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SNOWBALLS IN HELL
THE SOONER, THE BETTER

Nobody will be happier than farm workers when growers finally begin marketing organically-grown, pesticide-free food.

But, determined as we are to end the tragic deaths and illnesses poisonous pesticides cause farm worker families, we know that day is not just around the corner.

Nor is it for consumers. They, too, are endangered by the cumulative effects of ingesting even minuscule amounts of cancer-causing pesticide residues on the food they eat.

Nor is it for environmentalists, who wage a constant battle against agribusiness and other toxic pollutants in a heroic effort to keep the land beautiful and water safe for both humans and animals.

That day is not just around the corner because, from our long struggle with agribusiness, we know corporate growers are too self-indulgent to voluntarily stop using dangerous pesticides no matter how much harm they do to farm workers, consumers, and the land.

We also know from painful experience that corporate growers simply cannot be trusted. There are enough recent scandals in the grape industry alone to remind consumers that they would be as naive to trust the label "organically grown" as farm workers once were to trust similar promises of "free and fair" elections.

Consumers should also be reminded that organically grown and pesticide free are not the same. Even if growers stopped using pesticides in the growing process right now, the chemicals remaining in the soil for many years and those used for cosmetic and cold-storage purposes would still be alarming. For example, practically every single table grape on the market contains residues of sulfur dioxide used to preserve grapes held in storage for long periods of time.

When safe, healthful food becomes commonplace again, farm workers will be happy. So will consumers. And growers, whether they like it or not, must be made to be happy about it, too.

The sooner, the better.
been a new development among growers in reaction to consumers’ fear of pesticides: the use of commercial testing to certify their crops as pesticide free.

The leading commercial laboratory, Oakland-based NutriClean, Inc., serves as the center of a tripartite for-profit affair: NutriClean attracts growers eager to advertise their produce as organically grown and pesticide free and thereby attract more supermarket customers; the supermarkets in turn hype the grower-NutriClean certification and thereby attract consumers who want to buy produce they think contains no pesticide residues.

**Pavich Grapes?**

One table grape grower who tied up with NutriClean and Raley’s Supermarkets in a big advertising blitz was Stephen Pavich and Sons Family Farms with vineyards near Delano and in Arizona. But are Pavich’s Thompson Seedless grapes “grown without any pesticides” as Raley’s advertised? Are there, as Raley’s advertised, “absolutely no detected pesticide residues present”? (Raley’s emphasis)

Marion Moses, M.D., a recognized authority on occupational and environmental disease and a UFW consultant, responded on September 6, 1988, to an inquiry from John Mascaro of the Akron Catholic Commission concerning Pavich’s pesticide-free claims on its pavich-labelled products: “These grapes are from Pavich Farming Farms near Delano. Pavich Family Farms, Pavich says he markets organically grown grapes. In the vineyard, he applies annually to the California Department of Food and Agriculture for a permit to use restricted-use pesticides.”

On which of his own vineyards and additional leased acreage does Pavich use Methyl Bromide? And what about the other pesticides he seeks permits for? Since only some of his grapes qualify as organically grown, which grapes from which fields are going into which boxes?

Does such a large producer of table grapes never have to apply sulfur dioxide during storage? Are there “absolutely” no sulfate residues on Pavich grapes?

Recently, grape pickers in a vineyard near Delano were observed packing the same grapes from the same field into two different-labeled grape boxes: one with the Pavich label and the other marked with the name Pavich and the words “organically grown.” And Pavich simultaneously sells supermarkets some table grapes that have been NutriClean-certified and some that haven’t. Who knows which is which? Pavich and NutriClean. But they won’t tell. Client relationship. It’s a for-profit, not for-consumer, enterprise.

Dr. Moses, who said she applauds “any effort that will provide information to the public on pesticide residues on food,” has strong reservations about NutriClean. For one thing, she points out, there are 496 pesticides legally allowed to be on food at the time of retail sale for which the Environmental Protection Agency has set maximum allowable pesticide residue levels (tolerances). NutriClean has one screen for 14 pesticides and another for 92. So produce certified as pesticide free is in reality free only of the pesticides NutriClean can test for.

