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Introduction
Combating Malaria in East Asia:
A Historical Perspective

Ka-che Yip

This book is an attempt to provide a much needed historical study of malaria in modern East Asia. It examines how different countries attempted to combat this mosquito-borne disease in the context of the global history of malaria since the nineteenth century. Malaria has affected human developments since ancient times, and it remains a major health problem in Asia, not to mention Africa, today. The study of malaria has largely been dominated by scientists as well as medical and public health specialists, while social scientists and historians have only recently been contributing their expertise to examining the cultural, social, economic, and political dimensions of the relationship between human beings and diseases, including malaria. Developments in East Asia, however, have not received their fair share of attention. This book therefore fills an important gap in our understanding of the global problem of malaria and its impact on human society in an area where malaria has been, and still remains, a serious public health concern. In trying to understand the history of a disease, we have to look at its historical development in the course of human history, the concepts of disease and health and how they change over time, and the interplay of human activities, environment, and epidemiology. Moreover, we need to examine the impact of political, social, and economic factors on disease development, as well as how these factors influence individual or collective responses to diseases and other health concerns.

While the chapters in this book explore aspects of these issues in their study of the history of malaria in East Asia, they are particularly concerned with the emergence, development, and consequences of various approaches to dealing with malaria. In focusing on these aspects, they provide insights into the complex and subtle relationship between disease, society, and politics. Chapters two, three, and four by Yip, Ku, and Liu respectively, deal with anti-malaria efforts in colonial Hong Kong and Taiwan, and investigate the emergence and development of a “colonial model” (with variations) of malaria control and eradication. Chapter five by Iijima examines the eradication of malaria in Okinawa, first through the efforts of the Japanese based on their experience in Taiwan, and then the Americans after World War II with the use of dichloro-diphenyl-trichloroethane (DDT) technology. It also traces the emergence of a network of Japanese scientists and research institutes and their roles in the development of colonial medicine
as well as in anti-malaria efforts in Okinawa, Taiwan, and other Japanese colonial possessions. The introduction and use of DDT in the global anti-malaria campaign owed much to the research and experiments undertaken by the Rockefeller Foundation, and Stapleton’s study in chapter six highlights the tremendously influential role of the Foundation not only in the development and application of DDT technology but also in the promotion of public health in Asia as a whole. Taiwan in the postwar era emerged as one of the success stories in malaria eradication, and in chapter seven Yip analyzes the role of the Nationalist government in this effort, both in mainland China before 1945 and in Taiwan after they relocated to the island, and how the use of DDT technology as well as international political and economic interests helped to shape Nationalist anti-malaria policies. Finally, chapter eight examines an alternative model of malaria control and eradication in mainland China that was based on the concept of mass mobilization and primary health care. At the same time, it explains the impact of recent changes in the health care system on the anti-malaria effort and public health developments and the state’s role in formulating health policies in a new social and political environment. In fact, a theme that runs through the studies in this book is the significant role played by the state in anti-malaria efforts. The book, in short, lends a critical historical perspective to our understanding of the profound impact that malaria has exerted on human development in East Asia. In this introductory chapter, I shall examine briefly the nature of malaria and its importance in human history and put developments in East Asia in the context of the global attempt to combat this deadly disease.

**Malaria: The Disease**

Malaria is a parasitic disease transmitted by infected female anopheles mosquitoes. Before the 1950s, malaria was a major health problem in most countries; since then, because of malaria control or eradication efforts, Australia, Europe, and the U.S. have been largely free from the disease although it remains a problem in tropical Latin America, Africa, the Indian sub-continent, Southeast Asia, and the islands of the Pacific. During the first half of the twentieth century, malaria killed around 2 million people each year, mostly in the Asian and the Pacific tropics and in Africa. A report from the Regional Office of the Western Pacific Region of the World Health Organization (WHO) revealed that within the region in the year 2000, malaria was endemic in ten countries, seven of them in Asia and three in the south-west Pacific, with 404,376 confirmed cases, and 2,371 deaths.¹

There are four species of parasite that affect humans: *Plasmodium falciparum, P. vivax, P. ovale, and P. malariae*; of these species, the first is the most vicious, while *P. vivax* is the most common but rarely fatal. In the past, falciparum malaria was the major scourge in tropical Asia. The period from the 1950s to the 1980s witnessed successes in northeastern Asia, Taiwan, Okinawa, and parts of China in stamping out the disease, as well as the control or near eradication, and then resurgence, of malaria in countries like Sri Lanka, India, and the Philippines. In fact, multi-drug resistance of falciparum malaria has become the most serious threat in Southeast Asia, especially in the international
border regions of Yunnan province in China, Myanmar, Thailand, Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam.²

