The Coalition of Immokalee Workers uses Ensemble Storytelling Processes to Overcome Enslavement in Corporate Supply Chains

Rosile, Grace Ann; Boje, David M.' Herder, Rick; Sanchez, Rick
This is earlier draft of article accepted by Business and Society Journal, July 2019

ABSTRACT
The Coalition of Immokalee Workers (CIW) has successfully combatted modern-day slavery by transforming the ways over a dozen major brands, including Taco Bell, Subway, and Wal-Mart, manage their 'supply chains'. The CIW's efforts over more than 20 years have effectively stopped enslavement practices, including abuses such as wage-theft and peonage indebtedness. We conducted a field ethnography, interviews, and archival analyses to understand this success. We find that the CIW employs a decentered, egalitarian, and ensemble approach to their multiplicities of alliances by collectively "animating" themselves and their partners through ensemble leadership. This combination of alliances along with ensemble leadership, brings life to the CIW motto "We are all leaders." Translating this motto into daily practice is how the CIW virtually eradicates enslavement practices in corporate supply chains.

Keywords: corporate social responsibility, worker-driven social responsibility, enslavement, Ensemble Leadership, multiplicities, Ensemble Storytelling, supply chains.

INTRODUCTION

The exceptional success of the Coalition of Immokalee Workers (CIW) in combatting modern-day slavery deserves our study and emulation. In 2014 the CIW, using its innovative Fair Food Program, was awarded the Presidential Medal for Extraordinary Efforts to Combat Human Trafficking in Persons.[1] We observe that a key factor in the success of the CIW is their ensemble approach to leadership, both within their organization and with their external allies. This ensemble approach employs storytelling processes, and allows the CIW to "animate" a cross-field range of actors into a collective movement resulting in large scale change.

The expectation that business be a good corporate citizen in society is expanding (Crane et al., 2015 a and b). There is increasing concern over corporate social responsibility and pseudo-corporate responsibility (Wickert et al., 2017). The highly effective approach of the CIW's Worker-Driven Social Responsibility holds great promise for all these issues.

---

[1] CIW receives Presidential Medal for Extraordinary Efforts in Combatting Modern-Day Slavery at White House Forum! January 30, 2015 accessed on September 14, 2018 at http://ciw-online.org/blog/2015/01/presidential-medal-combatting-slavery/

Despite the success of the CIW, shocking slave-like working conditions, which we call "enslavement," are the daily reality even today for as many as 60,000 (with estimates as high as 400,000) in the US, and an estimated 29-46 million persons around the globe who are enslaved.[2] Our focus here will be not on the sources and roots of this terrible problem, which has been done so thoroughly by Byerly (2011), Crane (2013), LeBaron (2014), Bales (2000), Bales and Trodd (2013) and others, but rather, on effective responses.

Byerly (2011: 124, 126), notes that "Combating modern slavery is a mammoth challenge" and adds "Many human rights violations do entail business involvement, although not all are committed by the business itself but by a third party." It is this complex web of third-party, transnational, multi-disciplinary aspects of this problem, which lead us to employ two (2) perspectives: multiplicities, and Ensemble Leadership Theory, to explain the exceptional success of the CIW in combatting enslavement practices and related labor abuses. Our purpose is to use the above two perspectives to understand how the CIW achieved such broad and lasting success. They gained the support of fourteen major brand corporations, and changed the face of agricultural work in south Florida from what the media called "ground zero" to a model for all of commercial agriculture. Further, once change was implemented, how was it successfully maintained? This is especially important since so many other improvement and regulatory strategies (Butkus 2007) have eroded over time, circumvented by abusers.

The enslavement and abusive working conditions (Bowe 2008; Marosi, 2014) which predominated before the CIW's successes in the tomato fields, constitute one of the most dramatic examples of inequality and inequity in modern times. In addition to blatant wage theft, the tomato field workers faced unfairly inflated prices on food and shelter. One initial project the CIW developed was a community market or a farmer's market in order to provide nutritious food at an affordable price to the CIW and the surrounding communities' members. According to Elmes (2016), "access to nutritious food is a requirement for living and for participating fully in the workplace and society" (pg. 1046).

The CIW is a worker-driven movement that is resisting a "system that is 'disembedded' (Polanyi, 1957 as cited in Elmes, 2016) from human values, norms of reciprocity, and the common good, which are the basis for fair and just exchanges in any economic system" (Elmes,

[2] Walk Free Foundation's Global Slavery index

2016: 1047). The industrial food system of the United States is a juggernaut that is resistant to change (Elmes, 2016) aided by the alignment of U.S. agricultural policies and subsidies. However, the CIW's successes have proven that any juggernaut can be defeated or changed by its antagonist, in this case the CIW and its alliances.

We make two (2) theoretical contributions to understand better the social dynamics underlying this persistent problem of enslavement practices within business supply chains. Our first contribution is to theorize the dynamics of the ensembles of various multiplicities. The concept of multiplicities has roots in work by Bergson (1960, 1988) and deeply influences Deleuze (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987; Deleuze, 1990, 1994), in a Deleuzean century (DeLanda, 1999). Lindstead and collegues have applied it to organizations (Linstead and Pullen, 2006; Linstead and Thanem, 2007). We demonstrate how the CIW's broader multiplicity pattern of relationships has inherent practical advantages over the corporate supply chain's narrower socioeconomic. Our multiplicity perspective is to look at CIW's ways of bridging between the name brand corporations and the supply chain's economic and efficiency interests (as one kind of multiplicity) by developing extensive multiplicity with relations to CIW's alliances with consumer groups, student groups, and faith groups. In addition, CIW is able to intensively deepen those relations in successfully combatting enslavement, wage theft, and sexual abuse of migrant workers in the field. Finally, the CIW uses a virtual form of multiplicity in relation to extensive (expansion) and intensive (relationality) by keeping one foot in the 'real' and the other foot in 'actualizing' its vision of socially responsible capitalism (see Boundas, 2010 for more on virtual multiplicity). We will assert that it is these ensembles of the three practical multiplicities that changes how we think about corporate supply chains in ways that can bring about corporate social responsibility. In sum, we look to Deleuzean multiplicity concepts to guide us regarding social change and multiplicity: "When Deleuze turns his attention from multiplicity to social organization he rejects any notion of dialectics as the resolution of opposites because the multiplicity of organization is more than a series of oppositions and differences" (Linstead and Thanem, 2007: 1487). This avoidance of dualistic opposites opens possibilities for relationships outside the typical union-management or boss-worker dualisms.

Our second contribution to theory is to offer a living case example of Ensemble Leadership and Ensemble Storytelling. The CIW history demonstrates that when we go beyond corporate walls to the broader world, traditional bureaucratic hierarchical systems may be less

effective than flatter, more diverse “heterarchical” systems. We term those dynamic heterarchical systems “Ensemble” (Authors, 2016).