Worse yet, a large number of pesticides can’t even be tested for even if a laboratory wanted to because an EPA-FDA testing method has not even been developed. “To my knowledge,” Moses said, “there is no program anywhere in the country, private or public, that tests on a regular basis for all pesticide residues in any food.” (Moses’ emphasis)

From the time Methyl Bromide is first applied to the vineyard soil until the last gassing of grapes with sulfur dioxide, there are no California table grapes, Pavich’s included, with “absolutely no detected pesticide residues present,” as Raley’s advertised.

That’s as certain as no snowballs in hell.

**MR. OBBINK AND THE BOYCOTT**

Truth can often be stranger than fiction, everyone knows.

However, for Bruce Obbink, president of the California Table Grape Commission, who loves to describe himself as a “word merchant” in his capacity as spokesperson for grape growers, there appears to be no discernible difference.

ITEM: Shortly after the United Farm Workers ended its ninth constitutional convention in Delano last October 9 and heard reports on the progress of the national Fast for Life and the multitude of other boycott actions being carried out throughout the U.S. and Canada, Obbink announced: “In the fresh fruit business, God controls production, God controls quality, and God controls the marketplace. The union is really stretching its credibility when it says its activities can supplant the work of God.”

While neither UFW leaders nor members have ever laid claim to sanctity, they are at least somewhat God-fearing and would never be so brazen as to confront God Himself with boycotts and marches and picketing had they known they were interfering in His business and not the growers.

Interestingly, the God of the Marketplace didn’t seem the least bit vindictive after two previous grape boycotts when farm workers unknowingly interfered with His business and He uncharacteristically allowed Himself to be defeated. Strange.

Even more mysterious, God is now showing similar signs of weakness in this boycott. The UFW, unwittingly interfering in His business again, is, in Obbink’s words, guilty of “distorting data on the grape industry... to suit their own damn purposes.” (It is believed he must have meant to say “God-damn purposes,” given the context of his previous remarks, but, of course, it would be presumptuous for lowly farm workers to second guess someone whose forte is the well-chosen word.)

ITEM: This stranger-than-fiction item isn’t quite up to God-of-the-Marketplace standards but close enough to be reported. About four months ago, Obbink announced that the table grape growers would launch a $250,000 media blitz to counteract the increasing success of the UFW boycott. Phase One was carried out. Just recently, however, he held another press conference to announce that, because the boycott was fizzling out anyway, it would be silly to waste money on Phase Two.

For someone as privy as Obbink is to what God
the boycott is over. More bullying beyond the Rockies, apparently.

Meanwhile...

At the root of all Obbink's insights into divine behavior, polls, press releases, and sudden jumps in his frequent-flyer mileage is, of course, the growing impact of the grape boycott by thousands of people on both sides of the Rockies.

The national fast continues without let-up with more celebrities and labor and religious leaders taking up where River Phoenix left off on October 19: Fred Wallace, United Teachers, Florida; Andy Banks, director of Florida Jobs for Justice; Marty Urra, president of Miami American Postal Workers; Judy Johnson, president of Florida State AFL-CIO; Bishop Thomas Gumbleton, Archdiocese of Detroit; Baldemar Velasquez, president of Farm Labor Organizing Committee; Carlos Palomino; Dick Gregory; Dagmar Celeste, First Lady of Ohio; Margot Kidder; Courtney Kennedy-Ruhe; Kelly McGillis; Kathleen Kennedy-Townsend; and Whoopi Goldberg.

Numerous other individuals and groups were also "sharing the burden" of the fast throughout the country. For example, the 33-member national executive board of Church Women United began their fast on November 14 and planned to keep on until Christmas Eve.

Elsewhere, reports from boycott offices and letters to the national boycott office in La Paz indicated people's actions were causing the removal of grapes from local supermarkets, college and school cafeterias, church and temple social halls, union halls, and even some restaurants.

And for the past several months, even agricultural weeklies and national and state market reports have been quoting lower prices for California table grapes and using such general phrases as "movement slow," "storage supplies twice as much as same time last year," "demand down," and "trading too slow to quote."

All the boycott actions being carried out by UFW supporters throughout the U.S. and Canada cannot be tabulated precisely enough to report exact totals and percentages. Only God knows all the exact details. After all, He's in control of the marketplace.

Meanwhile, farm workers, too ignorant to know better, keep right on boycotting grapes and supermarkets without realizing they are interfering in God's business and not the growers'.

