labor costs.³⁶ The OPA refused, and the plants agreed

to re-enter negotiations with the union. Talks quickly broke down over disagreements about back pay, vacations, union security, and the length of the new contract.³⁷ However, ASARCO reached an agreement with national representatives of the IUMMSW June 12, and strikers at the eighteen ASARCO smelters across the nation voted to return to work the next Monday. The agreement secured the eighteen-and-a-half-cent-per-hour wage increase and retroactive pay for strikers. On June 28, a settlement with Phelps Dodge units in Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona was reached. The agreement allowed for an eighteen-and-a-half-cent-per-hour raise and guaranteed workers back pay. The refinery would reopen the next day.³⁸ Workers applauded the union and the agreement because they were now the best-paid workers in the Southwest. The IUMMSW had successfully begun to erode the system of “Mexican jobs” and “Mexican wages” in the region.³⁹

In June 1946, as the strike was ending in El Paso, members of LULAC Council No. 132 headed to Houston for the organization’s seventeenth annual national convention. There, President General Arnulfo Zamora discussed the role LULAC would play in the post-war period. LULAC had been established in 1929 to fight for the welfare of Mexican Americans, Zamora said, but had done little to achieve that goal. LULAC councils had been “haphazardly pecking” at the surface of problems. These disconnected efforts were not the ideal way to fight for civil rights.⁴⁰ To help reinvigorate the organization and unite it under clear objectives, Zamora identified six key areas of focus: 1) fight educational discrimination, 2) establish Boy Scout troops, 3) participate in community athletics, 4) develop night schools for adults, 5) organize pay-your-poll-tax campaigns, and 6) promote efforts to raise LULAC’s public profile.

These objectives help explain why the local council in El Paso seemed to ignore strikers as they called upon the business community for support. Council No. 132 continued to be actively involved with the LULAC national board and to apply the national agenda to the local

community. Modesto Gomez of El Paso served as a trustee on the national board for several years, and several El Paso members held positions on the national education committee. However, low LULAC membership in El Paso limited the number of campaigns the local council took on and therefore limited the impact of the organization in the community.⁴¹ If the council had supported the strike, it might have become part of the national story. That publicity would have supported national goal 6 and possibly increased the membership and influence of the El Paso unit.

Council No. 132's lack of involvement with striking Phelps Dodge and ASARCO workers can lead to two possible conclusions: 1) The council did not have adequate resources to support the cause. Membership was down. Funds were restricted. Therefore, leaders chose instead to focus on education and citizenship – two key pieces of the organization's national agenda. Lack of resources does not, however, explain why the council did not publicly support the strike, which might have raised the organization's profile – another point on the national agenda. 2) LULAC members in El Paso did not care about striking workers or issues involved in the labor actions. The organization had strategically decided to focus on other causes. For example, Gomez was part of the national board when LULAC took on school segregation in the *Mendez vs. Westminster* case in California in 1946.

Because LULAC leaders unified the organization's civil rights strategy in 1946 around fighting discrimination in public education, historians have tended to overlook the variety of the League's pre-war activities. The assumption is that LULAC was always centralized. Many historians, especially former Chicano activists, deemed the agenda set by LULAC in 1946 insufficient and ineffective. Nevertheless, LULAC continued to fight for civil rights during the post-war period. But the focus of these efforts had narrowed. The concern was access to public

education, not workers' rights.

¹ See, for example, John R. Chavez, *The Lost Land: The Chicano Image of the Southwest* (Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1984); John C. Hammerback, Richard J. Jensen, and José Ángel Gutiérrez, *A War of Words: Chicano Protest in the 1960s and 1970s* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1985); Karen O'Conner and Lee Epstein, "A Legal Voice for the Chicano Community: The Activities of the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund, 1968-1982," in *The Mexican American Experience: An Interdisciplinary Anthology*, ed. Rodolfo O. De La Garza (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1985); Robert R. Brischetto, *The Political Power of Texas Mexicans, 1974-1988* (San Antonio, TX: Southwest Voter Research Institute, 1988); Roberto E. Villarreal, Norma G. Hernández, and Howard D. Neighbor, eds., *Latino Empowerment: Problems and Prospects* (New York City, NY: Greenwood Press, 1988); Armando Navarro, *Mexicano Political Experience in Occupied Atzlán: Struggles and Change* (Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press, 2005), 206-209; Armando Navarro, *Mexicano and Latino Politics and the Quest for Self-Determination: What Needs to Be Done* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2015), 59.

