

Subject: Re: Natural Steps and pesticide-use

Date: Wed, 10 Aug 2005 00:03:58 -0700

From: Corrie Kost <corrie@kost.ca>

To: Ernie Crist <ernie_crist@dnv.org>

CC: Corrie Kost <kost@triumf.ca>, M E Craver <mecraver@shaw.ca>, Brian Platts <bplatts@shaw.ca>, fonvca@fonvca.org, Mayor and Council - DNV <Council@dnv.org>, Senior Management Committee <managecomm@dnv.org>, James Ridge <James_Ridge@dnv.org>

Dear Councillor Crist,

Call me old-fashioned - but I think what counts is the truth in this matter. Denigrating corporations or impugning the motives of government seems like a desperate attempt to avoid the truth - that pesticides are safe to use as directed. I find it odd that we don't hear a peep from certain groups when governments declare something unsafe, yet those same groups consistently cry foul when governments declare something safe. Why is that?

As for who has told lies - neither "side" has an unblemished record. We live in the safest society in history. Live the longest ever. Governments had nothing to do with that?

Now for the Myth of the Day:

"Natural" products are safer than "man-made" products.

It may come as a shock to know that fully 50% of chemicals that occur in nature are carcinogenic - the same % as in man-made chemicals - and natural chemicals vastly outnumber man-made ones. The most deadly substance known to man is the "natural" product botulin.

I know we have the same goals. I wish we could find some common ground here.

Corrie Kost

Ernie Crist wrote:

> A MESSAGE FROM ERNIE CRIST

>

> The previous e-mail was sent to you by mistake, I guess, I pressed the
> wrong button. Below is the corrected version - my apologies.

>

> Ernie Crist

>

> Subject: RE: Natural Steps and pesticide-use

>

> The real issue and the one that Dr. Kost completely missed is not
> whether or not pesticides are safe or not per se but the fact that it is
> the corporations and the government, largely under corporate control,
> who told us that they are harmless. That point is crucial to the
> argument.

>

> The question as to whether you can trust or not trust what it says on a
> label attached to a corporate produced can of pesticides reminds me of
> an old proverb which goes something like this "he who lies but once will
> not be believed again though may he speak the truth". Did you notice
> that the door is always left open by stating "harmless if used
> according to instructions". Are corporations lying? yes, they are, or at
> least exaggerating more often than not. Have they lied in the past?
> indeed they have - over and over again. There is hardly a day where we
> do not learn from reports that this is the case, including that
> pesticides and chemical agents are harmless. People pay dearly for those

> lies sometimes with their lives.
>
> The key issue is that corporations today are the principle controllers
> of society including all levels of government and their agencies.
> Corporate influence reaches into every nook and cranny. This includes
> education, science, immigration, our economy, even the judicial and
> justice system and certainly our media and everything else of
> importance. Morality is that which serves corporations. If you don't
> believe this, watch the next TV program containing more than its share
> of gratuitous violence made possible by corporate paid commercials. Does
> this mean they are lying all the time, no. Does that mean they are not
> making good products? No, it does not mean that either. What it does
> mean, is that we cannot trust them to speak the truth.
>
> In a society where corporations constitute the principle power, it is up
> to government to establish controls commensurate with the need to
> protect its citizens. Governments are supposed to be neutral but they
> are nothing of the sort, not anywhere but especially not in Canada and
> the US. Governments in both countries are today mainly extensions of
> global and mainly US corporations. Governments are doing the corporate
> bidding in each and every step of our lives.
>
> The matter has been dealt with extensively over the last 50 years,
> including by some of the most outstanding scholars and intellectuals
> such as Sir John Kenneth Galbraith who, in his book "The New Industrial
> State" analyzed the corporation and its role in the modern state. Noam
> Chomsky, a distinguished American scholar and intellectual, dealt
> extensively with the corporate controlled media in more than one of his
> books.
>
> The public, through its democratic system i.e. the electoral process,
> has a certain influence over its government and the state but it is
> marginal at best. It is much like controlling the flight of a Boeing 747
> from one of its passenger seats. Do you honestly believe that the newly
> elected MP Don Bell will risk his career to represent the interests of
> his constituents? Or do you think he will do as he is told by his
> corporate friends who have elected him and who are looking to him for
> help to push their agenda in Ottawa.
>
> If the State were indeed neutral, Canada would not have a dollar worth
> 82 cents. Canada, because it has untold natural wealth and a hard
> working and skilled work force, could easily have the highest standard
> of living in the world; so why does it not? Take a guess? Do you
> honestly believe that the number one representative of corporate America
> in Canada namely the American ambassador would dare state in public and
> while in Canada that "we will develop the Alberta Tar Sands" unless he
> knew that the government of Canada is subservient to corporate America?
>
> Or do you think that the Government of Canada would dare take money from
> the Unemployment Insurance Fund taken from the workers of Canada and put
> it into general revenue for the benefit of corporate Canada? Or do you
> think it is an accident that the very first step of the Campbell
> Liberals, following their election, was to give a tax break to
> corporations while eliminating social programs and having a good time
> downloading to municipalities?
>
> And now Dr. Kost is asking us to trust what it says on the label of a
> can of pesticides sold by one of those corporations - I don't think so.
> And that is the issue which underlies all other issues. I did ask
> several housewives who have used some of the pesticides in question
> whether they trust what it says on the label and the answer was
> virtually a unanimous NO. The children got a skin rash and the dog got a
> cough, some of them said. I rest my case.
>
> Ernie Crist

