

Subject: Re: Natural Steps and pesticide-use

Date: Mon, 08 Aug 2005 23:00:44 -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>

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:

> Dear Mrs Craver:

> Corporations producing toxic pesticides will be pleased
> to hear that there is continued support by sections of the public for
> the production, distribution and sale of toxic pesticides when they
> could be forced to produce products without causing harm to human
> health. Natural agents like organic food is more expensive we have been
> told. Of course we were also told that the Pinto produced by the Ford

> Motor Company was safe. Unfortunately, some people believed it and paid
> with their lives.

>
> The proof of the pudding is in the eating as the saying
> goes. Facts are stubborn things and the facts are that asthma related
> diseases among the population, but especially among children are
> escalating and much of this is due to the increasing use of toxins from
> pesticides ending up in the atmosphere and the soil. It adds to the
> stock of toxic pollutants adding to the progressive poisoning of the
> world around us. Canada is one of the world's worst offenders and per
> capita is on par with the other corporate controlled power, namely the
> US. It is little wonder that the US has refused to sign the KYOTO
> agreement.

>
> Lack of public protest is of course music to the ears of
> the corporate leaders and saves them a great deal of money and bother
> and surely money is what this is all about. The human brain evolved
> through direct experience with the physical world around us. In such an
> environment well being translates into convenience and what is more
> convenient then to poison pests from a corporate produced spray can
> bought in the store. Besides, we can always pretend it is not toxic,
> after all it says so right on the corporate produced spray can does it
> not?

>
> What is apparently lacking on the part of the
> apologists of this corporate agenda is a fundamental understanding of
> the subversive, corrupting and anti social effects of the corporate
> mentality. It is also convenient since it saves us the trouble to
> challenge and go to war against powerful corporations, their paid
> scientists and their paid lawyers not to speak of our neighbours some of
> whom have also been brainwashed.

>
> Ernie Crist
>
>
>

>
> From: Brian Platts [<mailto:bplatts@shaw.ca>]
> Sent: Sunday, August 07, 2005 9:10 PM
> To: Ernie Crist; M E Craver
> Cc: Corrie Kost; fonvca@fonvca.org; Mayor and Council -
> DNV; Senior Management Committee; James Ridge
> Subject: Re: FW: pesticides and herbicides

>
> Dear Coun. Crist & Ms. Craver,

>
> Statements such as "anything which kills insects and/or
> bugs also kills people" rings of hysteria. This kind of thinking is not
> based on science, logic or even common sense. It is based instead on
> emotion and dogma. As Corrie Kost pointed-out, EVERY 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 occurring 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
> grandfather was proof of that. Both of us were poisoned by pesticides.
> Lyle's grandfather, now deceased, suffered from the effects of
> "government approved commercial application" of DDT poisoning. I am
> suffering from increasing chemical sensitivity from pesticide poisoning
> in the mid-eighties, from "government approved commercial application"
> of whatever was used to curtail cockroaches in the apartment complex we
> were living in at the time. Remember the saying, "Unsafe at any speed"?
> Pesticides, no matter who applies them, is "unsafe with any
> application".

> Meanwhile to keep as healthy as
> possible, I take omega 3-6-9 oils, vitamins and minerals, and immune
> enhancers. And I avoid use of any chemicals, as much as possible. And
> no pesticides! There are natural remedies to get rid of pests from ants
> to mice, and they have all worked. It may require a little more work,
> and the results are not instantaneous -- but do work!

> A relative who worked in the lawn care
> business, is now on disability, as the pesticides applied to the rolls
> of turf poisoned her. Dig deep enough, and you will find that people
> working in lawn care do suffer from the effects, also -- themselves, or
> family members. The cumulative effects are still there, so it does not
> matter if a weaker solution is applied or not. It may also depend on
> our physical make-up and DNA as to who will be "affected" and who will
> not. That does not mean it is safe! Of course we know that the chemical
> brew that is already inside our bodies from before birth and mixing in
> the air and water to create "who knows what?" is not good for us. So
> why add more to the mixture?

> I have no patience for the "whining" of
> those lawn care folks and the people who hire them -- because there are
> safe and natural solutions out there! Meanwhile, my health suffers from
> the continual commercial application of pesticides on neighbouring
> lawns. Why should I have to continually run around the house closing
> windows on a hot summer day, to protect myself from pesticides and
> chemical fertilizers being applied downwind? I am strongly on the side
> of Councillor Crist on this one, Dr. Kost. This is a fight for Survival!

> The chemical and drug companies work hand in hand. Cancer drugs are
> created by the same companies that make pesticides. They have the
> government in their pockets. Pesticides are "unsafe with any
> application". I, in the meantime, do not wish to die proving it.

>
> Sincerely,
> Monica Craver
> <<http://www.pesticidefreeyards.org>>

>
> <>Dear Dr.Kost:

>
> On this one there is no meeting of the
> minds. I want to pursue a totally new approach - a quantum leap, as in
> organically grown food as in prohibiting the production, sale and
> smoking of cigarettes or as in treating and neutralising all effluents
> 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 an open mind in this issue.

Corrie Kost

Ernie Crist wrote:

Dear Dr. Kost

> I did not save them. However, the
> evidence is overwhelming and the
> logic inescapable. The flaw in your
> position is evident in the
> statement "when used as indicated".
> Pesticides are either harmful or
> they are not.

Yours truly,

Ernie Crist

-----Original Message-----

From: Corrie Kost

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

Sent: Wednesday, August 03, 2005 5:20 PM

To: Ernie Crist

Subject: Re: FW: pesticides and

> herbicides

Dear Councillor Crist,

> Kindly forward any and all articles
> which indicate that "domestic"
> grade pesticides are a health hazard
> when used as indicated on the
> package(s).

Corrie Kost

Ernie Crist wrote:

From: Ernie Crist

Sent: Wednesday, August 03, 2005 5:00 PM

To: 'Bob Huen'; DNVCouncil

Subject: RE: pesticides and herbicides

Dear Mr. Huen

> Needless to say there is much logic in
> what you say and I would never

> agree to a ban of pesticides no matter
> what, as long we ourselves
> 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

> Mayor and Councilors,
>
> I find it amazing that you would
> consider banning pesticides used by
> professional lawn care companies but
> allow private individuals to
> purchase these chemicals and possibly
> misuse them. I am equally
> astonished that you would allow the
> parks board and golf courses to
> use
>
> them and expose the public to them while
> banning the use on private
> property where access is controlled. You
> have it backwards. I suggest
>
>
>
> banning the sale and use of these
> products by private individuals and
>
>
> only allow trained professionals to
> apply them. Your plan would only
> lead to a much greater misuse of these
> chemicals by private
> individuals.
>
>
> Bob Huen 920 Shakespeare Avenue North
> Vancouver V7K 2Y9
>
>
>
>
>
>

> Name: winmail.dat
> winmail.dat Type: application/ms-tnef
> Encoding: base64
> Download Status: Not downloaded with message

Corrie Kost <kost@triumf.ca>