Ensemble processes are a key reason why the CIW’s complex rhizomatic multiplicity endures, without deteriorating into oppressive bureaucracy. With ensemble, everyone is a leader. This contrasts with the agricultural supply chain’s traditional hierarchical top-down leadership styles. The CIW’s social movement is a rhizomatic-multiplicity of partners and alliances. The CIW’s Ensemble Leadership style facilitates concerted communal social movement. Further, the CIW’s Ensemble Leadership employs ‘Ensemble Storytelling’, which sees expression in theater for social change, and other ensemble forms of communication, which we describe below (see Part IV).

The structure of the paper is as follows. In Part I, we provide a brief introduction to the enslavement practices as experienced in south Florida among tomato field workers. In Part II, we explain our methodology for co-creating the story of the CIW, together with current CIW members and archival reports. In Part III, we offer the history of the CIW’s success, with a timeline of important events. We focus especially on their cross-field alliances as they develop from a small workers group into a broad-based social movement. This timeline is intended to provide an overarching context. More detailed vignettes will be offered in Part IV as they are relevant. In Part IV, we present the above-described two (2) theoretical contributions relating to multiplicities and to ensemble processes. We provide support for the interpretation of Ensemble Leadership and Ensemble Storytelling as essential keys to the CIW’s exceptional and durable success against enslavement and other workplace abuses, played out as “worker-driven” processes by the CIW.

Finally, in Part V, we offer our discussion and conclusions, with implications regarding the need for worker-driven processes for effective workplace monitoring. We suggest the outstanding successes of the CIW’s worker-driven and ensemble processes give us a model for truly effective corporate social responsibility which can be extended to any business context.

PART I: Enslavement Practices in South Florida “Tomato-Land”

What are “enslavement” practices? LeBaron (2014: 766) defines bonded labor or debt bondage as a situation in which a person uses their labor as collateral for a loan of money, but the lender manipulates the debt, credit, or contract in a way that makes it impossible for the person

to repay and so must continue to labor involuntarily. Allain, Crane, LeBaron, and Behbahani (2013: 10) define forced labor as having two elements, one is "that workers face the menace of a penalty and the second is that they have not offered themselves voluntarily for the work undertaken."

In our interviews with immigrant farmworkers in Immokalee, Florida, we learned that "recruiters" (the unscrupulous ones are called "coyotes") go to Mexico and promise people documents, a job, housing, and weekly pay. The workers are then taken across the border (most commonly the US-Mexico border) by this coyote who charges them a large fee. After arriving in the United States, the migrant workers are then forced to pay for housing, food, and even the alleged travel expenses nominally incurred in bringing them from Mexico, all inflated to an unsurmountable price. At this point, the migrant workers have little to no money left due to this large debt. They are then considered enslaved (Bowe 2008; Sellers and Asbed 2011), because they are kept against their will, usually with the use of violence. Bales (2012) defines this situation as contract slavery, a common situation where "the contract is used as an enticement to trick an individual into slavery, as well as a way of making the slavery look legitimate" (Bales, 2012: 20).

Estabrook (2012: 85-88) (also reported in Bales and Soodalter 2009) tells the unfortunately too-common story of Antonio Martinez. Martinez came to the US after his parents became ill. He paid a coyote to get him north to a construction job in Los Angeles. At the border, Martinez was handed off to another coyote, and crossed the desert for three days. The coyote named Chino handed Martinez off to yet another coyote named El Chacal, who drove them to South Florida where a labor contractor named Abel Cuello bought Martinez and other slaves for $350 each. Altogether, 26 slaves were locked into two trailers that had cockroaches, rats, lizards, snakes, and other animals from the surrounding swamps. The only water available was from a shallow, rank smelling well. The migrant farm workers slept on mattresses on the floor, were locked in at night, and overseen by armed guards. Martinez eventually escaped. Cuello was convicted on charges of forced labor and served less than three years in prison. Upon his release, he was able to renew his labor contracting license and began supplying field workers for Ag-Mart, one of the nation's largest agricultural produce companies.

We turn now to a brief overview of our methodology, followed by the presentation of the history of the CIW. This is followed by discussion of the relevant theory.

PART II: Methodology

Our research question was: How has the CIW employed Ensemble Leadership to successfully combat modern-day slavery? The CIW motto, boldly emblazoned across the front of their headquarters, is “We are all Leaders.” There were visible indicators that they practiced this motto, such as refusing to identify any individual as leader to inquisitive newspaper reporters. We wanted to know if and how actual daily behaviors of the CIW reflected this “equalitarian” (Popper 2008, p. 170) approach to organizational leadership.

During our early stages of this research, we used what we call ‘self-correcting induction’ (authors, in press), rooted in Charles Sanders Peirce (1958) and his triadic of abduction-induction-deduction. Our method included a cycling-through from theory to experience and back to theory, in an iterative and self-correcting process described by Watson (2012): “Theory is thus both ideation for guiding fieldwork and an outcome of the thinking process which is stimulated by the interplay in the researcher's mind of theory and field experience” (2012, p. 20). With this self-correcting process, we were able to refine our research question to ask more specifically: In what ways, if any, has the CIW employed the seven (7) methods of Ensemble Storytelling in their enactment of Ensemble Leadership in the CIW organization?

In choosing our research method, we felt the best way to compare espoused ensemble values with daily practice would be through organizational ethnography. We provide a narrative of our research process in Appendix B. This process incorporated 7 features of organizational ethnography, as identified by Ybema et al., (2009, pp. 6-9):

1) We used combined methods of participant observation, conversational interviewing, and close readings. We were “observant participants” at the 2017 Columbus, Ohio, march and demonstration at the Wendy’s Headquarters, then again for a week at the Immokalee headquarters to observe daily operations. One of our team also worked for a day picking onions. We scheduled most of our conversational interviews over 1-to-2-hour meals. We employed close readings of CIW web pages and worker-to-worker training materials.
2) We were at various locations for first-hand reporting: in Colombus, Ohio, in Immokalee, Florida and surrounding fields, and in Sarasota, Florida.
3) We addressed hidden issues relating to power. When we observed a weekly “encuentro” meeting, we were asked to stay well outside the circle of the discussion group, so our mostly-white-academic group’s presence would not inhibit the responses of the mostly-non-white workers. It is somewhat embarrassing to admit that the CIW members were

much more attuned to, and open about, "hidden issues relating to power" than we privileged researchers.

4) We were both context-centered and actor-centered, featuring both macro observations of remote agricultural fields, as well as personal conversations with agricultural field workers.
5) Interviewees spoke in their own language, framing experiences in their own meaning-making ways, with their own coalition members translating.
6) We sought varying perspectives and interpretations to achieve multi-vocality. In addition to workers and staff, we had many conversations with the CIW's faith-based allies as well as student interns.
7) Finally, we incorporated reflexivity and positionality in our own meaning-making processes through our research group's reflection times as we traveled together over multiple days for this field research.