Mercy!
The results of the latest research on the link between pesticides and birth defects will come as no surprise to many farm worker mothers.

They have known for a long time, through tragic personal experiences, what researchers are finally discovering through scientific studies: women living or working in California agricultural counties where pesticide use is high experience almost double the normal risk of having babies with birth defects.

The latest research, reported in the American Journal of Public Health in June, was carried out at the University of Washington in Seattle by a team headed by Dr. David Schwartz. It was the second such study done by Schwartz and joins two other research reports recently published in foreign countries that reveal a similar relationship between pesticide exposure and "limb-reduction" birth defects — missing or severely deformed arms and legs. (In his earlier research two years ago, Schwartz tentatively established a link between birth defects and farm worker parents.)

Schwartz learned that women living in farm counties high in pesticide use were 1.9 times more likely than other California women to give birth to babies with limb-reduction defects, and farm worker mothers were 1.6 times more likely to have a child with both a limb-reduction defect and some other type of deformity.

Schwartz said the slightly lower risk among women working in the fields could "be an underestimate based on misclassification of maternal occupation." He said 50% of the birth certificates for babies born with deformities classified their mothers only as "homemakers," but he said his researchers strongly suspect that a significant proportion of women listed as homemakers actually had been employed as farm workers during pregnancy.

In the research conducted by Schwartz and his team, 237 cases of limb-reduction birth defects were identified on California birth certificates between Jan. 1, 1982 and Dec. 31, 1984. Women who had children with birth defects and who lived and worked in the 12 counties with high pesticide use were compared at random with 475 other women who gave birth at about the same time of the year.

Jose Luis Gonzalez was born with missing fingers. His mother, Nora, worked more than 10 years in vineyards owned by the Tenneco Corporation.

Grape Workers
Dr. Marion Moses, an authority on environmental disease and a consultant for the United Farm Workers, said that the new findings substantiate the UFW contention "that farm workers, particularly in the grape industry, experience abnormally high birth defect rates." Several of the 12 counties identified in Schwartz' research involve grape production.

Moses pointed out that Captan, one of the five dangerous pesticides the UFW is seeking to have banned in its current table grape boycott, is a carcinogen (cancer causing) and teratogen (causes birth defects). It is structurally similar to thalidomide, the sedative drug that caused thousands of infants to be born without arms or legs in the early 1960s. "Captan," she added, "is the pesticide found most frequently in residue testing of grapes."

Compelling Theory
Schwartz acknowledged that every single factor that might account for his findings was not explored and that "one piece of work does not establish a causal relationship." And Dr. John Harris, chief of the California Birth Defects Monitoring Program, said Schwartz' reliance on data obtained from birth certificates "has significant risks."

However, Dr. Lowell Sever, an expert on birth defects at the federal government's Center for Disease Control in Atlanta, said Schwartz' two research studies plus the two from other countries linking pesticide exposure to limb-reduction defects create "a compelling theory."

For the farm worker mothers who have given birth to babies with missing or severely deformed arms and legs, the compelling theory is tragic reality — one that will continue until growers and pesticide manufacturers demonstrate a concern for farm workers as compelling as their concern for profits.
Cancer-causing Residues Okayed

EPA ON THE MOVE AGAIN — BACKWARD

A recent decision by the Environmental Protection Agency once again did more to heighten the mockery of its name than to provide farm workers and consumers better protection from cancer-causing pesticides. On October 12, the EPA announced it would move back from a "zero-risk" to a "negligible-risk" standard regarding cancer-causing pesticide residues in both raw and processed food. In certain cases, the agency said, the economic and social benefits of a steady supply of a given foodstuff outweighed the risk associated with pesticide residues, even those known to cause cancer.

EPA: A steady supply of a given foodstuff outweighs the risk associated with pesticide residues, even those known to cause cancer.

Legality Questioned

The EPA knew its step backward in protecting farm workers and consumers from cancer-causing pesticides in the fields and from their residues in food would certainly provoke controversy and likely prompt legal action against the agency. "It's probably unrealistic to think we won't be challenged legally," said John Moore, acting deputy administrator of the EPA.

Those words were no sooner out of Moore's mouth than that probability became a strong likelihood. Janet Hathaway, lawyer with the Natural Resources Defense Council in Washington, D.C., said her group was considering a lawsuit challenging the new EPA policy. "The agency has re-written the pesticide rules for its own convenience instead of coming up with measures to protect the public," she said.