**Malaria: Miasma and Sanitation**

The term malaria, from the Italian *mala* and *aria* meaning “bad air,” reveals the old belief that the disease was a product of miasma, or noxious vapor generated by putrescent organic matter. In the past, this concept was generally embraced by people in the West. In many parts of Asia, including China, a similar concept existed. People believed that exposure to *zhang*, or foul air, produced in valleys with marshes and swamps caused malaria. The disease was generally associated with marshy areas or newly opened land. It is not surprising that most of the measures adopted to deal with the disease centered on the avoidance of low-lying areas and the improvement of sanitation. Hippocrates once wrote that:

[where] there be rivers … which drain off from the ground the stagnant water … [the people] will be healthy and bright. But if there be no rivers, and the water that the people drink be marshy … the physique of the people must show protruding bellies and enlarged spleens.³

As Ku’s chapter points out, people in Taiwan considered land reclamation to be an effective countermeasure, and they also drank only boiled water.

Before pathogenic agents were identified, such preventive actions would be supplemented by control measures designed to improve sanitation and living conditions. By the 1830s and 1840s, public health reformers in Europe pushed for sanitation reforms involving clean streets and sewers. This movement was reinforced by the Christian sense of moral living—a belief that proved to be especially important when Europeans encountered natives in their overseas expansion. A notable figure in this sanitation movement was Edwin Chadwick of the English Board of General Health who was influential in developing ideas for the construction and improvement of sewers and water systems to protect people’s health.⁴ In fact, as Yip’s chapter on the history of malaria in Hong Kong shows, the sanitation movement constituted an important part of the Hong Kong colonial government’s attempt to rid the city of diseases such as plague and malaria.

The Western expansion into tropical colonies created a health crisis as Europeans found themselves in the midst of unfamiliar environments without the immunity to protect themselves against unknown diseases. In India, British administrators in the second half of the nineteenth century introduced a series of sanitation reforms with the hope of reducing the malaria mortality and morbidity rates. But as in the case of Hong Kong, the Indian colonial administration was careful at first not to provoke indigenous opposition through overly aggressive medical intervention.⁵ In Taiwan, many Japanese fell victim to falciparum malaria which was absent from the home islands. The search for the etiology of and cures for “tropical diseases” including malaria proved to be a driving force behind the development of tropical medicine which was deemed vital to success in the race for colonies and possessions overseas.⁶
Malaria: Mosquito and Man

It is therefore no accident that many advances made in medical science in the second half of the nineteenth century were made by countries with expanding overseas political and economic interests. Tropical medicine relied heavily on bacteriological studies and research which promoted the germ theory of disease. Scientists like Louis Pasteur in Paris and Robert Koch in Germany were among many investigators trying to unlock the secrets of the biological processes of human diseases. Malaria was a favorite subject because of the widespread affliction and economic losses it caused the colonizers. A key question for these malaria fighters was how the disease was acquired by humans. It was Patrick Manson, a British medical officer who had served in the Imperial Chinese Customs Service who pointed to the possible link between mosquitoes and human diseases in his research on elephantiasis in the late 1870s and early 1880s. In late 1880 Charles Laveran, a French military doctor working in Algeria, identified a parasite as the cause of malaria. However, it was not until 1897 that the role of the mosquito in the transmission of the disease was established by a member of the Indian Medical Service, the British physician Ronald Ross.7

The discovery by Ross and the work of other investigators created a debate among the scientific community as to the best strategy to deal with malaria. Robert Koch, the German researcher, advocated the use of quinine to suppress the disease, while Ross insisted on the reduction of vector populations as the best approach. Others, especially in Italy, continued to stress sanitation reforms and general improvements in living conditions. From the late nineteenth century to the 1960s, this debate over control versus eradication led to the development of a number of anti-malaria “models” which were based on the latest scientific understanding of the etiology of the disease, the availability of technology, as well as on the political, social and economic concerns of the respective states engaged in the anti-malaria struggle.

Malaria Control: The Colonial Model

The first four chapters of this book focus on the historical development of malaria and anti-malaria policies in two former colonies, Hong Kong and Taiwan, as well as in Okinawa, at the southern edge of the Japanese home islands. Okinawa is considered together in the discussion of the colonial model because, as Iijima demonstrates, anti-malaria efforts there were based on the experience acquired by Japanese malariologists in colonial Taiwan, and in both concept and personnel, relied heavily on contributions from the imperial periphery. This illustrates the process of the “metropolitan capture of knowledge and resources from the tropics”8 that proved important in the development of Japanese colonial medicine. But Iijima also reminds us that the development of malaria studies in Taiwan and the Taiwan model of malaria control depended to a significant extent on infectious disease research conducted in research institutes in Japan. Liu likewise shows how malariology was developed and anti-malaria strategies were formulated in the metropolis. Researchers from Japan used Taiwan as a laboratory for
testing theories about malaria control and eradication, the results of which were then
applied to Okinawa. In so doing, malaria research not only helped to advance Japanese
colonial medicine, but also transform Taiwanese and Okinawan societies.