Because we are studying egalitarian "ensemble" leadership processes, we chose the more egalitarian research method of a co-produced ethnography (Down and Hughes, 2009), avoiding the "demarcation between worker and intellectual" (Figiel et al., 2014). We admire the words of Callon (1986, p.216) regarding translation and voice: "to speak for others is first to silence those in whose name we speak". Like Schatz (2013), we seek "to let the people being studied 'speak'" (p. 315). Happily, this egalitarian intent was also a requirement of the CIW: they agreed to interviews on the condition of co-authorship of our findings. However, the review process for most if not all reputable academic journals such as this one is somewhat extended in time and esoteric in nature. In the end our CIW participants chose to review and comment on, but not co-author, this paper. We continue to collaborate with them on other projects related our shared goals of eliminating enslavement and workplace abuses.

This and similar challenges taught us as researchers a more "equalitarian" (Popper, 2008, p. 170) approach to all aspects of our research, mirroring the CIW's everyone-a-leader beliefs back to us. In this way, our 'subjects' helped us avoid the Figiel et al., (2014) pitfall of our research methods "reproducing the very social world they were designed to take apart" (p. 314). Such mirroring made our own self-reflexive auto-ethnographic processing of our experiences with the CIW even more relevant and educational for us as co-learners in this process.

Overall, our team engaged in many activities as "observant participants." We marched with the CIW for hours in the rain in Columbus, Ohio, in March 2017. We ate meals with

workers who with their children took buses to participate in these demonstration marches. We sat with students and religious leaders in educational workshops by alliance partners representing a range from church groups to Marxist groups to LGBT groups. Then in Florida in May 2017, we listened, wrote down, and taped conversations. One of us left in predawn hours to observe field trainings in actual, remote fields. We observed and interviewed people doing their daily work at the Immokalee headquarters, as well as observing a weekly meeting open to all workers. In addition, one of our team members got hired for a day in the fields, in the hot sun, doing real "picking" to experience the material conditions of agricultural field work (also see Appendix C for this one team member's experience in onion fields).

The above experiences were shared and discussed among research team members and with CIW members and allies both "on the spot" at our various times and locations, and also, via follow-up emails and phone calls. Our team continues contact with the CIW. We anticipate further collaborations with them to promote their accounts and their vision of transforming agriculture. Finally, we share with Clarke (2010) the aim of "documenting efforts that not only have explanatory power but connect that power to praxis" (p. 301). We hope our methods offer insights to reduce and eliminate enslavement and abuse of power in the workplace and beyond.

Next, we present our case history of the CIW. With this case serving as a rich context, we then present selected theories to help understand the events described.

PART III: The CIW's Ensemble Beginnings and the Worker-Driven Fair Food Program

We begin our brief history with an overview of the CIW's beginnings. As much as possible, we use the words of the members themselves, based on our research team's interviews with them in Immokalee, Florida in May of 2017. Below we quote Lucas Benitez, one of the original members of the CIW, and identified by outside sources as one of the "founders" of the CIW.

Please note that the following history is abstracted in Table 2, Timeline for CIW Collaborative and Worker-Driven Actions. This table is drawn from our research team's personal interviews with the CIW and their archival data on their web sites and elsewhere (including Solomon 2015). Some portions of the table are presented in greater detail in Appendix A, Summary of Phases.

In 1993, Lucas Benitez was a young man from Mexico who was picking tomatoes in south Florida. Experiencing unfair treatment in the fields, he began meeting with a small group of co-workers in the local church basement. They called themselves the "Southwest Florida Farmworkers Project". As Lucas tells it, in our research team's interview in May 2017 in Immokalee:

> Lucas: So we began the Wednesdays reunions (meetings)….and… no one had experience in managing reunions at that time so it was more like group discussions….at that time we had a poetic name: The Southwest Florida Farmworkers' Project.

Lucas explained that every one of the members was a leader. During local protests, reporters would ask who the leader was, and the response would be "we all are." Lucas explained that there was not a Gandhi figure to come out of their movement because there was no one individual responsible for the coalition, they were all equally leading it. Via community meetings and education on workers' rights, every member was given a voice in a safe space to bring about the conversation of abuse. The awakening of the CIW's members power came when Pacific Tomato Growers made the announcement that the minimum wage for farmworkers would be decreased. Below is Lucas' account of it:

> Lucas: "…we began…creating more awareness in the community. And in 1995, when it came out that one of the companies was reducing the minimum wage from $4.25 to $3.85 per hour, plus 10 cents per bucket… We are in a bind, we are like then starting more intensive series of reunions with the community. Um, we asked what are we going to do? People were angry. And a series of reunions came about day after day after day at the church until…the 11th of November at night we had reunion outside the church because at that time all the reunions were at the catholic church, in a small room that the Guadalupe Social Service lent us.
>
> Yeah, we were 600 that arrived. So we said, what will we do? Well then, let's do a strike tomorrow. If then each of us here brings someone else tomorrow, that will not go to work, we will double our numbers. And we focused the strike on the company that had decreased the minimum wage. When we arrived at the parking lot…You would see dozens and dozens of buses in the morning. When people saw that we were there, we got there yelling and everything, the people in the other buses began getting off and explaining that 'it was not just that one company, it was all the companies and here, this happens, and where I work this other thing happens.' So the people got off the buses and of the 600 (or) 800 of us began the march, we became 3,000" (May, 2017).

After a five-day strike, Pacific Tomato Growers succumbed to the pressure and reversed the wage cut to $4.50 an hour (Marquis, 2017), and even increased it to $5.25 an hour[3].

In 1997, the CIW was trying to establish an agreement on human rights for agricultural workers but the growers refused to recognize the CIW. To make the growers' denial public, six CIW members went on a month-long hunger strike. The growers not only did not budge but also had established a $100,000 fine to any grower who would accept the CIW's terms. Bishop John Nevins joined the CIW's cause and called on growers and corporations to dialogue with the CIW and join the Fair Food agreements[4].

The hunger strikers' health was deteriorating seriously, with no end in sight. Bishop Nevins helped break the month-long fast by holding a mass in Naples, Florida. The involvement of the Bishop made the strike notable and symbolic, and allowed the strikers to withdraw from their fasting with honor. However, it was clear that the lives of the CIW members and farmworkers did not matter to the growers, who were under pressure themselves from other growers and from corporate buyers to keep down prices. Other measures had to be taken.

Through the late 1990's, two shifts had occurred. First, the CIW's years of partnering with law enforcement, including risky undercover work among other efforts, was paying off in convictions (see Table 2 and Appendix A for details regarding 1997, 1999, 2001, 2004, 2007, and 2008 convictions). Second, public pressure led by the CIW with their Fair Food alliance groups, hit a high point with the 234-mile March for Dignity in 2000. The important shift that changed everything was when the CIW initiated a boycott, not against the tomato growers, but against those who would buy from tomato growers who tolerated abusive practices. With the support of their growing network of alliance partners, the CIW initiated a boycott of Taco Bell in 2001, and then McDonald's in 2004 (see Table 1).

