

PRECAUTIONARY PRINCIPLE Part 4



FORCE OF NATURE

THE WHOLE TRUTH FROM AN INDEPENDENT PERSPECTIVE from
National Organization Responding Against HUJE that seek to harm the Green Space Industry (NORAHG)



In the 9|11 Era of Anti-Pesticide Terrorism ...

Pest control products CANNOT BE PROHIBITED in agriculture

- ANY RESTRICTION on the use of pest control products would result in a SUBSTANTIAL REDUCTION IN HARVESTS and a related SUBSTANTIAL INCREASE IN FOOD COSTS, LACK OF AFFORDABLE FOOD, HUGE INCREASES IN STARVATION, and tens of thousands of additional DEATHS among the poor of the world.
- Even if you could use all the organic material that you have — the animal manures, the human waste, the plant residues — and get them back on the soil, YOU COULD NOT FEED MORE THAN FOUR BILLION PEOPLE.
- If all agriculture were organic, you would have to INCREASE CROP-LAND AREA DRAMATICALLY, spreading out into marginal areas and cutting down millions of acres of forests.
- Organic farming — with no use of conventional pest control products — CANNOT MATCH THE PRODUCTION OF CONVENTIONAL FARMING.
- Organic farming is INCAPABLE of feeding the entire world.
- The Precautionary Principle weighs even more strongly AGAINST the PROHIBITION of AGRICULTURAL pest control products.
- The Precautionary Principle would clearly and strongly dictate that agricultural pest control products NOT BE BANNED.

The Wisdom of John J. Holland



Precautionary Principle

October 2011

John J. Holland

T & R Government Affairs

Selected and adapted excerpts



John J. Holland is Communications Director for Integrated Environmental Plant Management Association of Western Canada (IEPMA). He is Canada's most eloquent and intelligent writer on the subject of public policy and pest control products.

The Wisdom of John J. Holland



The CARNAGE of Anti-Pesticide food production
that leads to STARVATION and DEATH

Agriculture and Food Security THREATENED by Precautionary Principle

The Precautionary Principle weighs even more strongly AGAINST the PROHIBITION of AGRICULTURAL pest control products.

Obviously, ANY RESTRICTION on the use of pest control products would result in a SUBSTANTIAL REDUCTION IN HARVESTS and a related SUBSTANTIAL INCREASE IN FOOD COSTS.

This, in turn, would quickly equate to a LACK OF AFFORDABLE FOOD, a HUGE INCREASE IN STARVATION, and tens of thousands of additional DEATHS among the poor of the world.

The Wisdom of a REAL Expert



Pesticide-Free Agriculture would
REDUCE crop production by 21 per cent

Therefore, the Precautionary Principle would clearly and strongly dictate that agricultural pest control products NOT BE BANNED.

According to an April 2003 report by the United States National Centre for Food and Agricultural Policy, crop production would be REDUCED by 21 per cent IF HERBICIDES WERE NOT USED (this does not include insecticides or fungicides).

Moreover, according to a September 2009 statement released by the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization, by 2050, THE WORLD MUST INCREASE ITS FOOD PRODUCTION by 70 per cent to adequately provide food for a projected world population of 9.1 billion.

The Wisdom of John J. Holland



The world MUST INCREASE
its food production ... or else

According to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
(FAO) ...

*<< ... for the first time in human history, more than one
billion people are under-nourished world-wide >>*

Reference — More People than Ever Are Victims of Hunger, FAO press release, June 2009.

As well, from Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
(FAO) ...

*<< since the 1990s, the number of under-nourished people
has been increasing. >>*

Reference — The State of Food and Agriculture, FAO, 2009, available on-line.

The Wisdom of a REAL Expert



FOOD INSECURITY would
lead to POVERTY and DEATH

Cornell University's Christopher Barrett, in an article in Science Magazine, outlined some of the problems with food security, stating —

<< Although the most severe FOOD INSECURITY is typically ASSOCIATED WITH DISASTERS such as drought, floods, war, or earthquakes, most FOOD INSECURITY is associated, not with catastrophes, but rather with CHRONIC POVERTY.