² Transcript, *El Paladín*, February 22, 1929, Oliver Douglas Weeks Papers, Benson Latin American Collection, University of Texas at Austin; Márquez, *LULAC*, 17; Cynthia E. Orozco, *No Mexicans, Women, or Dogs Allowed: The Rise of the Mexican American Civil Rights Movement* (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 2009), 55, 90, 160-163.

³ Orozco, *No Mexicans, Women, or Dogs Allowed*, 160-163.

⁴ Constitution of the League of United Latin American Citizens, 1929, Oliver Douglas Weeks Papers, Benson Latin American Collection, University of Texas at Austin. For a short but detailed biography of each of LULAC's founding fathers, please see Orozco, *No Mexicans, Women, or Dogs Allowed*, Chapter 4.

⁵ For more information, see Laura Cannon, "Situational Solidarity: LULAC's Civil Rights Strategy and the Challenge of the Mexican American Worker, 1934-1946" (PhD diss., Texas Tech University, 2016).

⁶ "Minutes of the Seventeenth National Assembly of the League of United Latin American Citizens Held in the City of Houston, Texas, June 15th and 16th, 1946," *LULAC News*, July, 1946.

⁷ Monica Perales, *Smelertown: Making and Remembering a Southwest Border Community* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2010), 35-38; Mario T. García, *Desert Immigrants: The Mexicans of El Paso, 1880-1920*, Yale Western Americana Series 32 (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1981), 49-52.

⁸ Perales, *Smelertown*, 42-43, 114-115, 118; Mario T. García, *Mexican Americans: Leadership, Ideology, and Identity, 1930-1960*, Yale Western Americana Series 36 (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989), 176-180; García, *Desert Immigrants*, 51-52.

⁹ *El Paso Herald-Post*, "Citizen Unity Aim of League," November 1, 1932.

¹⁰ *El Paso Herald-Post*, "Will Urge Votes for Beer, Bonds," August 14, 1933, "Discuss Beer Election," August 16, 1933, "Lulacs Help Bowie," October 16, 1933, "Citizen's League Holds Public Dance," April 14, 1934, "Club Members Help Give 17 Boys New Start in Life," March 29, 1935, "Boy's Club Officer Arrives in El Paso," March 23, 1936, "Birth Record Fight Widened," October 10, 1936, "School Section Cleanup Begun," October 29, 1936, "Thanks for Help," January 19, 1937, "Church Leaders Oppose Child Labor Amendment," January 21, 1937, "Street Cleanup Aim of League," April 21, 1937, "League Opens Poll Tax Drive," January 9, 1940.

¹¹ *El Paso Herald-Post*, "LULAC Reorganized, New Officers Named," February 16, 1942.

¹² *El Paso Herald-Post*, "Discrimination Inquiry Set," February 19, 1944, "Discrimination Slight in E.P., Committee Finds," February 21, 1944, "CIO Leaders Present Cases on Discrimination," February 28, 1944.

¹³ Perales, *Smelertown*, 132-136; García, *Mexican Americans*, 176-181.

¹⁴ García, *Mexican Americans*, 189-190.