The turning point came in 2005 when Taco Bell signed on to the Fair Food Program, followed in the next decade with 13 more major corporations, including all of Yum! Brands and then major grocery chains including Wal-Mart in 2014. Signing these corporations was a great success (Drainville, 2008). Still a problem remained: how could the CIW be sure that the signees

---

[3] Accessed on November 30, 2017: https://ampglobalyouth.org/students/coming-together-for-farmworkers-rights/

[4] Accessed on November 30, 2017: http://www.ciw-online.org/blog/2014/09/bishop-nevins/

were living up to their promises? The CIW asked themselves, what would it look like if the workers designed a program to ensure fair labor practices?

In 2011 the CIW created the Fair Foods Standards Council (FFSC) to do this monitoring. The CIW has coined the phrase "Worker-Driven Social Responsibility" to convey the equal partnership the workers have in monitoring workplace standards. In our interviews with Judge Laura and her staff, they expressed it as follows (cited in Author, 2017):

Formerly, when authorities discovered forced labor (slavery), officers swept in and arrested everyone. Now, the enslaved workers are treated differently:

"(Before CIW and FFSC) ICE (Homeland Security) would have taken everyone to jail.

Now, trafficking victims and witnesses can get work authorization" (Judge Laura).

And until the authorization came through for these enslaved victims to work legally in the US, the FFSC put these victims in hotel rooms and personally stayed with them until the special work permits arrived. There were other ways the CIW's "Worker-Driven" approach was more effective:

> "With one of the first calls to a grower complaint line (an "independent" auditor, not affiliated with the CIW), the worker's name was given to the grower. The grower grabbed the worker and FIRED him. Then (other workers) called OUR complaint line and in a few short weeks the grower had to apologize---apologize to ALL of us, to us and to the WORKERS (in public)." (Judge Laura)

Judge Laura emphasizes the difference between traditional corporate monitoring processes and the FFSC's worker-driven processes, by telling the story of "the Homestead case." Judge Laura:

> "There was one forced labor case that happened in the Fair Food program. It is a textbook case of how (well) this system works.
> First, the supervisor involved was already listed on our web site as "Do not hire", on the "No Hire" list. In 2 weeks a worker called in a complaint. In 1.5 days we had an investigation going on there. In 2.5 weeks we met with the US attorney and served (documents) on the Homestead case.
> So, Feb 14 the call came in, Mar 3 arrests were being made, AND, the victims were NOT taken into custody (as had been the practice), but put in hotel rooms with us (Victor and others).
> Mar 17 an indictment was filed, and sentencing was just this past January.
> (This was VERY SPEEDY.)
> We met them at the laundromat, there was a lot of FEAR because they LIVED with the perpetrator. We passed out cards (and explained their rights).

A woman stood and said "I don't want to wait - - I will speak now, and (the rest of you) can speak too!"
Formerly, ICE would have taken EVERYONE to jail.
NOW, trafficking victims and witnesses can get WORK AUTHORIZATION (in conjunction with VIDA, a non-profit for survivors of sexual violence and forced labor).

Crossing jurisdictional lines creates an extensive spatial multiplicity, which had further complicated the complaint process. Victor remembers:

"It used to be workers could complain in Florida but could be threatened (by the bosses) 'you just wait until we cross the border into the next state!' But now we have 6 states. Then we got one crew leader fired." (Victor, interview May 11, 2017.)

"We do a comprehensive assessment of performance in every area of the Code of Conduct, and this report ONLY goes to the participating grower and to the CIW. They must have BINDING plans (for corrections) and we must see a change by the next visit. Otherwise, they are WARNED, then DROPPED." (Matt W.)

And yes, there have been cases of growers dropped from the program.

"Most standards are not upheld without consequences. But we are like consultants…. We can give them a BLUEPRINT of how they can fix (their problems), do risk prevention, and fix illegal situations." (Judge Laura)

Further, there are not just punishments, there are also incentives to abide by the Fair Food Codes of Conduct:

"Growers get purchasing preference [with the Fair Food certification].
These (Fair Food) growers are now the "employers of choice." Fair Food growers have LESS labor shortage." (Judge Laura)

Matt W (Interview, May 11, 2017)
"The system is still designed and spearheaded by workers… Workers can make a complaint without fear of retaliation. We take complaints but NOT anonymous ones. We are the megaphone (for their voices), and also the protective barrier for complaints."

Paying attention to the voices of the workers is crucial. As Judge Laura explained:

"Workers know their own industry, (so we interview them), and then we have worker-to-worker education at least one time each harvest. (This way) informed and active workers are the front lines (of this process)… The CIW did try using the outside auditing firm of "Verite" but they did NOT have the model of partnership that the CIW had in mind, nor the depth of monitoring. For our audits at least 50% of the workers are interviewed, not a small sample. This is not done anywhere else. (Also) we have a 24-7 complaint line staffed by our field monitors (who rotate through this job)." Judge Laura (Interview, May 2017)

And finally:

> "CONSEQUENCES are what make this work. After 6 seasons, we have resolved over 1700 complaints." (Judge Laura)
> "Did it help that I was a judge (in dealing with complaints)? Yes. The process is more like 'treatment court' where former adversaries are getting together on the same side of the table… Half of the fight is letting people be heard" Judge Laura

Parallel to Judge Laura's belief in letting people be heard, the CIW listens to its members, many of whom identify as female and have experienced sexual violence in the field. Therefore, the CIW recently launched the Fair Food Sisters Campaign, where Lupe Gonzalo, a founding member of the CIW, was invited to the stage by Olympic gold-medalist Abby Wambach for the "Together Live Tour!" to share her story:[5]

> Abby: My goodness, where do I begin. Lupe, what is your story?
>
> Lupe: My name is Lupe Gonzalo, and I am an immigrant. But I am also a woman, I am a mother, I am a farmworker. And more than anything, I am a human being. Like 80% of women working in the fields, I have experienced the sexual violence. When I would come home from work, I carried the weight of my anger. I did not have space in my heart to embrace my children, and much less to love them in the way they so desperately wanted.
>
> Abby: What did you do to change those circumstances?
>
> Lupe: We decided to put an end to the abuses that oppressed us day after day. We decided to no longer be victims, and instead demand the right as women to work free of sexual harassment and violence.

The CIW educates about and performs gender equality in and out of the agricultural fields. The CIW recognizes that the fight for womens' rights is the fight for human rights. As shown in the accounts provided above, the CIW's ensemble processes recognize the ways in which the interests of women are the interests of all. Anyone working in the agricultural fields of Immokalee, Florida has a right to dignified work.

Having provided this brief history, we will give an account of the theories most relevant to understanding the success of the CIW.

PART IV: Theories of Multiplicities and Ensemble Processes

[5] CIW's Lupe Gonzalo "Only together were we able to break our silence…" interview from the Together Live accessed 23 October, 2017 at http://www.ciw-online.org

We view the CIW as an example of multiplicity. “Multiplicity is arguably Deleuze’s most important concept,” and is the basis of other Deleuzian concepts: rhizome, assemblage, and “concept” itself (Roffe, 2010: 181). Any situation is composed of three multiplicities that “form a kind of patchwork or ensemble without becoming a unitary or whole” (Roffe, 2010: 181). An extensive multiplicity is spatializing, dividable into a number of parts. Intensive multiplicity is temporalizing, with changes to its nature. The third multiplicity is a virtual multiplicity that is real without necessarily being embodied in the world, but it is not “abstract alternative possibilities.” Instead, it is “something like a real openness to change that inheres in every particular situation” (Roffe, 2010: 182).

