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**Don't Recycle: Throw It Away!**  
*adapted from an opinion piece by Roy E. Cordato*

Many people think recycling is the right thing to do. Why? Their kids learn wrong facts in school. They use this misinformation to guilt their parents into recycling. One poll shows 63% of kids have told Mom or Dad to recycle.

Parents, don’t feel bad! Throw that trash away. Don’t recycle trash you can’t get paid for. What kids are learning is based on liberal politics, not fact or science.

One argument for recycling is that we are running out of landfill space. A "public service" ad on Nickelodeon shows a city being buried in its own trash. This is typical of what passes for environmental education. Just as hysterical is American Education Publishing's *50 Simple Things Kids Can Do To Save the Earth*.

In fact, there is no landfill shortage. All the solid waste for the next *thousand years* would take up only 44 miles of landfill. This is just .01% of the U.S. landspace.

How about the claim that recycling paper saves trees? Why not make new paper from old paper and save more trees from being cut down?

Because it doesn't work. Supply meets demand. If we suddenly stopped making bread from wheat, there would soon be less wheat in the world. Farmers would stop growing it. If everyone stopped eating chicken, the chicken population would not grow but fall.

The same logic applies to paper and trees. If we stopped using paper, there would be fewer trees planted. About 87% of new trees are planted just to produce paper. For every 13 trees "saved" by recycling, 87 will never get planted. It is the demand for paper in the U.S. that caused the number of trees to increase for the last 50 years. So if you want to increase the number of trees, don't recycle.

Others claims made by recycling advocates are just as bad. Recycling doesn't save resources. In general, recycling is more expensive than landfilling. The exception is aluminum. As former EPA official J. Winston Porter admitted, "trash management is becoming much more costly due to...the generally high cost of recycling."

Children are also told that recycling will reduce pollution. They are not told that the recycling process itself causes a lot of pollution. Recycling newspapers requires old ink to be bleached from the pages. This process generates toxic waste, as opposed to the harmless waste from just throwing the papers away.

Also, curbside recycling programs require more trash pickups. This means more trucks on the road. These trucks generate more air pollution. Due to mandatory recycling, New York City had to add two more pickups per week. Los Angeles had to double the number of trash trucks.

The recyclers want more than just recycling. In *Waste Management: Towards a Sustainable Society*, O.P. Kharband and E.A. Stallworthy even complain that builders throw away bent nails and that hospitals use disposable syringes. "The so-called 'standard of living,'" they conclude "has to be reduced."

Here is the real goal of the recycling gurus. They want to lower our standard of living. Unfortunately, it’s happening already in the many cities that bought expensive recycling plants. It’s lead to great waste, high taxes, and cash-strapped local governments.

Recyclers are not better citizens. They are just ill-informed. This holiday season, unwrap those presents, stuff the paper in a big plastic bag, and throw it all away.
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