Profits vs. People

Obbink expressed more concern about dollars than he did the danger sulfur dioxide residues pose for both diners and consumers who buy similarly poisoned grapes at supermarkets. "They are protected by regulations of the Food and Drug Administration," he said.

Some protection. The FDA has conceded that 17 deaths and hundreds of illnesses have already resulted from sulfite dioxide residues among sulfite-sensitive consumers in the U.S. It was, in fact, the death of a 10-year-old Salem girl, Medaya McPike, who died after eating sulfite-treated food in a restaurant, that led the Oregon Legislature to enact stricter regulations.

Will Bruce Obbink and California table grape growers get their way in Oregon, too?

Grape Growers Sue Oregon

Hell hath no fury like California table grape growers scorned. Or even slighted.

The State of Oregon felt that fury in October when the angry growers demanded that Oregon's Marion County Circuit Court nullify a rule requiring restaurants to post public notices warning diners when sulfite-treated table grapes are served.

The growers are afraid Oregon restaurants will quit serving grapes rather than post the warnings. "We've already got some restaurants that are no longer handling our products," said Bruce Obbink, president of the California Table Grape Commission, which represents 1,100 table grape growers. "Our losses could total several hundreds of thousands of dollars," he said.

Profits vs. People

Obbink expressed more concern about dollars than he did the danger sulfur dioxide residues pose for both diners and consumers who buy similarly poisoned grapes at supermarkets. "They are protected by regulations of the Food and Drug Administration," he said.

Some protection. The FDA has conceded that 17 deaths and hundreds of illnesses have already resulted from sulfite dioxide residues among sulfite-sensitive consumers in the U.S. It was, in fact, the death of a 10-year-old Salem girl, Medaya McPike, who died after eating sulfite-treated food in a restaurant, that led the Oregon Legislature to enact stricter regulations.

Table grapes are often kept in cold storage for long periods before shipment. To preserve them, growers gas them with sulfur dioxide every seven to 10 days, leaving on them sulfite residues over the legal limit of 10 parts per million.

Last year, the Environmental Protection Agency permitted grape growers to market grapes with excessive sulfite residues as long as they tagged 40% of them — two out of five bunches — with warning labels. But that turned out to be a farce. (See Food and Justice, January 1988.)

This past April, the EPA, succumbing to pressure from grape growers, did away with the tagging and instead permitted growers, subject to the almost nonexistent monitoring of the FDA, to certify that their grapes contained sulfur dioxide residues under the 10 ppm level.

Even worse, the FDA is now allowing grape growers to set up their own laboratories to test and certify their grapes. When the FDA this year granted such permission to Delano growers Marko Zaninovich and Pandol and Sons, Dr. Marion Moses, environmental disease expert and consultant for the United Farm Workers, expressed amazement that the FDA "could be so blind to the obvious danger of turning over regulatory power to the very industry being regulated."

In California, one way or the other, in or out of court, table grape growers get their way. Whether or not the same holds true in Oregon remains to be seen.
“Monster” Pesticide Revived

The use of Dinoseb, a highly toxic and deadly pesticide, has the federal Environmental Protection Agency flip-flopping on how to handle pressure from the agrichemical industry and its own responsibility to farm workers and the public.

Dinoseb is one of the five dangerous pesticides which the UFW wants banned. The compound is known as a “teratogen,” from the Greek ἔταρατος, which means monster — a reference to its victims who suffer severe birth defects as deformities of the fetal brain and spine, sterility through testicular atrophy, and genetic mutations.

Exposure to Dinoseb can be deadly. In late 1983, a farm worker died after his backpack sprayer leaked and the Dinoseb seeped through his clothes. It can also cause blindness through cataracts, cancer, defects in the immune system, yellow staining of the skin, hair and fingernails.

Two years ago, EPA Administrator Lee Thomas explained that an “emergency suspension” issued to prohibit use of Dinoseb was based on “an unacceptable risk” to applicators, equipment maintenance and repair workers, farm workers re-entering fields after spraying, and other people who come into contact with Dinoseb-tainted equipment or clothing.