>
>
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Corrie Kost [<mailto:corrie@kost.ca>]
> Sent: Monday, August 08, 2005 11:01 PM
> To: Ernie Crist
> Cc: Corrie Kost; M E Craver; Brian Platts; fonvca@fonvca.org; Mayor and
> Council - DNV; Senior Management Committee; James Ridge
> Subject: Re: Natural Steps and pesticide-use
>
> Ernie Crist wrote:
>
> > Dear Mrs Craver:
> >
> > It is my opinion that anybody who uses harmful pesticides is an
> > extremist - gullible maybe but an extremist just the same.
>
> I fully agree. I just disagree that pesticides like 2,4-D in
> Weed-and-Feed, when used as directed, are harmful - either to the user,
> the neighbours, or the environment.
>
> > The evidence
> > that pesticides are harmful is overwhelming and so is the fact that
> > the producers of these harmful pesticides will do anything within
> > their power to keep on producing regardless of damage to human health
> > and/or the environment.
>
> The evidence is certainly not overwhelming. In fact, from the
> scientific point of view there is no evidence at all that pesticides
> like 2,4-D is harmful when used as directed.
>
> >
> >
> > The last line of defence and their last refuge will be to accuse those
> > who are opposed to their frenzy to make profit, of being ideologically
> > motivated - this does not frighten me, of course, indeed I personally
> > consider it to be a badge of honour for what could be more patriotic
> > then to fight for a healthy environment and against those who, for
> > money's sake, poison the globe. Unfortunately there are people who are
> > intimidated by such tactics and give up the struggle, which is the
> > purpose of the campaign in the first place.
>
> I have no vested interest in any companies promoting pesticides. I
> rarely use ANY of these products. I am a strong common-sense supported
> for a healthy environment. I am not intimidated by either side of any
> debate.
> I am for reason over emotion, for fact over guesswork, and dealing with
> issues in a sustainable fashion. The risk, if any, of using government
> approved pesticides is being taken by the private user, on private
> property. There is no external impacts that science is aware of (if the
> products are properly used).
>
> >
> >
> > Do you remember Vietnam and Agent Orange? It made a lot of money for
> > the producers. The fact that the health of millions of children was
> > ruined for the rest of their lives is rarely reported on. Many of the
> > companies who waxed rich on Agent Orange are the same ones who are
> > producing pesticides - remember it and remember it well.
>
> Good point, but we still buy automobiles from the same factories that

> were used to drive the machinery of past wars. I recall WW1 companies
> making mustard gas (Chlorine) - and they now make it for peaceful uses -
> that have given enormous health benefits. Make no mistake about this -
> if a product should be declared unsafe - these same companies will be
> producing the new ones - and be making more money in the process.

>
>
>
>
>> However, if these extremists including those who have been misled are
>> willing to see the error of their ways and join the ranks of progress,
>
>> we should certainly welcome them with open arms.

>
> Similarly, we should welcome with open arms, even if they won't admit
> their errors, those who are inadvertently setting back the environmental
> movement by misleading the people with unsubstantiated fear mongering.

> Corrie Kost

>> Ernie Crist,
>>
>> _____

>> From: Corrie Kost [<mailto:kost@triumf.ca>]

>> Sent: Monday, August 08, 2005 1:42 PM

>> To: M E Craver

>> Cc: Ernie Crist; Brian Platts; fonvca@fonvca.org; Mayor and Council -

>> DNV; Senior Management Committee; James Ridge

>> Subject: Re: Natural Steps and pesticide-use

>> Dear Monica Craver,

>> I wish life were as simple as Bush put it.. "you are either for us or
>> againsts us". Extreme positions - both ways are almost always wrong.