For us, the CIW is an ensemble patchwork of several multiplicities. First, CIW’s extensive multiplicity is its spatializing movement from Florida agricultural spaces to other states up and down the eastern United States, and into other countries. Second, CIW’s intensive multiplicity is its temporalizing changes in the modalities of its movement, as it moved from migrant farm worker demonstrations to forming programs that cross institutional field alliances with faith-based people, students, consumers, and a dozen corporate supply chains (from Taco Bell to Wal-Mart). Third, CIW’s virtual multiplicity affects changes in actual situations of production and consumption. This includes the CIW’s radio station broadcast in indigenous languages, its extensive virtual archive of CIW’s organizing events, its use of a cell phone app to record migrant farm worker’s hours and compute pay, and its large collection of YouTube recordings of demonstrations, rallies, marches, and acts of theater.

Deleuze and Guattari (1987) define multiplicity as an “assemblage” (p. 4) and “multiplicity grows” in many directions in a “unity of totalization” by rhizomatic tubers, by roots shooting out in “lines of flight”, and by “rhizome” imagined cycles of Nietzschean “eternal return” (p. 6). “A rhizome as subterranean stem is absolutely different from roots and radicles. Bulbs and tubers are rhizomes” (p. 6).

CIW is rhizomatic, a multiplicity that “evolves by subterranean stems” and it forms “a bulb” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987: 7). “Multiplicities are rhizomatic” (p. 8) but without the unity of a central tree trunk, without the string pulling of a puppet master, or some centralized leadership cabal. Rather, CIW is what Sartre (1960/2004) terms a ‘practical ensemble’ of multiplicities differentiating within multiplicities that differentiate and totalize. Deleuze (1994)

and Deleuze and Guattari (1987) use ‘assemblage’ whereas Sartre is focused on dialectics of ensembles of multiplicities.

Nails (2013) reviews the “Occupy Wall Street” movement as an example of multiplicities gone bad. In brief, the Occupy movement is said to be leaderless, but we do not see that it pulls things together in what we call ensemble processes. For us, an ensemble of all participating as leaders is not the same as being “leaderless”.

Nail (2013) criticizes Deleuze’s multiplicity work on political organization on the basis of political ambivalence, virtual hierarchy, and subjective paralysis. Political ambivalence stems from pure affirmation of Difference that is ultimately ambivalent (Zizek, 2004, Organs without Bodies). Our finding is CIW continues to affirm Difference in its extensive and intensive multiplicity, while also grounding its potential future in actual training, monitoring, and continued mobilizations of alliances against injustices in the fields. We found that CIW does sustain its unity of subjectivity while engaging the ensemble of the three multiplicities.

For Badiou (1999), Deleuze & Guattari’s virtual exists only in hierchized space where the potential for change is not actual change. Hallward (2006: 162) adds that multiplicities can be “indifferent to the politics of this world.” Here we have found that CIW’s virtual multiplicity sustains difference by having one foot in the real (everyone at CIW has worked in the tomato field and is in touch with its conflicts and contradictions) so that actualizing potential ‘bets on the future’ (antenarratives) are grounded potential transformations, rather than pure potentiality in virtuality.

It is beyond the page limit and scope of this article to attempt to reconcile the differences of various perspectives on multiplicities beyond this point. Sartre is dialectical and Deleuze was anti-dialectic and rhizomatic. Both had critiques of late modern capitalism shortcomings. Deleuze (1994: 8) addressed “pseudomultiplicities for what they are”, a kind of fake unity. CIW forms alliances in what Deleuze and Guattari (1987: 8) define as assemblage:

> “An assemblage is precisely this increase in the dimensions of a multiplicity that necessarily change in nature as it expands its conditions.”

In short, the CIW is a multiplicity of ensemble leadership (or assemblage leadership) by virtue of its connecting "the lines of flight or deterritorialization" that "marks the reality of a finite number of dimensions that the multiplicity effectively fills" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987: 9).

CIW is a multiplicity of "together-telling" and "together-leading," by "flattening all the multiplicities on one single plane" (p. 9) that we and others studying CIW call "worker-driven corporate social responsibility (WSR)." It does this in "lines of deterritorialization" (p. 9) that make the coyote-subcontractor exploiters of migrant workers flee to multiplicities that are not yet part of the Fair Food Program, with its monitoring of growers 'praxis' by the Fair Food Standards Council. As an ensemble (or "assemblage"), the CIW "necessarily acts on semiotic flow" (p. 23) which is why we focus on together-telling in their discourse praxis.

In antenarrative terms, CIW is driven by "potential multiplicity" (Deleuze, 1994, 1987: 50) by preparing in advance the overlapping alliances of student groups and faith groups with consumer groups (Caruana and Crane, 2008). This is a forehaving of "heterogeneous potentials and intensities" as it organizes the agricultural fields and brings corporate brands into another kind of subcontracting alliance. Next, we explain why we see the multiplicity of the CIW's context as especially suited to what we view as the CIW's Ensemble Leadership and Ensemble Storytelling.

The CIW's most unique and distinguishing characteristic may well be its egalitarian slogan written boldly on the front of its modest headquarters building in Immokalee, Florida: "We are all leaders". Based on our first-hand experiences partially documented here, it is our (authors') contention that the CIW effectively embodies and enacts this motto, as a way of life and not just empty words.

It is our further contention that the CIW's daily practices of living those egalitarian words are the key to its success in creating change, change so dramatic and deep that enslavement and labor abuses have been almost eliminated within its domain. For us (authors), these particular daily practices exemplify what we call "Ensemble Leadership Theory" (ELT), which is enacted through "Ensemble Storytelling" processes. We now explain these two ensemble concepts in further detail.

Ensemble Leadership Theory (ELT) (authors names withheld for anonymity) employs the word "ensemble" as it is used in the world of theatrical performances, as in, for example, an

"ensemble cast." This refers to a style of interacting whereby a group of people, such as in a television situation comedy like M*A*S*H or Cheers, avoids having one "star." Instead, the core cast members share the "star" role, and each is a star.

The ELT approach to leadership challenges notions of the inevitability of hierarchy, and challenges our tendency to project hierarchy onto our perceptions of social situations. Archeologists discovered they had fallen into this perceptual error in studying leadership in centuries-ago Mesoamerica. Earlier studies had projected an assumption of hierarchy onto what was discovered regarding these ancient cultures (Mills, 2000). More recently, there is agreement that those ancient cultures had a social structure which archeologists now identify as "heterarchy." Heterarchy refers to structures that are dynamic and flexible; they may include hierarchy but are not limited to it (ibid).