EPA issued the suspension after the agency received studies from a West German manufacturer which showed Dinoseb causes serious defects in the bones and nerves of the offspring of laboratory animals. But then agribusiness flexed its muscle and used political pressure through congressional representatives to make EPA issue “emergency exemptions” and allow the use of Dinoseb on certain crops in Oregon, Washington and Idaho.

In April 1987, a federal judge in Oregon ruled Thomas’ decision as arbitrary and opened the doors for the use of Dinoseb on more crops in the Northwest.

The EPA again bowed to agrichemical industry pressure when in June of this year it reached a settlement with chemical manufacturers to allow conditional use of Dinoseb to kill weeds in crops of chickpeas, lentils and peas through this year and on specified berries through 1989. To top it off, the EPA had to bear the cost of disposing the remaining stocks of the poisonous pesticide to the tune of $260 million. The dangers were apparently overlooked when the rationale for the settlement was given: The benefits of Dinoseb outweigh the risks.

Agribusiness was not satisfied. “The growers sued to challenge the settlement because it requires that Dinoseb no longer be used after this growing season,” said Albert H. Meyerhoff, senior attorney at the Natural Resources Defense Council in San Francisco. “We sued to try to get the chemical immediately banned.” Both challenges were denied twice and the case will be heard by the ninth circuit court of appeals in San Francisco.

The on-again off-again decisions actually began in California. Acting on an EPA announcement in August 1986 that Dinoseb was linked to birth defects, the California Department of Food and Agriculture head at the time, Claire Berryhill, who is himself a grower, banned its use in California. But then, only five days later, Berryhill reversed his decision under pressure from his fellow growers.

STUDENTS USED IN PESTICIDE TEST

Last summer when the Rhone-Poulenc Ag Company wanted to prove that Zolone, a pesticide they manufacture, is not poisonous, they lured college students into working in vineyards sprayed two weeks earlier to see if they would be poisoned. To make sure they would have plenty of participants, the company recruited needy students from Porterville College and offered a salary and bonuses which amounted to three times more than what the average farm worker makes.

Participants were told they could earn as much as $1800 for just six days of work, including bonuses for high production, $10 per hour and $25 per full grape bin. “I told the supervisor that those kind of wages are what farm workers regularly deserve to be paid,” said David Mendoza, one of several farm workers also recruited for the testing.

Zolone, also known as Phosalone, was blamed for the 1987 poisonings of 80 farm workers in three separate incidents in San Joaquin and Napa vineyards which had been sprayed with the pesticide. The farm workers suffered organophosphate poisoning by which the cholinesterase level was depressed, resulting in destruction of enzymes vital to the nervous system. Other symptoms included headaches, nausea and vomiting.

After the poisonings, Rhone-Poulenc had to pull its label on grapes and deciduous-tree fruits while they reevaluated the chemical, according to John Corkins, president of Research for Hire, which was sub-contracted to do the human guinea-pig research.

Corkins, incidentally, is also president of the Tulare County Farm Bureau, a grower-controlled group which issues anti-UFW and pro-agribusiness propaganda. When news about using students leaked out, he arranged a grower press conference and photo sessions of the research at Silver Farms in Delano to counter a public outcry. Major dailies covered the event, as well as Time magazine.

The California Department of Agriculture issued stop-harvest orders after the three crew poisonings occurred. CDFA eventually gave permission for the harvest to resume under specified conditions.

Julio Calderon, a spokesman for CDFA, reported that Zolone breaks down in high temperatures under dry conditions to create Ozone, a highly toxic chemical. CDFA officials believe that the poisonings were caused by exposure to the high residue levels of Ozone found in the duff and the dust that collect on the ground near the grapevines.

“Three or four people who attended the orientation objected to the experiment and said they would not participate,” said Mendoza. To participate in the test, the subjects had to sign a consent form which informed them of the symptoms they might suffer: “Low blood pressure, blurred vision, pinpoint pupils, trembling, twitching, slow heart rate, staggering, shortness of breath and walking disorders.” Some of these same symptoms were also experienced by farm workers in the three crew poisonings.

While Rhone-Poulenc tests different methods to get Zolone certified, farm workers continue working in fields where chemicals like Zolone and others even more poisonous are still being sprayed.
HUERTA RETURNS TO LEAD SAN FRANCISCO MARCH

More than 3500 marchers show their support for the grape boycott on their way to a lively rally in San Francisco.