>> Everything should always remain open to debate. That is how progress
>> is made.

>> The "Natural Steps" are just that - steps. Zero tolerance banning is
>> not a step - it is ideological extremism.

>> Corrie Kost

>> M E Craver wrote:

>> Dear Councillor Crist and Mr. Platts:

>> Has anyone bothered to address the criteria in the "Natural
>> Steps Framework"? If there is sincere effort to put the Natural Steps

>> criteria to work within DNV, then the arguments for pesticide use
>> automatically become null and void. We cannot keep straddling the
>> fence and delaying the "inevitable". Either we are for the Natural
>> Step Communities criteria, or not! If we are, pesticide-use arguments

>> become "moot" (modern usage: "not worth debating"). If we are not,
>> then pesticide-use arguments become "moot" (original usage: "open to
>> debate"). Point taken?

>> Monica Craver

>> Ernie Crist wrote:

> > substance CAN be be harmful to life; it is only a matter of dosage.
> > For example, there are documented cases of healthy people having died
> > from drinking copious amounts of bottled water. No one denies that
> > ingesting or being exposed to anything at an extreme dosage can be
> harmful to human health.

> >
> > Consider that beer is good for killing slugs. Of
> > course alcohol can be extremely toxic and can kill you either quickly
> > or over time by prolonged abuse. Yet countless studies show that
> > moderate alcohol consumption, particularly red wine, can be excellent
> > for your health. Consider also, do you ever swim in a pool or drink
> > tap water? I don't need to tell you that both are treated with
> > chlorine which, at the right dose, is about as deadly a substance as
> > you can find anywhere, but used properly is a benefit to human health.

> >
> > Don't forget you also probably wash some of your clothes with a small
> > amount of chlorine bleach. Sodium Hydroxide which was spilled in that
> > recent train derailment near Squamish and unfortunately killed some
> > fish in a creek is widely used in making soap and is probably an
> > ingredient in every cleaning substance you have in your homes. Have
> > you or any of your kids ever picked-up head lice? Well, the only
> > shampoo able to get rid of the nasty and socially embarrassing problem
> > is really just an insecticidal soap -- and you have to scrub your head
> > with it! Have you ever used mosquito repellent? Well, it's a chemical
> too. I could go on.

> >
> > The reason why some municipal governments have passed
> > bans on safe pesticide use isn't because there is a greater awareness
> > or environmental responsibility at the local level, but rather,
> > municipal governments are by far the easiest level of government for
> > the irrational anti-pesticide movement to "pick off." As I said in an
> > earlier e-mail, beyond the campaign to ban safe pesticides, there are
> > people convinced -- without any scientific basis -- that cell phones
> > or overhead power lines are causing cancers. Others say that
> > electrical appliances are making them sick. You can even find groups
> > demanding, in the interest of health, a ban on wearing perfume
> > fragrances in public.
> > In spite of people living longer and healthier lives than ever before,
> > we are increasingly, and irrationally, afraid of the latest and
> > trendiest health scares.

> >
> > When it comes to the safe use of pesticides, a one
> > litre squirt bottle of selective herbicide or insecticide (or 2-4-D
> > weed &
> > feed) used occasionally in my family's garden is of no health threat
> > to anyone. However, my adjacent neighbour's noxious "Horse Tail" weeds
> > and spreading blackberry vines are a direct threat to the use and
> > enjoyment of my garden which my family takes pride in, and spends a
> > great deal of time and money, not to mention hard work, to maintain
> > and keep beautiful thereby benefiting the surrounding neighbourhood.

> >
> > Sincerely,
> > -Brian

> >
> > Ernie Crist wrote:

> >
> > Dear Mrs. Craver;

> >
> > So there is no misunderstanding on the

> > question of pesticides - yes they are harmful to human health -
> > anything which kills insects and/or bugs also kills people. Of course
> > everything is relative and it stands to reason that the amount of
> > poison needed to kill an insect is less than that needed to kill a
> > human. Also, some humans show more resistance to poison than others.
> > The Russian Monk Rasputin had to be given ten times the amount of
> > poison necessary to kill an average Russian. But then Rasputin was no
> > ordinary man, he was not even an ordinary Russian. He was, as the
> > saying goes, one tough cookie.

