

What the scientists say about DDT

The National Academy of Sciences, 1970: It is estimated that, in little more than two decades, DDT has prevented 500 million human deaths, due to malaria, that would otherwise have been inevitable.

Wayland J. Hayes, Jr., *Toxicology of Pesticides*, 1975: When DDT was introduced, there was an unprecedented increase in the production of those crops on which it was used, and the increase corresponded to the degree of its use. Crops such as cotton, peanuts, and potatoes, on which pesticides are used most extensively, showed gains ranging from 68 to 119%. The production of alfalfa seed increased from 300 to 600% in states where the crop was treated intensively with insecticides, but remained essen-

tially stable in states where the crop is raised for hay and, therefore, receives little treatment with insecticides.

Dr. Ed Remmers, American Council of Science and Health, 1993: DDT has certainly saved more lives than any other man-made chemical that has ever been made so far. . . . Who are the opponents of DDT? It's the anti-population group, by and large, the people who are trying to promote zero population growth, or the people who would like to reduce the Earth's population back down to 1 billion. . . . There are groups out there that have this policy of actual genocide.

Dr. J. Gordon Edwards, 1993: DDT saved hundreds of millions of acres of forest in North America from decimation by gypsy moths and other insect pests, and thereby prevented extensive flood damage and loss of topsoil. . . . In the 1950s, DDT eradicated gypsy moth populations in the eastern United States wherever it was properly applied.

would reach \$213 billion this year.

Malaria may be the "queen" of deadly diseases, but DDT also controlled other insects that transmit killer diseases that affect millions: for example, the tse-tse fly, which causes sleeping sickness; the black fly responsible for "river blindness"; and the sand flies that cause leishmaniasis.

According to malaria specialist Dr. Hans Lobel at the Centers for Disease Control in Atlanta, Georgia, there are 200 to 300 million cases per year of malaria.

Hoax 'mother'

The campaign against DDT was the "mother" of many environmental hoaxes that followed, from louseworts endangered by a dam, to Alar, to global warming and the ozone hole. The pattern is the same: A catastrophic scenario is put forward from the top down, the environmentalist groups campaign around it, and the media promote it via their "news" coverage. No matter how wild the scenario, once it is repeated often enough, people come to accept it as "fact."

How many people today know that the official decision made at the EPA hearings on DDT in 1972 was *not* to ban it? Even former EPA Administrator William Ruckelshaus, just last year, wrote a letter to the editor of the *Wall Street Journal* asserting that the science was on his side in the DDT ban—an outright lie. And in this year's celebration of the 25th anniversary of Earth Day, the current EPA administrator put the DDT ban at the top of her list of environmental "accomplishments" of the past 25 years.

The underlying motive in the anti-DDT campaign, as

in every other green campaign, was and still is population control. The genocidal views of England's Prince Philip, who sits at the top of the chain of command of the world's green groups, are amply documented in his own words.²

Other malthusians have been just as frank, from Alexander King, who co-founded and heads the Club of Rome, to the director of the Sierra Club, Michael McCloskey, who said in 1971: "The Sierra Club wants a ban on pesticides, even in countries where DDT has kept malaria under control.

. . . By using DDT, we reduce mortality rates in underdeveloped countries without the consideration of how to support the increase in populations." Even more blunt, according to a report by entomologist J. Gordon Edwards, was the chief scientist for the Environmental Defense Fund, Dr. Charles Wurster. When Wurster was asked by a reporter whether the DDT ban would result in the further use of more toxic insecticides, he replied: "So what. People are the cause of all the problems; we have too many of them; we need to get rid of some of them, and this is as good a way as any."

Can the environmental kill factor be reversed? The answer is yes. The first step is to tell the truth about the consequences of environmentalist policies—the real death count. Instead of saving this or that cute animal, save human beings, who are, after all, the only creative resource this planet has.

Notes

1. See J. Gordon Edwards, "Malaria: The Killer That Could Have Been Conquered," *21st Century Science & Technology*, Summer 1993.
2. See "The Coming Fall of the House of Windsor," Special Offprint, November 1994, *Executive Intelligence Review*, pp. 20-23.