Over 3500 supporters, labor leaders, farm workers, children, and public officials marched in San Francisco on November 19 and gathered for a rally geared to focus attention on the grape boycott. The event was co-sponsored by the San Francisco Labor Council, Mobilization for Peace, Jobs and Justice, and the UFW. Labor leader Dolores Huerta was featured as the main speaker, her first public appearance since she suffered a near-fatal attack by a San Francisco policeman on September 14.

"It was a very successful march," said Humberto Gomez, UFW boycott director in San Francisco. "The media coverage was pretty good; we reached over a million people."

Chants of "Boycott grapes!" "Viva Dolores Huerta!" "Viva Cesar Chavez!," Latin jazz, sambas, and labor songs filled the air as the procession wound through the community in sunny weather. Stops along the way were made to urge supermarkets to stop selling grapes and encourage participation from bystanders.

Waving UFW flags and carrying colorful banners and signs, the marchers started in front of the Hawthorne Elementary School and then proceeded through the Mission District and Castro communities.

"I hope the march will help make the government understand and stop the use of pesticides which harm people's health," said farm worker Francisco Silva. Silva said he suffered pesticide poisonings while working in the fields and is in favor of thorough testing of food for pesticide residues.

After two hours of walking, participants crowded on the partially closed-off city thoroughfare in front of the Safeway store near downtown.

"Abajo!" shouted the crowd in agreement with Huerta when she stated, "We are against the violence that is committed against farm workers by the horrible misuse of pesticides, and we will end that violence by boycotting grapes: down with grapes! By this march, we are proving to the government understand and stop the use of pesticides which harm people's health and Asian community leaders announced a three-day fast and expressed unity with the UFW and the grape boycott.

The police attack on Huerta was a major theme of the statements made by other speakers. "On the night of September 14th, a San Francisco Police Department representative battered her to near death, ruptured her spleen, broke her ribs, sent her to the hospital like a poor rag doll battered into the pavement in front of the Saint Francis Hotel," said Jack Henning, executive secretary-treasurer of the California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO. "And a confused grand jury, not only in effect vindicated the assault, but then had the madness to say that the police department should establish an intelligence system that would monitor and maintain surveillance on all dissenting groups in our society."

Henning said he was pleased to note that San Francisco Chief of Police Frank Jordan had also renounced the surveillance proposal, and he then added, "We ask Mayor Agnos today, speak out, speak against the surveillance of trade unionists and other dissenters in our free society."

The National Fast for Life was passed on at the rally by Farm Labor Organizing Committee President Baldemar Velasquez to actor and former world champion welter-weight boxer, Carlos Palomino, to "share the suffering" of Cesar Chavez' 36-day water-only Fast for Life. The Reverend Jesse Jackson initiated the chain of fasting when he accepted a small wooden cross from Chavez at the mass ending Chavez' fast on August 21.

Other speakers at the afternoon rally included: James Herman, president of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union (ILWU); Al Lannon, ILWU, Local 6; Sherri Phiefa, president of the Hotel and Restaurant Employees, Local 2; and Father Joe Tobin of Our Lady of Lourdes Church in San Francisco.

To conclude the rally, Huerta broke bread with farm workers Pedro Perales and Ray Munoz and the Reverend Bill Adol, who had fasted for up to six days for nonviolence and in support of the grape boycott.

Three days before the march and rally, more than twenty Bay Area labor, Latino and Asian community leaders announced a three-day fast and expressed unity with the UFW and the grape boycott.

Dolores Huerta is given a heartwarming welcome back to San Francisco after the near-fatal beating she received from a policeman on September 14. Joining her in one of the songs during the rally are (left to right) Howard Wallace, UFW march organizer; Huerta's daughters Maria and Camila; and Jack Henning, executive secretary-treasurer of the California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO.
Every year, more than 300,000 farm workers are poisoned while working with toxic pesticides that cause cancer, birth defects, chronic illness. And death.

Every day, you are consuming the same toxic substances in the food you eat.

Right now, the only major organized attempt to end pesticide abuse in our fields and food is being conducted by the United Farm Workers — but we need your help.

To join us in this important struggle — and at the same time take advantage of a unique learning experience as a volunteer with the United Farm Workers — fill out the coupon below and we will send you more information.

Mail to: Cesar Chavez, P.O. Box 62, La Paz, CA 93570. Thank you.
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