

Subject: Natural Steps and pesticide-use

Date: Mon, 08 Aug 2005 11:12:47 -0700

From: M E Craver <mecraver@shaw.ca>

To: Ernie Crist <ernie_crist@dnv.org>

CC: Brian Platts <bplatts@shaw.ca>, Corrie Kost <kost@triumf.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 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



◇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