Our World Of Politicized Science

The discussion of « politicized science » is ANATHEMA to the Environmental–Terror–Activists, who do not like it when certain issues are examined that may not be generally known, but need to be explained.

Many deeply held beliefs need to be re-examined.

Many of these beliefs have been entrenched in our minds for decades by our trust in social policies that has become « politicized » with the perpetuation of « junk science », and the use of coercion through « environmental terrorism ».

In our world, the « politicization » of science occurs when Environmental–Terror–Activists use economic or legal pressures to influence public policy.

In many cases, Environmental–Terror–Activists Policies spread to certain portions of the population, such as the Green Space Industry.

Policies of Environmental–Terror often lead to business failures, bankruptcies, unemployment, despair, and destitution.

The depraved indifference of Environmental–Terror–Activists has even led to DEATH — on a MASSIVE scale.

« Politicized science » has triumphed whenever politics have outweighed scientific fact.

« Politicized science » has prevailed when measures were taken that often had little basis in fact or « sound science ».

It is now common knowledge that the world of « politicized science » DEMONIZED one of the most impressive chemicals of the Twentieth Century — DDT.

We are told that the current array of modern and conventional pest control products used by the Green Space Industry MAY create the problems once encountered with the likes of DDT.

This is false!

The Green Space Industry needs to remind the public of the many MISCONCEPTIONS concerning DDT.

The public needs to be given a reality check on this matter.

Removing DDT — An Example of Depraved Indifference

The removal of DDT from the world market is a good example where social politics were implemented based upon « junk science ».
The measures that were urged for the removal of DDT had LITTLE BASIS in fact or science.

DDT had to be eliminated in order to « save » the environment — a move that was self-serving and underhanded by Environmental–Terror–Activists.

The fact that millions of people were hurt and killed with the removal of DDT has been ignored, since, sadly, the « saving » of the environment appeared to be a cause that was greater than any human suffering.

Some observers have described this as a form of « depraved indifference », and even « eco–manslaughter », by Environmental–Terror–Activists.

A classic example of « depraved indifference » by Enviro–Terror–Activists was displayed in 1971, during Congressional testimony before the U.S. House Committee on Agriculture. The discussion focused on the chemical alternatives to DDT.

The alternatives may have been more acceptable to Enviro–Terror–Activists, but they were truly UNSAFE for use by applicators, such as farm workers.

The response from Enviro–Terror–Activists was SHOCKING !

The following statement was attributed to an executive of the Environmental Defense Fund, a U.S. Environmental–Terror–Organization —

<< It doesn’t make a lot of difference because the organophosphate [ alternative ] acts locally and only kill [ sic ] farm workers, and most of them are Mexicans and Negros. >>

FACTS ABOUT DDT

The following nine statements challenge the « politicized science » that DEMONIZED DDT.

These statements are examined in detail in other reports.

Many deeply held beliefs about DDT need to be re–examined —

1. Things were NOT better before DDT.
2. DDT was a pretty good product.
3. DDT saved countless lives.
4. The turf industry embraced DDT.
5. The environmental effect of DDT was contradictory.
6. The effect of DDT on birds was exaggerated.
7. Removing DDT was politically motivated.
8. The removal of DDT led to the death of millions.
9. DDT is back again today.
DDT is safe for humans and the environment
With regard to DDT and malaria, any rational balancing of risks will favour the use of DDT.

AFRICAN NATION WANTS DDT
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Namibian Health Minister — Give Us DDT

Republic of Namibia’s Minister of Health and Social Services writes in The Wall Street Journal Europe that when it comes to using DDT for MALARIA CONTROL, his country and others still face pressure from ANTI-INSECTICIDE ACTIVISTS AND RESTRICTIONS FROM AN INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL TREATY called the Stockholm Convention. [See later segment.]

Spraying DDT insecticide inside houses to repel mosquitoes, called Indoor Residual Spraying, is the CORNERSTONE of an effort to eliminate malaria in Southern Africa.
Richard Nchabi Kamwi, Minister of Health and Social Services, says that the number of manufacturers of DDT have dwindled to just one, a state-owned factory in India.