> >
> > On the other hand, the accumulation of poisons
> >
> > in the human body does kill. It just takes longer. Nobody has ever
> > died from one cigarette but smoking, over a longer period of time,
> > will definitely kill. As to the contention that there is no
> > scientific evidence to the effect that pesticides are not harmful to
> > human health?..... This is outside the realm of logic. The burden of
> > proof that this is NOT so does not rest with you but with those who
> > deny this.
> > Providing evidence that there are no Aliens in our midst, is NOT your
> > responsibility. The proof that there are, rather rests with those who
> >
> > claim they are here. Stephen Hawking suggested if they were here they
> > would have surely visited him to set him straight on his theories.

> >
> > I do remember a time when scientific evidence,
> >
> > corporate paid scientists and corporate lawyers claimed that asbestos
> > was NOT harmful, ditto with smoking, but asbestos was harmful and
> > smoking was harmful. It just took the scientists a little longer to
> > figure this out than the people with whom I worked with in the the
> > shipyard.

> >
> > The evidence that pesticides are harmful to
> > human health is overwhelming. A visit to the cancer ward should
> > convince anybody. I believe a lot of people have figured this out
> > already which is why they are buying more and more organically grown
> > food. Even my cat, Willie, prefers organically grown food to that
> > laced with pesticides. Frogs, having been around longer than we have,
> > apparently, know it too.

> >
> > Ernie Crist

> >
> > From: M E Craver [<mailto:mecraver@shaw.ca>]
> > Sent: Thursday, August 04, 2005 2:28 PM
> > To: Corrie Kost
> > Cc: Ernie Crist
> > Subject: Re: FW: pesticides and herbicides

> >
> > But, Corrie, I am harmed by others' use of
> > pesticides, whether it harms them or not. It is like second-hand
> > smoke (and, yes, I am affected by that, too) Have you heard of
> > homeopathic medicine? Science cannot measure the minute dilutions and
> >
> > the way homeopathics works, so they "pooh-pooh" it as quackery.

> >
> > Just because it is "undetectable", does not
> > make it safe. It still kills weeds and insects, doesn't it? --thus,
> > harms us also! Meanwhile, it has been proven homeopathics works
> > --placebo/infant studies in the Lancet Medical Journal has proven it.

> > It works on me, my son's hayfever, and of course, the long-lived Royal

> > family, the Windsors.

> >
> > Yes, prohibition does not work, but that
> > should not keep us from trying to severely restrict pesticide usage.
> > I will not bother to argue modern man-made chemical medicines. Some
> > work, and some kill, and all have grave potential side-effects -- you
> > just have to read the warnings in American magazines advertising these
> > Wonder medicines, and news as of late.. There have been many deaths
> > by medicinal iatrogenics, both inside and outside of hospitals. We
> > cannot always take the experts' and professionals' word concerning
> > safety of chemical pesticides/medication. Take care. We agree to
> disagree?

> >
> > Monica Craver

> >
> > Corrie Kost wrote:

> >
> > Dear Monica Craver,
> >
> > I think you may be missing an
> > important point. You have every right to refuse to use any
> > product. You have no right to deny
> > others to use them if no one is harmed by them doing so.
> > I am now reasonably familiar with the
> > safety factors of applying chemicals to lawns. They are typically
> > in the range of 10,000 below any
> > detectable effects on the person applying them - and that
> > is when they are used more than
> > average and over much larger lawns than we have - and
> > with little or no clothing on! For the
> > adjacent lands the factor is in the millions.

> > Your barbeque (assuming you have one)
> >
> > has a far greater impact on the neighbours!

> >
> > It is also obvious that even many
> > naturally occuring substances are harmful if care is not
> > taken on their use. Just because
> > things are man-made does not make them any more
> > unsafe. Misuse by users - be it
> > alcohol, radiation, chlorine, ammonia, sugar, pesticides
> > is what makes them unsafe (compared to
> > the benefits).

> > As for our survival - without
> > man-made chemicals and
> > medicines most of us would not be
> > alive today. This does not mean we cannot do better.
> > By all means - let's promote safer
> > products, but as history has shown, prohibition
> > does not work!

> >
> > Corrie Kost

> >
> > M E Craver wrote:

> >
> > Dear Councillor Crist and Dr. Kost:

> >
> > It is very obvious that man-made
> > chemical pesticides are dangerous. I am living proof of that. Lyle's

>

> > including storm waters, before discharging them into the water. This
> > is a war and requires a more than business as usual approach. It is,
> > in fact, part and parcel of a total war for survival - that is TOTAL
> > WAR FOR SURVIVAL. <> What you are suggesting would leave a loop hole
> > and would require a huge and utterly ineffectual bureaucracy and an
> > even more extensive degree of co-operation from a totally
> > irresponsible and totally ignorant people, who could not care less
> > about the environment.
> > It is like asking a shark to co-operate to save seals. This is the
> > majority I am talking about. I listen to them on CKNW Radio on
> > occasion - it is frightening.

