

## Where Remains The Logic?

It is conspicuous that the laws of logic with the aim of judging health damages due to chemicals have never been accepted. Therefore permanently wrong reverse conclusion are drawn. (A wrong reverse conclusion is, for example, all dogs are animals that means all "non-dogs" aren't animals.

Here are some reverse conclusion, which can be found in all expertise of sick persons related to chemicals:

1 Of the existing 70,000 chemicals, which are present in daily life, maybe 5 or maybe 50 will be measured. If the five respectively fifty do not show any strange value they find the following conclusion: there **can be no pollution (toxic) level**.

Commentary: they come to the conclusion that the other approximately 69 950 likely chemicals - without any proof - are also existent in a harmless concentration. If you take the 1 000 big chemicals into consideration, 950 of them will not be taken into account.

2. There will not be found any conspicuous value while "biomonotoring" ( the examination of blood, serum, urine ... ) and no organic diseases - they come straight to the conclusion: **the sick person, the patient imagines himself his sickness, he is an "ecochonder", he is mentally ill, he has a psychosomatic pain syndrome, a frightening syndrome and/or hallucinations (delusions)**.

Commentary: When our possibility for diagnosis comes up against limiting factors, there is no discussion about this limits. The ill persons must have a psychic illness.

3. If a certain doses has no effect within 20 days **it cannot have any effects even not if there is an exposition of 200 days, 2 years or 20 years**.

Commentary: Resent research especially, supply evidence for this. (For example, Prof. Arpad Pusztai, Scotland, in the field of genetic engineering, that this conclusion is inadmissible and wrong. That the authorities of today still support the way Paracelsus thought (1493-1541) is typical for our science today.

4.If single doses in certain so-called low-level doses do not produce any effects **the combination of different ( for example number "n") harmful substances do not result in any effects**.

Commentary: The still existing research, ( e.g. Witte and Hostrup, Oldenburg) prove, that synergy effects play an important role, even with only two or three combinations. The combination possibilities with different pollutants are:  $2^n - (n+1)$ .. If you have only ten different pollutants there are 1013 possibilities. If you have 70 000 various pollutants you will come to a figure which is mathematically spoken possible to demonstrate, but to convert it, e.g. in research is however impossible. It is not logical, according to the impossibility of the proof, to draw the above mentioned wrong conclusion.

5. If a forty-year old man, 70 kg, doesn't react directly on the doses "A", **then there will be no reaction of the foetus, the baby, the toddler or a sick person, who are exposed to the doses "A" every day 24 hours or also 8 hours a day**.

Commentary: threshold values are a political instrument. New studies show that many chemicals come into force in a mother's womb also in very low doses: Years ago the opinion about the doses were different. Therefore it is absolutely important that the threshold value-policy will be reconsidered and will be changed drastically.

6. We know a lot about the effects of chemicals, **therefore we know everything, we know in particular this much in order to protect all consumers regarding the health risks**.

Commentary: Financial aspects to sell a chemical are much more important, especially in the case if there is no liability for secondary damages. If the patient is on the plaintiff and if there is no "reverse proof" (e.g. a company had to prove that a certain chemical is not the cause for a sickness or the

patient is permanently disabled and can no longer work) there will be no real changes, that means that the consumers are not protected.

7. If some pollutants are not any longer in circulation **the total amount of pollutants will be going back.**

Commentary: Even in the case if only a few chemicals will be decreased, the daily input will be increased. Many pollutants (e.g. pesticides) are still used with an increasing tendency in so-called third-world-countries. In these countries the problems are intensified due to the language or the inability to read. Every day many new chemicals enter the market, which are at the same time not controlled in terms of safety. Furthermore: many side-problems, like the residues of chemicals in drinking water are till today almost not controlled.

8. The knowledge of the existence and the sick-relating effects of chemicals in the air, water and on ground becomes bigger and bigger. **Health damages due to chemicals are a private, individual and psychological problem.** Commentary: The denying of the existing problems increases the whole problem considerably.

9. MCS (Multiple Chemical Sensitivity) can arouse by means of chemical weapons. Therefore one can come to the conclusion: **MCS can arise because of chemical weapons.**

Commentary : Many chemicals are being used as chemical weapons respectively they have the same or similar combinations like these. Regarding the "reverse conclusion" many substances and other factors like radioactive, electromagnetic, acoustic, UV-pollution and misuse of chemicals remain unconsidered.

Ingrid Scherrmann

May 1999