Richard Nchabi Kamwi writes further —

*There are several reasons to defend DDT and ensure we have ongoing supplies.*

*First, DDT is SAFE FOR HUMANS AND THE ENVIRONMENT.*

*Since the 1940s, thousands of scientific studies have investigated potential harm to human health from DDT.*

*Almost all these studies are WEAK, INCONCLUSIVE, or CONTRADICTORY.*

*In other words there is NO EVIDENCE OF HARM.*

*On the other hand, there is well-documented evidence of its GREAT PUBLIC-HEALTH BENEFITS.*

*As Minister of Health, I have to evaluate the full body of scientific evidence and balance risks.*

*With regard to DDT and malaria, ANY RATIONAL BALANCING OF RISKS WILL FAVOR DDT.*

According to Dr. Gilbert Ross —

*DDT has SAVED MORE LIVES than any other chemical known to man.*

*The HYSTERIA-BASED, UNSCIENTIFIC regulation of it — based mainly on Rachel Carson’s Silent Spring, the opposite of a science-based risk analysis — is intolerable and should be revoked.*

Dr. Gilbert Ross is the Executive Director and Medical Director of the American Council on Science and Health (ACSH), a consumer education–public health organization. He received his undergraduate degree in Chemistry from Cornell University’s School of Arts and Sciences in 1968, and received his M.D. from the N.Y.U. School of Medicine in 1972.
The restrictions on the use of DDT has resulted in millions of unnecessary deaths

THE IMPACT OF THE REMOVAL OF DDT
— Michael Crichton

There is still a great deal of controversy regarding the decision to remove DDT from the world market.

One popular debate can be summarized as follows —

The restrictions on the use of DDT has resulted in MILLIONS OF UNNECESSARY DEATHS!

In 2004, popular author Michael Crichton summed up the situation with the following excerpt from his book entitled «State of Fear» —

« Arguably, the greatest tragedy of the Twentieth Century was the removal of DDT.

DDT was the best insecticide for the control of mosquitoes.

Despite views to the contrary, no other products were as efficient, or as safe.

Since the removal of DDT, it has been estimated that THIRTY TO FIFTY MILLION PEOPLE have DIED UNNECESSARILY from the effects of malaria.

Sadly, removing DDT has KILLED MORE PEOPLE THAN HITLER.

Before the removal of DDT, malaria had become almost a minor illness, with only fifty thousand deaths per year throughout the world. »
THE STOCKHOLM CONVENTION

The STOCKHOLM CONVENTION on Persistent Organic Pollutants was the result of enviro-maniac negotiations that began in Montreal in 1998 under the United Nations Environment Programme.

The objective of the STOCKHOLM CONVENTION was to arbitrarily control, reduce, or eliminate discharges, emissions, and losses of persistent organic pollutants to the environment.

In 2004, the STOCKHOLM CONVENTION called for the elimination of DDT, as well as other persistent organic pollutants, barring any health crisis.

Ninety-eight countries ratified the convention.

PAUL K. DRIESSEN

In 2003, Paul K. Driessen wrote the book « Eco-Imperialism — Green Power, Black Death ».

Driessen claimed that MALARIA DEATHS are TWO MILLION PER YEAR.

Moreover, the hundreds of millions who « survive » the disease are too sick to work or take care of their families.

They become more vulnerable to subsequent diseases, such as AIDS, dysentery, and tuberculosis.

The survivors are obviously not able to adequately contribute to the economy.

According to Driessen —

« It’s no wonder that Sub-Saharan Africa is one of the most destitute regions on Earth. »

It has been observed that the removal of DDT showed that the West has a lack of compassion for those suffering in Third World countries.

Treatments were used long enough in the Southern United States and Southern Europe to eliminate insect-borne diseases, but now that DDT is only needed in poor countries, such as those found in Africa and Asia, it has been removed.
According to Driessen —

« Now, well-off environmental activists can afford to rail against pesticide use in Africa, while they enjoy all the comforts that our high-tech, malaria-free society bestows upon them. »

PRESSURE TO GIVE UP DDT

Many African nations want to use DDT to SAVE LIVES, but they have been told their agricultural exports may not be accepted if spraying becomes « widespread ».

Some people assert that many countries have been under pressure from international health and environmental agencies to give up DDT, or face losing aid grants or trade sanctions.

