

industries.

The reason they wanted a national network amongst all of them is simple. They are the urban environmentalists, they are the people that keep the acres of trees available to convert five to six tons of carbon dioxide a year to four tons of oxygen. They are the people that add 20% to the value of homes. They are the people that give us an esthetic balance that you and I demand and must have if we are to be productive and work in a healthy environment. Those folks know that they're threatened.

We've got to align perception with fact, because unless we do and, until we do, the politics of pesticides are going to win, and the politics of environmentalists are: Take these dangerous tools away, don't let people have access to them.

Politically it's wiser to err on the side of zero risk than it is to try to explain risk relationships. Politicians find it easier to say, "You can have a riskless society." But, you can't have it. I can't walk across the street today and guarantee you I won't be hit by a car. A politician will sell the idea of zero risk before he will take the time to explain risk relationships.

Why? One reason is that he or she might not know any better. A second is that it is tough to do and it takes time. That's what you folks, as profes-

sionals, are able to do. That's what people like me try to do. Because we are the ones that must do it, now! If we pull together and all walk down the same path, I think we *can* make the difference.

That difference will be having the chemical tools still there when we need them. Not only to produce the food and fiber that this society demands, but to protect the health and the environment of the American public. I remain convinced that if we work together and talk in concert, with strength and unity, we can succeed. But it will take all of us.

I urge you to listen carefully to what's being told to you and relate what you hear to how you can talk to your friend or neighbor in terms of how you benefit their health, how you protect the environment, how you assure their children of a better world in which to live. Because those are the messages that are going to make sense. I think if we all do that we will get common sense back into the question of the politics of pesticides.

*State Director
Oregonians for Food and Shelter
1511 K Street, NW, Suite 623
Washington, D.C. 20005*

COMMUNICATIONS IN THE 1980s¹

by George T. Fisher

It is often interesting for us to reflect upon the several different societies and cultures of our modern world, each showing a prominence and type of living that particularly describes certain trends. The southern European with the easy-going personality, the Spanish and French with their abilities in growing fruit, olives and grapes.

The Italian interested in the arts, singing and music contrasted with the northern European who is much more business oriented, much more oriented toward trade and science and the development of Science, Chemistry, Physics and Biology. And then we have the polyglot of the combined cultures of both north and southern

1. Presented at the annual conference of the International Society of Arboriculture in Quebec City, Canada in August 1984.

industries.

The reason they wanted a national network amongst all of them is simple. They are the urban environmentalists, they are the people that keep the acres of trees available to convert five to six tons of carbon dioxide a year to four tons of oxygen. They are the people that add 20% to the value of homes. They are the people that give us an esthetic balance that you and I demand and must have if we are to be productive and work in a healthy environment. Those folks know that they're threatened.

We've got to align perception with fact, because unless we do and, until we do, the politics of pesticides are going to win, and the politics of environmentalists are: Take these dangerous tools away, don't let people have access to them.

Politically it's wiser to err on the side of zero risk than it is to try to explain risk relationships. Politicians find it easier to say, "You can have a riskless society." But, you can't have it. I can't walk across the street today and guarantee you I won't be hit by a car. A politician will sell the idea of zero risk before he will take the time to explain risk relationships.

Why? One reason is that he or she might not know any better. A second is that it is tough to do and it takes time. That's what you folks, as profes-

sionals, are able to do. That's what people like me try to do. Because we are the ones that must do it, now! If we pull together and all walk down the same path, I think we *can* make the difference.

That difference will be having the chemical tools still there when we need them. Not only to produce the food and fiber that this society demands, but to protect the health and the environment of the American public. I remain convinced that if we work together and talk in concert, with strength and unity, we can succeed. But it will take all of us.

I urge you to listen carefully to what's being told to you and relate what you hear to how you can talk to your friend or neighbor in terms of how you benefit their health, how you protect the environment, how you assure their children of a better world in which to live. Because those are the messages that are going to make sense. I think if we all do that we will get common sense back into the question of the politics of pesticides.

*State Director
Oregonians for Food and Shelter
1511 K Street, NW, Suite 623
Washington, D.C. 20005*

COMMUNICATIONS IN THE 1980s¹

by George T. Fisher

It is often interesting for us to reflect upon the several different societies and cultures of our modern world, each showing a prominence and type of living that particularly describes certain trends. The southern European with the easy-going personality, the Spanish and French with their abilities in growing fruit, olives and grapes.

The Italian interested in the arts, singing and music contrasted with the northern European who is much more business oriented, much more oriented toward trade and science and the development of Science, Chemistry, Physics and Biology. And then we have the polyglot of the combined cultures of both north and southern

1. Presented at the annual conference of the International Society of Arboriculture in Quebec City, Canada in August 1984.

Europe coming to North America, (Canada and the United States of America). Here we have a mixture of both types and over the last 100 years we have become prominent and well-known throughout the world for our abilities in manufacturing and our abilities in agriculture to produce a great deal of the food that mankind now depends on, as well as an excellent ability in business, communications and advertising. And it is to this last ability, communication and advertising, that we North Americans supposedly have that I would like to speak to you about this afternoon.

It seems when anyone speaks of advertising they think immediately of Park Avenue, New York City, which for many years has developed as a hub and nexus for business and advertising and the selling of ideas, merchandise and products. The TV industry, the radio industry, all coming together at this place to find new and ingenious ways to sell their products. We North Americans have become known to our brothers throughout the earth as people who are sophisticated in communications and salesmanship. It is an ability I feel that we need more than ever as we face the '80s and '90s and the beginning years of this next century.