Only 8 per cent of hunger-related DEATHS world-wide in 2004 were caused by humanitarian emergencies.

92 per cent were associated with chronic or recurring hunger and malnutrition. >>

Reference — Christopher B. Barrett, Measuring Food Insecurity, Science, Vol.327, Feb. 12, 2010.

The Wisdom of John J. Holland



*Organic farming is INCAPABLE
of feeding the entire world*

Organic Farming

Organic farming — with no use of conventional pest control products —
CANNOT MATCH THE PRODUCTION OF CONVENTIONAL FARMING.

Organic farming is INCAPABLE of feeding the entire world.

According to University of Edinburgh molecular biologist, Professor Anthony
Trewavas —

<< *An intensive farm can match organic yields using only
50 to 70 per cent of the farmland.* >>

Reference — Anthony Trewavas, What's so Great About Organic, The Telegraph, February 22nd, 2009.

The Wisdom of a REAL Expert



*Organic farming could not feed
more than four billion people*

Dr. Norman Borlaug (1914 – 2009), a Nobel Peace Prize Laureate and the man credited with saving millions of lives through his development of the Green Revolution, stated in an interview in 2000 —

<< Even if you could use all the organic material that you have — the animal manures, the human waste, the plant residues — and get them back on the soil, YOU COULDN'T FEED MORE THAN FOUR BILLION PEOPLE.

In addition, if all agriculture were organic, you would have to INCREASE CROP-LAND AREA DRAMATICALLY, spreading out into marginal areas and cutting down millions of acres of forests. >>

Reference — Norman Borlaug, Happy 95th Birthday, interview by Ronald Bailey, re-published in Reason Magazine, March 26th, 2009.

John J. Holland iepma@shaw.ca

John J. Holland is Communications Director for Integrated Environmental Plant Management Association of Western Canada (IEPMA).

He is Canada's MOST ELOQUENT and INTELLIGENT WRITER on the subject of public policy and pest control products.

In Letters To The Editor, Holland has EFFECTIVELY and FREQUENTLY SPOKEN OUT AGAINST Anti-Pesticide Activists.

The Integrated Environmental Plant Management Association of Western Canada (IEPMA), in conjunction with its membership, has been VERY decisive regarding the CONSPIRACY to PROHIBIT pest control products in British Columbia.

After all, conventional pest control products are HEALTH-CANADA-APPROVED, FEDERALLY-LEGAL, SCIENTIFICALLY-SAFE, and PRACTICALLY-NON-TOXIC.

The Integrated Environmental Plant Management Association has correctly recognized that this is a BEACH-HEAD in the FIGHT FOR VICTORY against the ANTI-PESTICIDE CONSPIRACY to PROHIBIT pest control products in British Columbia.

Here are Mr. Holland's career highlights and accomplishments —

Fields of study — Honours BA in History and Geology, post-graduate work in History

Notable work — owner of a large professional lawn and tree care company in the Okanagan Region of British Columbia (1983 – 2004) — supervisor of a structural pest control company (1979 – 1982)

Special contributions — Communications Director of Integrated Environmental Plant Management Association of Western Canada (2007 – present) — Vice-President of Integrated Environmental Plant Management Association of Western Canada (1998 – 2007) — President of Environmental Standards Association (1985 – 1994) — Co-Founder of Environmental Standards Association, the fore-runner to IEPMA (1984)

John J. Holland

Here are some examples of Holland's wisdom —

Agencies of your own Government — namely Health Canada and the PMRA [Pest Management Regulatory Agency of Health Canada] — have stated on numerous occasions that 2,4-D POSES NO UNACCEPTABLE RISKS TO THE PUBLIC.

Although I have never used my degree in the profession for which I studied, I found that the training I received in the methods of research was invaluable in enabling me to discern the facts of the real science behind the use of pest control products. Not being a scientist, I have always been guided by the work of those who are the actual experts.