Both Belize and Bolivia have gone on record to say that they gave in to such pressure from the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID).

Additionally, the European Union (EU) has threatened trade sanctions against countries like Uganda that seek to use DDT, even solely for malaria control.

Fortunately, the 2004 STOCKHOLM CONVENTION inadvertently paved the way for the world-wide endorsement of DDT to control and repel the malaria insect vector.

Happily, anti-DDT policies changed, thanks to President George W. Bush.

A TURNABOUT FOR DDT

DDT now plays a crucial part in the U.S. program, announced by President George W. Bush in 2005, to spend an additional 1.2 billion dollars on malaria control over the next five years.

Later in 2005, the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) reversed its long-time opposition to the purchase of DDT.

This represented a momentous turnabout in U.S. foreign policy.
Background Information from an Independent Perspective

The following is an excerpt from a speech that Bush presented on December 14th, 2006 —

« One area in which America has a tremendous potential to help is in the fight against malaria. At home, malaria was eliminated decades ago. It is possible to eliminate malaria. In Africa, malaria remains a persistent killer. I think our citizens will be amazed to hear that last year, about a million Africans died of malaria. The vast majority were children under five — their lives ended by nothing more than a mosquito bite. In some countries, more people die of malaria than HIV/AIDS — and last week, a new study showed that people who contract malaria become more likely to spread HIV. [ ... ] We’re spending 1.2 billion dollars over five years to provide bed nets, and indoor spraying, and anti-malarial medicine, in fifteen African countries. »

Moreover, in 2006, the European Union ( EU ) indicated that it would NO LONGER IMPOSE TRADE SANCTIONS on those countries that use DDT for controlling a HEALTH CRISIS.

Evidently, the malarial affliction of more than 515 million people per year, and more than 1 million deaths per year due to malaria, qualified this situation as « health crisis », as defined by the 2004 STOCKHOLM CONVENTION.

In essence, the 2004 STOCKHOLM CONVENTION paved the way for the world-wide endorsement of DDT to control and repel the malaria insect vector.

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION ENDORSED DDT

On September 16th, 2006, the World Health Organization ( WHO ) announced that DDT could be used once again as a principal tool against malaria.

For 30 years, the WHO had phased out DDT from widespread « indoor residual spraying ».

As of 2006, WHO endorsed DDT for « indoor residual spraying » in those areas subject to epidemics, as well as in places with constant and high malaria transmission, including throughout Africa.

Ironically, several environmental groups now grudgingly endorse the indoor use of DDT for malaria control, including — the Environmental Defense ( Fund ), the Sierra Club, and the Endangered Wildlife Trust.

After having killed more people than Hitler, maybe the environmental movement finally grew a conscience? Not completely!

The World Wildlife Fund and others still lobby against DDT.
"DDT is good for me-e-e!"
Force of Nature presents THE WHOLE TRUTH FROM AN INDEPENDENT PERSPECTIVE from National Organization Responding Against Huje that seek to control the Green Space Industry, the Environmental Terror Movement, the Media, and governments across Canada and beyond. The content presented in this Report was found somewhere on the Internet, and may be considered in the public domain, serving one of the following purposes: archive, education, promotion, publicity, or press release. Any similarity to actual persons, living or dead, may not be coincidental.

The events, characters, companies, and organizations depicted in this Report are not always fictitious. Any similarities to actual persons, living or dead, may not be coincidental. The neutrality of these Reports might be disputed.

Huje is a term used to describe Enviro Maniac Activists that routinely commit FEAR MONGERING, FRAUDULENT LIES, MISCONCEPTIONS, COERCION, THREATS, DECEPTIONS, TERROR, and PARANOID CONSPIRACIES that are DESIGNED to SCAM and DECEIVE the public into believing there is some NON-EXISTENT danger with conventional pest control products. Huje also aims to SCAM and DECEIVE Government Officials into the NEEDLESS, SENSELESS, and MALICIOUS CONSPIRACY to PROHIBIT conventional pest control products that are FEDERALLY LEGAL, SCIENTIFICALLY SAFE, TOTALLY INREPLACEABLE, and ABSOLUTELY INDISPENSABLE.

A half-truth is the most typical of Enviro-Maniac lies