> > My mind is made up - the production,
> > sale and use of all pesticides other than those organically grown and
> > derived from natural products, must be banned. That's it for me.

> > Yours truly,

> > Ernie Crist

> > From: Corrie Kost

> > [<mailto:kost@triumf.ca>]

> > Sent: Thursday, August 04, 2005 8:56

> AM

> > To: Ernie Crist

> > Subject: Re: FW: pesticides and

> > herbicides

> > Dear Councillor Crist,

> > I consider only Scientific American
> > and Nature as reasonably reliable.

> > I certainly do look at the big

> picture.

> > That is why these type of bylaws

> > bother me. They can put the whole

> > environmental program in disrepute (eg. cry wolf syndrome).

> > Of course the planet is being

> poisoned.

> > With so many people it cannot be

> > otherwise. There are no harmless

> > products. Home pesticide remedies are often

> > far less safe than the government

> > approved products. It has not been shown that

> > bylaws have been (all-inclusive) cost

> > effective nor attained the desired effect - namely

> > harm reduction. Note also that

> > "Professionals", using far more potent (read "commercial" as opposed

> to

> > "domestic") versions of products are

> > far more likely to suffer related health problems and

> > will tend to use solutions that result

> > in repeat business (profit being paramount).

> > It is important that public facilities

> > play a leading role in realistic, believable, and

> > cost effective environmental harm

> > reduction.

> > The adage "those in glass houses

> > should not throw stones" comes to mind.

> >

> > Corrie Kost
> >
> > Ernie Crist wrote:
> >
> >
> > Dear Dr. Kost:
> >
> > I read "Scientific American",
> > "Nature", "Discover", "Der Spiegel", I
> > even read "US Business" and the
> > "Economist" and the message to varying
> > degrees is, we must change course. If
> > "US Business" rings the alarm
> > bell, believe me we should all be
> > concerned. I don't keep those
> > magazines. It is a strategic
> > necessity.
> > Always remember the big picture.
> > We must step outside the little box.
> > The planet is being poisoned. It
> > is a fact which in typical corporate
> > fashion is being denied and or
> > marginalised. As long as we make
> > concessions there is no incentive to
> > produce truly harmless products.
> >
> > Ernie Crist.
> >
> >
> >
> > -----Original Message-----
> > From: Corrie Kost
> > [<mailto:corrie@kost.ca>]
> > Sent: Wednesday, August 03, 2005 11:33
> >
> > PM
> >
> > To: Ernie Crist
> > Subject: Re: FW: pesticides and
> > herbicides
> >
> > Dear Councillor Crist,
> >
> > Too bad you did not save them.
> >
> > You should know that every substance
> > on this planet is harmful to life -
> > it is only a matter of dosage. The
> > statement "pesticides are harmful or
> > they are not" is thus not a scientific
> > statement. We should deal with
> > this matter in a factual - not
> > emotional, manner. Exaggerated risk
> > underlies a lot of the junk science on
> > this issue - leading to dogma and
> > the resulting bad policies. I have to
> >
> > believe that reason and rational
> > thinking will prevail. I look forward
> > to a reasoned debate and trust you
> > will keep on open mind in this issue.
> >
> > Corrie Kost

> > are using pesticides. Unfortunately,
> > there is no support from the senior
> >
> >
> > levels of government and it looks like
> >
> > we at the local level have to
> > strike the first blow and maybe this
> > is the way it should be since
> > everything starts at the local level.
> >
> > As for allowing private companies to
> > continue using pesticides?....
> > this cannot be a long term solution
> > either as those who live adjacent
> >
> >
> >
> > to such properties will tell you not
> > to mention the big picture which
> >
> >
> >
> > is indeed frightening to say the
> > least.
> > The scientific material made
> >
> >
> >
> > available to me for reading in the
> > last few months is cause for alarm
> >
> >
> >
> > and that is all I can tell you.
> > However, this matter will be returned
> >
> >
> >
> > to Council for further discussion and
> > deliberation.
> >
> >
> > Yours truly,
> >
> > Ernie Crist
> >
> >
> >
> > From: Bob Huen
> > [<mailto:bobhuen@shaw.ca>]
> >
> > Sent: Wednesday, August 03, 2005 3:03
> > PM
> >
> > To: DNVCouncil
> > Subject: pesticides and herbicides