As you may be aware, there are also numerous MISLEADING — or UN-SCIENTIFIC — studies with such a negative point of view, such as the Ontario College of Family Physicians' [OCFP] Pesticide Literature Review (2004). This review has been used to support almost every proposed pesticide ban, from the Municipal to the Provincial (e.g., Ontario) level. The information used by those like the OCFP has been CHERRY-PICKED by the physicians — NOT SCIENTISTS — writing the report, and the report has been DISCOUNTED by many scientists and government experts in this and other countries. Studies used are generally all epidemiological, and links to cancer and other diseases have been WEAK and NOT CONSISTENT from study to study. Toxicological studies DO NOT CONFIRM the epidemiological findings. By definition, epidemiology CANNOT FIND CAUSES — they merely suggest correlations, and the basic tenet of epidemiology is that correlation does not mean causation. Studies must also be consistently reproducible before a finding can be found meaningful. At any rate, the OCFP study ignored or downplayed other important epidemiological studies that did not conform to its premise of the dangers of pesticides (again, check with the PMRA).

CAPE and Forman also seem to believe, with NO SCIENTIFIC PROOF, that all synthetic pesticides cause cancer.

Despite popular belief, Canadian Cancer Society, which has taken such a large and activist role against pesticides, is NOT A SCIENTIFIC ORGANIZATION. Canadian Cancer Society is a volunteer advocacy and fund-raising association, with NOT A SINGLE SCIENTIST on staff with pesticide expertise.

From your statements, I would have to assume that you must consider the 350 qualified scientists of the PMRA incompetent and/or incapable of arriving at correct scientific findings.

It must first be noted that there is NO SUCH THING as « full scientific certainty ». ONE CANNOT PROVE A NEGATIVE. It is IMPOSSIBLE to prove scientifically that pest control products — or any substance, including water- — could NEVER harm anything or any-

John J. Holland

one under ANY circumstances. There is also NO PROOF of « environmental degradation » caused by what are erroneously termed « cosmetic » pest control products.

Municipal and provincial governments and even health-related professional organizations have been taking advice on pesticides from those who are THE LEAST QUALIFIED TO PROVIDE IT. These governments also ignore those who have THE ESSENTIAL EXPERTISE, such as Health Canada's Pest Management Regulatory Agency (PMRA).

Products containing 2,4-D DO NOT POSE UNACCEPTABLE RISKS to human health or the environment. They also have value for lawn and turf, agriculture, forestry and industrial uses when used according to the label directions proposed in previous consultation documents.

Proper weed control on turf HELPS PREVENT SLIPPING INJURIES by eliminating broad-leaved weeds. [...] the Precautionary Principle dictates that, with the choice between treating and not treating, the decision for proper weed control must be made. Therefore, turf pest control products SHOULD NOT BE PROHIBITED.

There are NO efficacious or cost-effective alternatives to the conventional products being banned. Due to their POOR PERFORMANCE, the « alternative » products left have to be applied more often, with more applicator visits, dramatically increasing an applicator's environmental foot-print — there is no lack of certainty about this.

There is SUBSTANTIAL AND UNDENIABLE PROOF for both « serious » and « irreversible » harm to employees and families of applicator companies (and to the companies themselves). In Quebec and Ontario, many companies have been driven out of business — there is no lack of any certainty about this. In spite of the claims of activists to the contrary, THOUSANDS OF EMPLOYEES HAVE LOST THEIR JOBS, and they and their families are suffering the consequences, health and otherwise — there is no lack of certainty about this.

While there have been numerous studies published on the effects of pesticides on human health, the VAST MAJORITY have shown that there are NO DISCERNABLE HEALTH PROBLEMS.

2,4-D has been registered in our country since 1946, and is the third most-used herbicide in Canada. If there were health problems related to 2,4-D's application, it would seem obvious that concrete proof — after over 60 years of use — would have surfaced by now, particularly when you realize that there have been thousands of studies, and numerous re-evaluations by both Health Canada and the U.S. EPA [Environmental Protection Agency]. This herbicide is probably THE MOST STUDIED PESTICIDE IN HISTORY.



**Do not let yourself be
tainted with barren
anti-pesticide lunatics**