To summarize, Ensemble Leadership is collective, dynamic, decentered, and heterarchical (authors names withheld for anonymity). It has an indigenous sense of collectivity, avoiding the dualism of individual-group, and the dualism of one-many, in favor of the concept of "multiplicity" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987). It is dynamic, avoiding static beginning-middle-end storytelling in favor of living webs of multiple stories. Its webs are decentered as well as multi-centered, and non-human-centric, encompassing all plant, animal, and planet life. Its heterarchic structure is enacted using Ensemble Storytelling processes.

Ensemble Storytelling (ES) is the term we use for the practices by which Ensemble Leadership is implemented. It is the communicative glue holding together individuals in more egalitarian groups. Ensemble Storytelling's 7 processes are: 1. ES Together-Telling; 2. ES Materiality; 3. ES Economics; 4. ES Worker-to-Worker training; 5. ES Elicitation; 6. ES Authorship; and 7. ES Theatrical Performances. Each of these is discussed next, with an explanation of how it occurs within the CIW context (adapted from Author, 2018). (Please note that these categories are not designed to be exclusive. They are intended only to provide rough categories for descriptive purposes that might help others wishing to engage in ensemble processes.)

1. Ensemble Storytelling "together-telling": This process prefers that people speak in their own voices, and that multiple voices can be heard together. This process avoids summarizing and speaking on the behalf of others or purporting to represent the voice of others. This was demonstrated when our research team might ask a question and be told to consult the workers directly. Also, to accommodate different languages, when people spoke in front of a group, someone accompanied them to translate, sentence by sentence. This

category also includes the first-hand personal account of the "testimonio," unfiltered by others such as journalists.

2. Ensemble Storytelling Materiality: The material "props" that accompanied speaking reflected broad-based egalitarian participation. For example, during the demonstration at Wendy's Headquarters in Ohio in March 2017, equal numbers of men and women had equal time at the microphones, and those who acted in skits also worked at carrying pieces of the sets to the stages and back to the trucks afterwards. In addition, there were men (rather than women) in charge of making lunch for the group of over a hundred demonstration/march participants in Columbus, Ohio. Finally, handing out tamales in the lunch line was Lucas Benitez himself, one of the founding members of the CIW. We also saw Lucas sweeping the floor.
3. Ensemble Storytelling Economics: The CIW's Fair Foods Standards come with economic "teeth" such that purchasers in the program will not buy from those found in violation of standards. If one grower violates Fair Food standards, none of the dozen or so major buyers will purchase the violator's tomatoes. The numbers also tell a story. In the case of the CIW's monitoring group the Fair Foods Standards Council (FFSC), over 1700 complaints were handled within 3 years, with about 1/3 of the decisions not in favor of the worker.
4. Ensemble Storytelling Worker-to-Worker Training: Those who instruct the workers in the fields regarding their rights, have also worked in the fields themselves. Also, peer training means trainers need to be bilingual. This emphasis on peer relationships is apparent when Lucas Benitez tells how they recovered over $100,000 in wage theft in the 1996-1997 growing season. Lucas: Y como lo haciamos, no era porque teniamos como eh con abogados, con este policia. No, no, no, lo hacemos como comunidad. Translator: How did we do that? It wasn't that we had an army of lawyers, and we didn't use the police to be able to do it. We did it just as a community.
5. Ensemble Storytelling Elicitation: Instead of telling an audience what a picture or skit is supposed to convey, trainers instead ask very open-ended questions. Most often, we heard the question "What do you see?" regarding a drawing or a skit or film clip. When conducting workplace monitoring, the FFSC interviews 50% or more of the workers at each location (not a "sample"). Instead of "storytelling," behaviors of monitors were more often "story eliciting." Such eliciting also had the material aspect that interviewers in the fields would go down on their knees in the dirt so as not to slow down the worker.
6. Ensemble Storytelling Authorship: When skits are developed, or training drawings created, worker-artists collaborate, asking for feedback and modifying accordingly. For example, (one author) observed a colorfully drawn training banner depicting a man in a tomato field with a bucket of tomatoes on his shoulder. The man is walking past a woman crouched down picking tomatoes. In a cartoon bubble, the man asks the woman what she is doing on the week-end, referring to her as "mamacita." (This author) is told that the term "mamacita" (which this author translated literally as "little mother") is considered a sexually inappropriate form of address, perhaps more like "hot mama". In developing this drawing, the two CIW artists who collaborated in its creation would have also shown it to the entire staff, received feedback, and made changes until the group was satisfied. Perhaps the man's eyebrows were raised more suggestively, perhaps the woman's eyes were squinted with worry. In these practical ways, even art and authorship are ensemble.
7. Ensemble Storytelling Theatrical Performances Theater for social change is inclusive and highly visual. It involves audience discussion, and it may involve spectators becoming

actors ("spectactors" according to Boal, 1979). Its material, visual, and active and engaging nature allows it to overcome language and status barriers. These ensemble performances also allow participants to exchange roles, where actor becomes author or audience becomes actor.

To highlight the connections we see between multiplicities, Ensemble Storytelling, and examples of CIW Ensemble behaviors, we offer Table 3: Extensive, Intensive, and Virtual Multiplicities of Ensemble Storytelling Behavior.

Following is an example of a combination of Ensemble Storytelling Together-Telling using ES Worker-to-Worker training, using one of the CIW's many hand-drawn pictures. On this particular drawing, on the left side of the page, the year is noted as 1980. There is man holding 2 bags of groceries, and also standing with the man is a woman holding 2 more bags and a child holding one bag. The caption says that the pay for a bucket of tomatoes in 1980 is 40 cents, and notes that in 1980, one could buy 5 bags of groceries (as pictured) for $50.

On the right side of the page, labeled 2000, there is a man holding two bags of groceries. The caption says the pay for a bucket of tomatoes through the 1990's is 45 cents, and that a person can only by 2 bags of groceries for $50 in 2000. With this pay, a worker cannot afford to feed a wife and child, like they could in 1980. This is one of the older training pictures, probably, from the date, used in the early 2000's. Observers of the picture would be asked: What do you see? Even without being able to read, a person can understand the message. It is these Ensemble processes that, by fostering egalitarianism and inclusiveness, can build the necessary solidarity for creating a social movement that can cause institutional change. Power-at-the-top hierarchies, even of worker-owned and worker-run organizations, still tend towards power abuse of lower participants. The CIW demonstrates the enduring change that comes about when the organization at the deepest levels emulates the change it hopes to create.

PART V: Discussion and Conclusions

The CIW is different from other worker organizations, and also, they are exceptionally effective. The CIW refuses to be narrated into a position of 'other-ness.' Instead, they are all leaders, they all speak up for themselves and for their rights as workers and as human beings. Avoiding dualisms such as labor-management, we see the multiplicities apparent with worker-to-

worker training, and with worker-driven social responsibility. Multiplicities open possibilities for new relationships. These are not just stakeholders assembling into a movement. Rather, there are material and dialogical aspects that intermingle.

