Negro and Mexican American workers in its ranks. The union was also concerned with community bias, for local prejudices invariably spill over into plants and union halls.

As a starting point, UPWA asked Fisk University to make a survey of its membership. The results, and the union program that followed, have been analyzed by John Hope II, Director of Industrial Relations for the American Missionary Association. His findings appear in a book entitled *Equality of Opportunity*, published by the Public Affairs Press in 1956.

At the time of the survey, one-third of UPWA's members were Negroes; one-tenth were Mexican Americans; and one-fifth were women. The Negro members of this union had slightly more schooling than the whites but they earned less.

Negroes did not attend union meetings as regularly as whites, although over two-thirds of the locals had Negroes in key posts as officers and organizers. Probably because of language difficulties, a smaller proportion of Mexican Americans reached positions of leadership, although they attended union meetings as often as white workers.

Within the union there was twice as much opposition on the part of white workers to the hiring and promotion of Negroes as there was to the upgrading of Mexican Americans. One-third of the white unionists objected to working under Negro foremen; almost as many resented Mexican American foremen.

About one-third of the plants covered by UPWA had segregated washrooms, cafeterias and other facilities. Negroes were fired more frequently than whites and were moved more frequently from job to job. Everywhere, both Negroes and Mexican Americans were conspicuously absent from skilled jobs.

In 1950, with Fisk University's appraisal of their union's problems and resources in hand, UP leaders launched a vigorous anti-discrimination campaign. In every district, bar-

riers of custom and prejudice were challenged and new opportunities for minority groups opened up.

By October 1951, twelve plants in Chicago, St. Louis, Kansas City and Sioux City had eliminated separate locker rooms; the food facilities of three other plants were opened for Negro workers without segregation and separate drinking fountains were eliminated in several shops. Shortly afterwards, plants in Fort Worth, Birmingham and Baltimore also eliminated separate facilities. These practices all were changed by local negotiation.

In one Southern branch of a major packing company, a white minority opposed to desegregating plant facilities nominated an all-white slate to run against the interracial group in office. Despite a heated campaign, the interracial slate won handily. Fifty-one white members out of a total local membership of some 1,400 resigned from the union in protest. A year later, 35 had applied for reinstatement.

Today, all master contracts with the Big Four Packers—Swift, Cudahy, Armour and Wilson—contain anti-discrimination clauses, so complaints of prejudice can be handled through the grievance machinery. In Chicago, the union charged Swift & Co. with refusing to take on qualified Negro workers; through arbitration the applicants won not only their jobs but also seniority rights and back pay of over \$6,000.

The campaign to break down the color bar in the big general offices of Armour & Co. in Chicago started in 1952 and lasted two and a half years. A procession of white and Negro applicants for office positions, all of them well qualified, were sent by the union to Armour's personnel office. The white applicants were hired; the Negroes received assorted brushoffs.

Armour & Co. is a Government contractor. So, with the cooperation of the Chicago Urban League and other civic groups, the union finally took its evidence to the President's Committee on Government Contracts. An investigation by