

Overview from an Independent Perspective

INTRODUCTION — 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 exambut need to be explained.

Many deeply held beliefs need to be

trenched 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.

ror-Activists Policies spread to certain Green Space Industry.

Environmental-Terror Policies often

The depraved indifference of Environmental-Terror 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 » DE-MONIZED one of the most impressive chemicals of the Twentieth Century — DDT.

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 MIS-CONCEPTIONS 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 ».

Overview from an Independent Perspective

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-Acti-

The fact that millions of people were DDT has been ignored, since, sadly, the « saving » of the environment appeared to be a cause that was greater

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

A classic example of « depraved indifwas displayed in 1971, during Congressional testimony before the U.S. House Committee on Agriculture. The discussion focused on the chemical alternatives to DDT.

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 [alterfarm workers, and most of them are Mexicans and Negroes. >>

FACTS ABOUT DDT -

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

These statements will be examined in detail in future reports.

Many deeply held beliefs about DDT need to be re-examined.

- Things were NOT better before DDT.
- 2. DDT was a pretty good product.
- 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.

Prohibition of Pest Control Products Boon for Bugs



PESTICIDE BAN BOON TO BEDBUGS

Bronwyn Eyre

August 18th, 2010

The StarPhoenix (Saskatchewan)

Selected and adapted excerpts

If you follow the news even lightly, you'll know that bedbugs — flat-bodied blood-suckers that can hide in all kinds of small crevices and live up to a year without eating — are making a horror-movie-like RESURGENCE everywhere, Saskatchewan included.

Pest control experts say the infestation already comprises a GLOBAL PANDEMIC.

Nice. So are we going back to the BAD OLD DAYS when, to fight this resilient vermin, people regularly poured oil or boiling water into floor crevices, and traced kerosene around bed mattresses?

The French writer Simone de Beauvoir attributed no small part of the Parisian CAFE CULTURE to the bedbug. Such was its infestation of hotels and dwellings that, to converse and write, everybody sought refuge in cafes.

In 1939, after four years of work, Swiss chemist Paul Müller developed a synthetic insecticide — DDT — which was basically SAFE FOR HUMANS, but deadly against malariacausing mosquitoes, typhus-causing lice, plague-spreading fleas ... and bedbugs.

For preventing the deaths of tens of millions of people, Müller was awarded the 1948 Nobel Prize for Medicine.





In 1970, according to U.S. National Academy of Sciences report —

<< To only a few chemicals does man owe as great a debt as to DDT. >>

But in the wake of Rachel Carson's 1962 anti-chemical blockbuster Silent Spring, in which she distorted scientific data to suit her purpose, chemophobic zealots began lobbying for a ban on the wonder insecticide.

In June 1972, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), DESPITE CONSIDERABLE EVIDENCE OF ITS SAFETY, outlawed DDT.

After seven months of testimony, the EPA's own administrative law expert declared that the insecticide ...

<< [...] is not a carcinogenic, mutagenic or teratogenic hazard to man, and its proper use does not have a deleterious effect on freshwater fish, estuarine organisms, wild birds or other wildlife. >>

But those who apparently find NO problem in the Consequent Deaths of MILLIONS WHO DIE FROM MALARIA AND OTHER INSECT-CAUSED ILLNESSES - or who would rather put up with the bedbug affliction than acknowledge the wonderful efficacy of DDT — still celebrate that 1972 ban as a great victory.

Why do these enviro-fanatics want to take us back to medieval times?

How do they always manage to triumph on such matters?

And why does one instinctively know that, despite the building chorus of « Bring Back DDT », these people will prevail?

Instead of returning to a procedure that has proven its worth, we're left with prescriptions for fighting bedbugs that are LAME AND LAUGHABLE — the planting of mosquito-repelling trees such as neem or oak, for example.



Paul Driessen, author of Eco-Imperialism: Green Power, Black Death (2003), writes contemptuously of how New York City's Bedbug Advisory Board recommends that people dealing with the problem —

<< Use blow-dryers to flush out (maybe five per cent of) the bugs, then throw away (thousands of dollars worth of) infested clothing, bedding, carpeting, and furniture. Hire (expensive) professionals who have insecticides that (may) eradicate the pests - and hope you don't get scammed. >>

(Obviously, the parentheses are Driessen's, not the board's.)

So-called volumetric heating, the super-heating of bedbug-infested spaces to 60°C — recently conducted in a University of Saskatchewan residence, for example – apparently works, but it's expensive, time-consuming, short-term and localized.

So if DDT is the all-around best prevention against malaria and other tropical diseases, and is also effective against bedbugs, let's bring it back — if only to test claims that some bedbug resistance to it now exists, or remains.

As Driessen also says —

<< If not for the economy and mental health of Americans afflicted by bedbugs, then do it for Africa's sick, brain-damaged and dying parents and children. >>

In 2006, the World Health Organization finally acknowledged that DDT is an unrivaled insecticide that ought not be banned.

But in 2009, the United Nations Environmental Program nevertheless announced its intention to rid the world of DDT by 2020.

If only the millions who are vulnerable to the ravages of malaria — and now the trauma of experiencing bedbugs — could have a say on the matter.



DT...FOR CONTROL OF HOUSEHOLD PESTS



Prepared by the
Bureau of Enternology and Plant Quarentine
Agricultural Research Administration
United States Department of Agriculture, and
the United States Public Health Service
Festeral Security Agency
Washington, D. C. - Issued March 1947





