

Viewpoint: Should there be a ban on glyphosate and other pesticides in US parks? Here's why environmentalists and the Park Service say that would be a disaster

When last I wrote about my [battle of the brush](#), I was losing, badly, to the invasive vines and noxious weeds that had turned forest and field at my Virginia home into an impassable jungle. I'd cut them back, but they would return in even greater numbers.

So, I consulted far and wide, asking botanists, naturalists, academics and federal and state scientists what to do. Buy a Bush Hog? Rent a herd of goats? Move back to the city?

One consistent, counterintuitive answer came back: The best thing I can do for nature is to fight the invaders with herbicides.

Follow the latest news and policy debates on sustainable agriculture, biomedicine, and other 'disruptive' innovations. Subscribe to our newsletter.

[SIGN UP](#)

It comes down to this: Without chemical treatments, the invaders would take over much of the [Shenandoah] park in the coming decades. Herbicides might be the difference between whether or not there will even *be* a forest in Shenandoah National Park in the future.

...

If maintaining the status quo is a struggle now, it would be impossible without herbicides. "I think of it as chemotherapy," said Doug Tallamy, a University of Delaware entomologist and guru of the native-plant movement. "We have ecological tumors out there. If we don't control them, we have ecological collapse. We have the collapse of the food web."

[**This is an excerpt. Read the original post here**](#)