

Subject: RE: Natural Steps and pesticide-use

Date: Tue, 9 Aug 2005 20:01:34 -0700

From: "Ernie Crist" <ernie_crist@dnv.org>

To: "Ernie Crist" <ernie_crist@dnv.org>, "Corrie Kost" <corrie@kost.ca>

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>

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:

>
> 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 than 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,

> [\[mailto:corrie@kost.ca\]](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

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

> [\[mailto:kost@triumf.ca\]](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"

>
> *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*