To summarize our previous discussions, we see the CIW is an ensemble of multiplicities of three kinds. First it is extensive multiplicity, expanding alliances. Second, it is intensive multiplicity, temporalizing a reflexive understanding of socially responsible capitalism in its Fair Food Program across generations. Finally, CIW is virtual multiplicity, as part of the 'real' getting below the surface of a myriad of socioeconomic material-discursive relationships, actualizing corporate social responsibility supply chains of some of the major brand corporations into accountable monitored relationships.

The three kinds of multiplicities are entangling. For example, CIW is both actors and actants (software, apps, techniques of monitoring). These are entangled in the extensive (spatializing) multiplicities, and with each movement, gain the intensive multiplicity (temporalizing), actualizing virtual changes in the game of power relations and negotiations, and by technical solutions to collecting hours by scanning workers' ID cards with a cell phone. The cell phone use is simultaneously an extensive multiplicity, drawing on another technology unrelated to agriculture. The linking of the cell-phone to a payroll app is a virtual multiplicity that expands beyond Florida to other states, beyond tomatoes to other kinds of agricultural produce.

The CIW itself constitutes an intensive multiplicity by bringing the grower/employers into direct, accountable contact with the workers, circumventing unscrupulous supervisors, middle-men, and coyotes. As workers perceive these improved conditions, which are reliably verified by the CIW and the FFSC, these improved working conditions in turn lead to lower turnover and easier recruitment for grower/employers. This ensemble of multiplicity actually allows growers, corporate brands and consumers to save money that had been siphoned off due to dysfunctional, unethical, and illegal activities.

We know from previous research that profits from enslavement practices do not go to employers nor to consumers. By eliminating these practices, such savings allow the CIW monitoring program to pay for itself. In addition to the arguments that enslavement is both morally wrong and illegal, we can add the "business case" that it is unprofitable. Further, the key

to success in this story of agricultural enslavement practices in Florida is the CIW's pioneering model of ensemble processes both internally and with its multiplicities of external allies.

From our research team's first participation with the CIW, we saw that ensemble processes were key. The importance of speaking up for oneself, of being a leader, and of marching side by side in solidarity with one's community, was apparent to us. At the CIW event in Columbus in 2017, many grade-school-age children were present with parents, grandparents, aunts, and uncles. As we marched with them, we came to understand that the presence of these children was important to the families. It was important for the children to see the importance their parents placed on speaking up, making one's voice heard, empowering oneself, and engaging in service as a leader behavior.

As some of us have noted elsewhere, "we" cannot empower "them." However, we as critical theorists can stand with them as they seek fair and equitable wages and humane working conditions. The CIW has been exceptionally successful in their quest. Their success is deeply rooted in the daily practices by which they live their message: We are all leaders. For us, this translates to Ensemble Leadership and Ensemble Storytelling.

What are the implications for us as academics involved in this research? For our own self-reflexivity, we are concerned with critical performativity (Esper et al., 2017). Is the CIW's "penny a pound" slogan letting off corporations too cheaply? We know from the concept of hegemony that even participative processes can be exploitive, and that we as researchers run the risk of maintaining a system of oppression even as we critique it (Fleming and Banerjee 2016; Gond et al., 2016).

Our view is that the most effective method of making corporations less exploitive of workers is that the workers have equal power in any negotiations (authors, 2016). Through their network of alliances, the CIW members have empowered themselves to effectively influence practices in large corporations, possibly more quickly and effectively than any management theory or critique. We have observed that the CIW's worker-driven efforts appear less susceptible to being subverted or coopted into further exploitation. The WSR approach has been so effective against enslavement that they received U.S. Presidential recognition in 2014 with a medal and a citation: "For its extraordinary efforts to combat human trafficking by pioneering the Fair Food Program, empowering agricultural workers, and leveraging market forces and

consumer awareness to promote supply chain transparency and eradicate modern slavery on participating farms, we award this Presidential Medal." (Downloaded 4/4/2019 4:35pm at https://ciw-online.org/blog/2015/01/presidential-medal-combatting-slavery/)

The CIW is successful because they embody the change they wish to see in the world. They "animate" themselves and their alliance partners with their worker-driven approaches to corporate social responsibility. The CIW successfully influences giant corporations, fosters broad alliances, and effectively combats enslavement and workplace abuses by living their slogan "We are all leaders." We say "Bravo!" to this outstanding ensemble performance.

References

Allain, J., Crane, A., LeBaron, G., & Behbahani, L. (2013). Forced labour's business models and supply chains. Joseph Rowntree Foundation: London. Available at: Http://Www. Jrf. Org. Uk/Sites/Files/Jrf/Forced-Labour-Business-Full. Pdf.(Accessed: 20 August 2014).

Badiou, Alan. (1999). Deleuze: the Clamor of Being. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Bales, K., and Soodalter, R. (2009). The Slave Next Door: Human Trafficking and Slavery in American Today. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Bales, K. (2012). Disposable people: New slavery in the global economy. Univ of California Press.

Bales, K., & Trodd, Z. (Eds.). (2013). *To plead our own cause: personal stories by today's slaves*. Cornell University Press.

Bales, K. (2000). Slavery in the Age of Globalization. *Journal of International Affairs*, 461-484.

Bergson, Henri. (1960). Time and Free-Will: An Essay on the Immediate Data of Consciousness. Translation by F.L. Pogson, New York: Harper & Row.

Bergson, Henri (1988). Matter and Memory. Translation by Nancy Margaret Paul and W. Scott Palmer, New York: Zone Books.

Boal, A. (1979). Theater of the Oppressed. Pluto Press.

Boundas, Constantin V. (2010). Virtual/Virtuality. Pp. 300-302 in in Adrian Parr (ed.). The Deleuze Dictionary Revised Edition (1st edition 2005). UK: Edinburgh University Press.

Bowe, J. (2008). Nobodies: Modern American slave labor and the dark side of the new global economy. Random House Incorporated.

Butkus, A. S. (2007). Ending Modern-Day Slavery in Florida: Strengthening Florida's Legislation in Combating Human Trafficking. Stetson L. Rev., 37, 297.

Byerly, C. M. (2011). Global Report on the Status of Women in the News Media (Washington, DC: International Women's Media Foundation).

Callon, Michel. 1986. "Some Elements of a Sociology of Translation: Domestication of the Scallops and the Fishermen of St Brieuc Bay." Pp. 196–233 in *Power, Action and Belief: A new sociology of knowledge.* Edited by John Law. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Caruana, R., & Crane, A. (2008). Constructing consumer responsibility: Exploring the role of corporate communications. Organization Studies, 29(12), 1495–1519.

Clarke, K.M. (2010). "Towards a Critically Engaged Ethnographic Practice." Current Anthropology, Vol 51 No S2, pp. S301-S312.

Crane, A. (2013). Modern slavery as a management practice: Exploring the conditions and capabilities for human exploitation. Academy of Management Review, 38(1), 49–69.

Crane, A., Henriques, I., Husted, B., & Matten, D. (2015a). A new era for business & society. *Business & Society*, *54*(1), 3-8.

Crane, A., Henriques, I., Husted, B. (2015b). Defining the Scope of *Business & Society. Business and Society,* 54(4), 427-434.

