

Overview from an Independent Perspective

OUR WORLD OF POLITICIZED SCIENCE

The discussion of « politicized science » is ANATHEMA to the Environlike it when certain issues are exambut need to be explained.

Many deeply held beliefs need to be

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.

ror-Activists Policies spread to certain portions of the population, such as the Green Space Industry.

Policies of Environmental-Terror often cies, unemployment, despair, and des-

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.

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.

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 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 undertivists.

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

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 are examined in detail in other 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.
- 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

November 11th, 2010

HealthFactsAndFears.com

Selected and adapted excerpts

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 CON-TROL, his country and others still FACE PRESSURE from ANTI-INSECTICIDE ACTIV-ISTS and RESTRICTIONS FROM AN INTERNATIONAL ENVIRO-MANIAC 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 CONTRA-DICTORY.

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.

The restrictions on the use of DDT has resulted in millions of unnecessary deaths

THE IMPACT OF THE REMOVAL OF DDT MICHAEL CRICHTON

from the world market.

One popular debate can be summarizes 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 » —

was the removal of DDT.

Despite views to the contrary, no other products were as



PEOPLE have DIED UNNECESSARILY from the effects of malaria.

Sadly, removing DDT has KILLED MORE PEOPLE THAN HITLER.

THE STOCKHOLM CONVENTION

The STOCKHOLM CONVENTION on Persistent Organic Pollutants was the result of

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

In 2004, the STOCKHOLM CONVENTION called for the elimination of DDT, as well

PAUL K. DRIESSEN

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

PER YEAR.

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

The survivors are obviously not able to adequately contrib-



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.

Europe to eliminate insect-borne diseases, but now that DDT is only needed in

According to Driessen -

« Now, well-off environmental activists can afford to rail against pesticide use in

PRESSURE TO GIVE UP DDT

Some people assert that many countries have been under pressure from interna-

countries like Uganda that seek to use DDT, even solely for malaria control.

Fortunately, the 2004 STOCKHOLM CONVENTION inadvertently paved the way for

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

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 pol-



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

« 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 HIV/AIDS — and last week, a new study showed that people who contract ma-

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 « 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

Ironically, several environmental groups now grudgingly endorse the indoor use of DDT for malaria control, including — the Environmental Defense (Fund), the Si-

After having killed more people than Hitler, maybe the environmental movement





