

PRECAUTIONARY PRINCIPLE Part 5

FORCE OF NATURE

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

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

CONCERNS About the Precautionary Principle

- The Precautionary Principle is MIS-USED TO SERVE THE AMBITIONS OF ENVIRONMENTALISTS.
- The Precautionary Principle is essentially VACUOUS, since « *full scientific certainty* » is IMPOSSIBLE.
- With the Precautionary Principle, activists DO NOT HAVE TO PRESENT ANY EVIDENCE ... they just have to say « *harmful to the environment* ».
- The ABSOLUTIST INTERPRETATION of the Precautionary Principle is used by activists TO JUSTIFY ANY KIND OF REGULATORY INTERVENTION OR BAN.
- The Precautionary Principle rules AGAINST the PROHIBITION of pest control products, as human life, health, environment, and economy are of utmost concern.
- Many cancers have DECREASED since the introduction of synthetic pest control products.
- In the past 60 years, stomach cancer has DECLINED by 60 per cent, mostly because the doubling of the consumption of fruits and vegetables that require pest control products for their production — eliminating the use of these products would subsequently INCREASE THE INCIDENCE OF CANCER.

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



CONCERNS About the Precautionary Principle

Incidence of Cancer

Many cancers have DECREASED since synthetic pest control products were introduced.

In the last 60 years, stomach cancer has — in the Western World — DECLINED by 60 per cent.

Much of this reduction is attributed to the doubling of the consumption of vegetables and fruit.

Eliminating the use of pest control products, would greatly increase the cost of produce, resulting in less consumption due to higher costs, and a subsequent INCREASE IN THE INCIDENCE OF CANCER.

Again, the Precautionary Principle rules AGAINST the PROHIBITION of pest control products, as human life and health are of utmost concern.

Reference — Anthony Trewavas, A Critical Assessment of Organic Farming—and-Food Assertions with Particular Respect to the U.K. and the Potential Environmental Benefits of No-Till Agriculture, Crop Protection, Vol. 23, 2004.

The Wisdom of a REAL Expert



CONCERNS About the Precautionary Principle

Alien Plants and Plant Pests

According to the 2008 December report of the Auditor General of Canada
(available on-line) —

<< The report notes that INVASIVE ALIEN PLANT AND PLANT PESTS can THREATEN THE ENVIRONMENT AND THE ECONOMY.

In their new habitat, their impact on native eco-systems can be SEVERE and often IRREVERSIBLE.

In addition, they can THREATEN Canada's agriculture and forestry sectors, which produce goods valued at about 100 billion dollars a year. >>

Since alien plants and plant pests can threaten both the environment and the economy (which can also have health implications), and since organic products are INADEQUATE for the task, and since no application of pest control products is obviously NOT A SOLUTION, the use of pest control products is FAVOURED by the Precautionary Principle.

Reference — News Release, Serious problems Increase Vulnerability to Damage by Invasive Plants, Pests and Diseases, Office of the Auditor General of Canada, February 5, 2009.

The Wisdom of John J. Holland



CONCERNS About the Precautionary Principle

Environmentalist Ambitions

It might perhaps be educational to examine some evaluations of the Precautionary Principle from around the world.

According to Václav Klaus, President of the Czech Republic —

<< The Precautionary Principle is either misunderstood by the environmentalists or understood only too well, but in any case, it is essentially MISUSED TO SERVE THEIR OWN AMBITIONS.

We are witnessing the ABSOLUTIST INTERPRETATION of the Precautionary Principle being used by environmentalists TO JUSTIFY ANY KIND OF REGULATORY INTERVENTION OR BAN.

All they need to implement such regulations — once the imminent catastrophe is sufficiently described — is simple moralizing, noble preaching about the future, and demonstrating their « concern » about human-kind. >>

Reference — Václav Klaus, Blue Planet in Green Shackles, 2007.

The Wisdom of a REAL Expert



CONCERNS About the Precautionary Principle

Inherent Irrationality

The Social Issues Research Centre (SIRC) is a British independent, non-profit organization founded to conduct research on social and life-style issues.

According to Social Issues Research Centre —

<< The burden of evidence and proof (in the Precautionary Principle) is taken away from those who make UNJUSTIFIED AND OFTEN WHIMSICAL CLAIMS and placed on the scientific community which, because it proceeds logically and rationally, is often powerless to respond.

This is what makes the Precautionary Principle so DANGEROUS.

It generates a quasi-religious bigotry which history should have taught us to fear.

Its INHERENT IRRATIONALITY renders it UNSUSTAINABLE. >>

Reference — Social Issues Research Centre, Beware the Precautionary Principle.

The Wisdom of John J. Holland



CONCERNS About the Precautionary Principle

No Evidence

According to James Peron, an Editor in New Zealand —

<< The Precautionary Principle is tantamount to a COUP in legal theory.

Say a developer wants to build an apartment and a Green group condemns the plan, saying it's « harmful to the environment ».

The group WOULD NOT HAVE TO PRESENT ANY EVIDENCE to stop the developer.

Rather, the developer would have to prove that all possible outcomes from his plan are good.

But he could NEVER do that.

This would also be true for the inventor, scientist, industrialist, and virtually anyone else who has to deal with the physical world — in other words, all of us.

Continued on next page ...

The Wisdom of a REAL Expert



We must remain STAGNANT until we can prove that any particular action is good under all possible scenarios. >>

Reference — James Peron, The Irrational Principle, The Freeman, April 2004, Volume 54, Issue 4.

CONCERNS About the Precautionary Principle

Essentially Vacuous

Indur M. Goklany is a Science and Technology Policy Analyst with the United States Department of the Interior.

According to Goklany —

<< It may be argued that (the Precautionary Principle's) first part is essentially VACUOUS, since we can almost never have « full scientific certainty », and therefore — like it or not — actions are almost invariably taken « in the absence of full scientific certainty » >>

Reference — Indur M. Goklany, The Precautionary Principle – A Critical Appraisal of Environment Risk Assessment, 2001.

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.