De Landa, M. (1999). Immanence and transcendence in the genesis of form. Pp. 119–34. in I. Buchanan (Ed.), A Deleuzian century. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Deleuze. Gilles. (1990). Logic of Sense. NY: Columbia University Press. French 1969 (Les Editions de Minuit).

Deleuze, Gilles. (1991). Bergsonism, Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam (translator), NY: Zone Books.

Deleuze, Gilles. (1994). Difference and Repetition, Paul Patton (tr.), New York: Columbia University Press. Accessed Mar 24 2019 at https://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu.documents/18052021/20110414150123784.pdf?AWSAccessKeyId=AKIAIWOWYYGZ2Y53UL3A&Expires=1553364161&Signature=1NhSo%2BbOrvRo4jf9cHc62gHwjkw%3D&response-content-disposition=inline%3B%20filename%3DDifference_and_repetition.pdf

Deleuze, Gilles; Guattari, Felix. (1987). A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia. Translation & foreword Brian Massumi. University of Minnesota Press. Accessed Mar 25

2019 at https://www.ntnu.no/wiki/download/attachments/21463142/deleuzeguattarirhizome.pdf

Deleuze, Gilles; Guattari, Felix. (1994). What is Philosophy. Translated by Hugh Tomlinson & Graham Burchell. NY: Columbia University Press.

Down, S., and Hughes, M. (2009) “When the ‘subject’ and the ‘researcher’ speak together: Co-producing organizational ethnography” in Ybema, S., Yanow, D., Weiss, H., and Kamsteeg, F. H. Organizational Ethnography: Studying the Complexities of Everyday Life. London: Sage Publications Ltd., pp. 83-98.

Drainville, A. C. (2008). Present in the world economy: The Coalition of Immokalee Workers (1996–2007). Globalizations, 5(3), 357–377.

Elmes, Michael B., Karla Mendoza-Abarca, and Robert Hersh. "Food banking, ethical sensemaking, and social innovation in an era of growing hunger in the United States." *Journal of Management Inquiry* 25, no. 2 (2016): 122-138.

Esper S., L. Cabantous, L. Barin-Cruz, J.-P Gond (2017). Supporting alternative organizations? Exploring scholars’ involvement in the performativity of worker-recovered companies. Organization, 24(5), 671-699

Estabrook, B. (2012). Tomatoland: How modern industrial agriculture destroyed our most alluring fruit. Andrews McMeel Publishing.

Figiel, J., Slukaitis, S., Walker, A. (2014) “The politics of workers’ inquiry,” Ephemera: Theory & Politics in Organization, Vol 14, issue3, pp. 307-314.

Fleming, P. and Banerjee, S.B. (2016) ‘When Performativity Fails: Implications for Critical Management Studies’, Human Relations 69(2): 257-76.

Gond, J-P., Cabantous, L., Harding, N. and Learmonth, M. (2016) ‘What do we Mean by Performativity in Organizational and Management Theory? The Uses and Abuses of Performativity’, International Journal of Management Reviews 18(4): 440-63.

Hallward, Peter. (2006). Out of this World: Deleuze and the Philosophy of Creation. London: Verso.

LeBaron, G. (2014). Reconceptualizing Debt Bondage: Debt as a Class-Based Form of Labor Discipline. Critical Sociology, 40(5), 763–780.

Linstead, S., & Pullen, A. (2006). Gender as multiplicity: Desire, displacement, difference and dispersion. Human Relations, 59(9), 1287–1310.

Linstead, S., & Thanem, T. (2007). Multiplicity, virtuality and organization: The contribution of Gilles Deleuze. Organization Studies, 28(10), 1483–1501.

Marosi, R. (2014). Desperate workers on a Mexican mega-farm:‘They treated us like slaves.’ LA Metcalf Times, 7, 10–12.

Mills, B. J. (2000). Alternative Leadership Strategies in the Prehispanic Southwest. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press.

Nail, T. (2013). Deleuze, occupy, and the actuality of revolution. *Theory & Event*, *16*(1).No page numbers https://muse.jhu.edu/article/501858/pdf?casa_token=_0yiFAdu9GkAAAAA:AK-LDwNK_HDX_YpJF4eU4vsj0hEkkfgEwJIPUsSJ0wzbGNHHdoEZU9HlpcW1Semd0d5Yg2xoxQ

Peirce, C.S. (1958). Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce, Vol VIII: Reviews, Correspondence, and Bibliography. Burks, A. W., (Ed). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Polanyi, K. (1957). *Societies and Economic Systems*.

Popper, K. (2008). After the Open Society: Selected Social and Political Writings, edited by Shearmur, J., and Turner, P. N. London and New York: Routledge.

Roffe, Jonathan. (2010). Multiplicity. Pp. 181-2 in Adrian Parr (ed.). The Deleuze Dictionary Revised Edition (1st edition 2005). UK: Edinburgh University Press.

Sartre, Jean Paul. (1960/2004). Critique of Dialectical Reason, Vol. 1: Theory of practical ensembles. 1960 is French Critique de la Raison Dialectique Paris: Gallimard. 2004 is English translation by Alan Sheridan-Smith, foreword by Fredric Jameson. London/NY: Verso.

Schatz, E. (2013). What Kinds of Ethnography Does Political Science Need? In Schatz, E. (Ed.) Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Power. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sellers, S., & Asbed, G. (2011). The History and Evolution of Forced Labor in Florida Agriculture. Race/Ethnicity: Multidisciplinary Global Contexts, 5(1), 29–49.

Solomon, L.K. (2015) “Tomato pickers persuade big food companies to sign on to human-rights movement” Florida Sun Sentinel, news article downloaded 9/10/2018, 6:36pm, from http://www.sun-sentinel.com/news/florida/fl-tomato-pickers-20151231-story.html

Wellbrook, C. (2014) “A workers inquiry or an inquiry of workers,” Ephemera: Theory & Politics in Organization, Vol 14, issue3, pp. 357-374.

Wickert, C., Vaccaro, A., & Cornelissen, J. (2017). “Buying” corporate social responsibility: organisational identity orientation as a determinant of practice adoption. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *142*(3), 497-514.

Ybema, S., Yanow, D., Weiss, H., and Kamsteeg, F. H. (2009) Organizational Ethnography: Studying the Complexities of Everyday Life. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Žižek, Slavoj. (20040. Organs Without Bodies: Deleuze and Consequences. New York: Routledge.

Table 1: CIW Alliance Chronology with Corporate Supply Chains

Start Date	Corporate Agreement with CIW
2005	Yum! Brands (Taco Bell, Pizza Hut, KFC)
2007	McDonald
2008	Burger King
2008	Whole Foods Market
2008	Subway
2009	Bon Appétit Management Co.
2009	Compass Group
2009	Aramark
2009	Sodexo
2012	Trader Joe’s
2012	Chipotle Mexican Grill
2014	Wal-Mart
2015	The Fresh Market
2015	USA Hold (Giant, Stop & Shop)[3]
2017	Ben & Jerry’s[4]