We who are in agriculture have always included arboriculture as a form of agriculture. The producing of plants that beautify, that shade, that delight mankind. The Science of Arboriculture that has been developed in our nation over the last 100 years is certainly now well-known throughout the world. But, paradoxically, this science of agriculture has developed and grown successfully right along with the science of manufacturing, communications and advertising. The two side by side, have given to the foreigner at least one picture of what North America is all about.

However, since the early '60s, its public in North America has been strongly influenced by another social phenomenon; that is the movement of environmentalism. The ecology epoch has influenced almost every American man, woman and child. We are all products of our public school system which has emphasized ecology, preservation, conservation and environmental studies.

On the other hand, even though we have been very successful in the production of agricultural products, although we have been very successful

in the development of new techniques of communication and advertising, we somehow or other have not joined these two success stories to explain to the public our own agricultural success story!

The public today is somewhat unaware of our ability in agriculture and arboriculture, is somewhat unaware of the importance of arboriculture, and certainly the average citizen of Canada and the United States is at this moment *abysmally lacking* in any knowledge of what it takes to scientifically raise and maintain commercial plant life on this continent. Somehow or other we have over the last 100 years produced excellent products and advanced our technology in agriculture far beyond other nations, but we have neglected, sorely neglected to convey the histories of that development, the requirements of that science, through the educational channels to the non-agricultural or urban dweller of North America.

Now, with the rising tide of environmentalism that enters into all social decisions, all political decisions, all economic decisions, this lack of communication, this lack of telling the agricultural or arboricultural story, has placed much of our science, much of the needs of that science, in jeopardy. To ask the average 8th or 9th grader of the public school system why pesticides or fertilizers or heavy equipment are really needed in agriculture, I think we would find that they are totally unable to come up with concrete and sensible answers. Their young minds have been so filled with the desires of maintaining the wilderness, of removing adulterants such as pesticides and artificial fertilizers, of diminishing wherever possible the use of gasoline driven equipment, that a question about pesticides, a question about chemicals, is almost certain to be received in a negative manner, and the answer received will also be a negative one as well.

And yet, here we are in 1984, the recipients of 100 to 150 years of scientific endeavor. Here we are the recipients of the leading techniques in producing food and beautifying foliage, shrubs, lawns and turf that delight millions upon millions of people. And here we are constantly defending our use of techniques in order to maintain and develop our science. Certainly, we have been lacking in

the ability to communicate our needs to the millions of customers that we serve.

This truth is extremely important, for the population of North America does need the nutrition from, and the beauty of, plants around them. They do need the quietness and loveliness of parks and private forests and certainly they all need breakfast, lunch and dinner at least once every day of their lives.

We have these products through the Land Grant System, through the government sponsored and funded agricultural programs, within both Canada and the United States. We have been able to produce more food, more clean food and fine and beautiful ornamental specimens. And yet, we have literally told very few people about our successes, and needs to maintain them. It's time, as we face these coming months and years of the 20th century, that organizations like the International Society of Arboriculture begin to organize, to explain, to communicate, yes, to advertise the accomplishments that it has achieved. This also goes as well for those in production of agriculture: food and fiber. We have to turn around 40 or 50 years of silence into a reasonable, honest, scientific and well-planned program of communication not to one another, not from one agricultural organization to another agricultural organization, but we must speak to those who are untrained in agriculture, to those who have been inundated for the last 25 years with ecology and environmental propaganda, and help them to see that the need for production agriculture will be necessary just as the needs are necessary to protect the environment and to maintain the wildlife that we all appreciate and love.

A one-sided picture of any movement, social or economical, is always unfortunate for it does not tell the whole story. I honestly feel here this day, that our environmental friends, our ecological friends in their zeal to maintain the environment, and in many cases a righteous zeal, have failed to realize the true needs of the agriculturist. Their

opinions are one-sided and many times irrational, and will only result in more stultifying regulations one after the other until our abilities to produce the food, to produce the shrubbery and the flowers and the turf will become more and more difficult if not finally impossible.

Who is going to tell our story? Who knows more about raising horticultural varieties, shade trees, turf and the many different varieties of nursery stock? Will it be the environmentalists? Certainly many of them are already giving recommendations for fertilizer or insect control, when they have little training or background for the task. No, I believe it is the agriculturist, the arboriculturist, who should be telling the story, their own story, the story they know how to tell better than anyone else. I think this story, this communication, this advertising should begin here among the professionals. I think it is a program that is much needed. I think budgets have to be arranged. I think communication systems such as radio and TV, and I'm not talking about the 4:30 a.m. farm report, but I'm speaking about prime time television and radio, where scripts of meaningful information about food and fiber can be presented to the urban public of Canada and the United States of America.

I would hope, I would urge, that an organization such as yourselves, well-structured with officers and committees could develop a reasonable and efficient program so that the history and the accomplishments of our Science can continue to help mankind enjoy the beauty of God's creation. This challenge is yours to pick up for no other will do it for you. I would strongly hope that here today, here this moment, we can start together and we can indeed tell the story, the whole story of our accomplishments and our needs.

*Department of Entomology
University of New Hampshire
Durham, New Hampshire 03824*