-
- ¹⁵ *El Paso Herald-Post*, "CIO Leaders Say Refinery Strike to Start Monday," February 26, 1946; "Refinery Strike Conference Called," February 27, 1946.
- ¹⁶ *El Paso Herald-Post*, "Strike Closes El Paso Smelter," February 25, 1946.
- ¹⁷ *El Paso Herald-Post*, "CIO Leaders Say Refinery Strike to Start Monday," February 26, 1946; "Refinery Strike Conference Called," February 27, 1946.
- ¹⁸ *El Paso Herald Post*, "Strike Closes Copper Refinery," March 4, 1946.
- ¹⁹ *El Paso Herald-Post*, "Strike Closes El Paso Smelter," February 25, 1946.
- ²⁰ *El Paso Herald-Post*, "The Copper Strikes," March 22, 1946.
- ²¹ *El Paso Herald-Post*, "Strike Closes El Paso Smelter," February 25, 1946.
- ²² *El Paso Herald-Post*, "Mexican Union Supports Strike of Smelter Workers," February 26, 1946.
- ²³ *El Paso Herald-Post*, "Mexican Union Supports Strike of Smelter Workers," February 26, 1946.
- ²⁴ *El Paso Herald-Post*, "Smelter Workers Set L.A. Strike," March 8, 1946.
- ²⁵ *El Paso Herald-Post*, "Smelter Workers Set L.A. Strike," March 8, 1946.
- ²⁶ Letter by J.B. Chavez and Ignacio Tovar, n.d., Box 55, Folder 4, Western Federation of Miners Collection, University of Colorado-Boulder, Boulder, CO.
- ²⁷ "Around the LULAC Shield," *LULAC News*, November 1936.
- ²⁸ *El Paso Herald-Post*, "Gomez Throws His Support to Valdes In School Race," March 11, 1946; "School Board on Record for Salary Raises," March 27, 1946.
- ²⁹ *El Paso Herald-Post*, "Union Committee Seeks Relief Funds for E.P. Strikers," March 11, 1946; "Strikers Get Relief Fund," March 12, 1946; Evelyn Berl, "For a Better El Paso," advertisement, *El Paso Herald-Post* (El Paso, TX) March 18, 1946.
- ³⁰ *El Paso Herald-Post*, "\$300 Collected for CIO Union Strikers," March 29, 1946.
- ³¹ *El Paso Herald-Post*, "Board Seeks to End Strikes Here," March 25, 1946, "E.P. Strike Board Decision Delayed," April 9, 1946.
- ³² *El Paso Herald-Post*, "Board Asks Pay Hike in E.P. Metals Strike," April 30, 1946; "Smelter Union Seeks Settlement," May 13, 1946; "Labor Settlement Awaits Price Ruling," May 14, 1946.
- ³³ *El Paso Herald-Post*, "Strikers Begin Mass Picketing at Copper Refinery," May 28, 1946.
- ³⁴ *El Paso Herald-Post*, "Program Announced for 'American' Day," May 14, 1946, "All New Citizens invited to Program," May 18, 1946.
- ³⁵ *El Paso Herald-Post*, "100,275 Man Days Lost in Strikes," June 1, 1946.
- ³⁶ *El Paso Herald-Post*, "Union Leader Joins Motorcade," June 7, 1946.
- ³⁷ *El Paso Herald-Post*, "Negotiations Begin at Copper Plant," June 11, 1946.
- ³⁸ *El Paso Herald-Post*, "End of Copper Strike Hinges on El Paso Meetings," June 22, 1946; "End of Phelps Dodge Strike Expected," June 24, 1946, "Phelps Dodge Strike Talks Continue," June 25, 1946; "Refinery Workers Await Agreements," June 26, 1946; "Refinery Workers Await Agreements At Other Plants," June 27, 1946
- ³⁹ Telegram by Humberto Silex, June 17, 1946, Box 134, Folder 509, Western Federation of Miners Collection, University of Colorado-Boulder, Boulder, CO.
- ⁴⁰ "Editorial," *LULAC News*, August 1946.
- ⁴¹ *El Paso Herald-Post*, "LULAC Installs New Officers," January 20, 1947, "Aims, Purposes, and Code of Lulacs," April 2, 1948, "LULAC President Will Be Guest of E.P. Council," August 16, 1948, "LULAC Protests Flow of Aliens to U.S." October 19, 1948, "Council Presents 'Mexican Night,'" May 13, 1949; *LULAC News*, December 1948.