Both Ku and Liu provide details about the development of the Taiwan model of
malaria control which was essentially based on Koch’s method of compulsory blood
testing of residents and treatment with quinine of suspected and confirmed cases. The
top-down approach to control exploited a centralized colonial administrative structure
and social system so that representatives of the state—the police and local headmen—
collaborated to enforce anti-malaria measures. As Ku’s chapter demonstrates, the
interventions were imposed from above based on the colonizers’ needs and beliefs,
but she cautions that we have to understand the interaction of the colonizers and the
indigenous population in order to appreciate the complexity of the anti-malaria policy,
both in formulation and implementation. For the Taiwanese people who generally
accepted malaria as a way of life, Ku aptly summarizes the situation when she writes
that the anti-malaria campaign remained the “colonizers’ conviction” rather than the
“colonized people’s necessity.”

From the Japanese colonizers’ point of view, however, there was indeed the need
to take action. Anti-malaria efforts were deemed part of the broader civilizing and
modernizing missions of the colonial government. The alleged backwardness and
“uncivilized” features of the Taiwanese people and society would be transformed.
Ku’s chapter contributes to our understanding of the nature of Japanese colonialism by
detailing the Japanese attempt to assimilate the Taiwanese through the implementation
of “interior extensionism”—a policy that treated Taiwan as an extension of the home
islands—and its relationship to the priority given to the anti-vector approach in malaria
control during the 1920s. For a brief period, the assumption was that the Taiwanese
could become Japanese, or at least conform to Japanese values. But this was at odds
with the dominant view among Japanese colonial leaders who:

intended from the outset that the enlightenment and progress of the indigenes
were to be consistent with the limited and distinctly inferior position which
they were to occupy within the empire.9

By the late 1920s, the colonial government re-emphasized targeting the parasite in
its anti-malaria policy.

The British in Hong Kong also understood many of the diseases that they
encountered, including malaria, to be products of the uncivilized and unwholesome
lifestyle of the local population and the untamed environment they lived in. Their
civilizing mission was certainly reinforced by their sense of superior Christian morality.
As in India, the Hong Kong colonial government’s health policy was shaped by local
historical forces and political expediencies.10 Yip’s chapter, which examines the evolution
of an anti-malaria policy in nineteenth century Hong Kong, notes that there was in fact
no specific anti-malaria policy until after the outbreak of bubonic plague in 1894. The
untamed environment as well as the unhygienic conditions of Chinese living quarters
and the lifestyle of Chinese residents seemed to validate the colonizers’ conviction that
something drastic must be done to reform the environment as well as Chinese living conditions to protect the health of the colony.

As noted earlier, it is important to recognize local factors, especially the nature and background of indigenous populations, as well as the vested interests of the colonizers in our study of the development of anti-malaria policies. In Hong Kong, the proximity to China, the power of the merchants and social elites, and the initial reluctance of the colonial government to provoke local opposition all proved to be critical in explicating the colonizers’ formulation of a health policy in general and anti-malaria strategies in particular. Ku’s chapter on Taiwan demonstrates how local apathy and resistance were responsible at least in part for the colonial government’s return to a policy of targeting the patients rather than environmental factors. In other words, the empire might impose policy, which should be understood as the product of the interaction between the empire and local society.

Unlike the Japanese in Taiwan, the Hong Kong colonial government adhered essentially to a sanitation approach for malaria control. The implementation of drainage schemes in urban areas, the clearing of vegetation, and the avoidance or filling of marshy areas were the main improvements to sanitation that helped to reduce malaria morbidity and mortality. Even after Ross’ discovery, the Hong Kong government, apart from introducing more anti-vector activities such as anti-larval measures, essentially continued with general sanitation and environmental improvements. Unlike Taiwan, Hong Kong’s rapid urbanization contributed to a reduction of vector sources, and its small size also made the implementation of anti-malaria measures much more manageable. But in both Hong Kong and Taiwan, as the chapters by Yip, Ku, and Liu show, there was an urban-rural dichotomy in the results of the respective anti-malaria efforts.

Before the rise of the technological model of malaria control and eradication, the colonial powers, through their control of vast areas affected by malaria and their domination of the scientific discourse on the subject, had influenced the directions of future anti-malaria efforts in the world. In particular, the colonial anti-malaria intervention had a scientific bias that often ignored the social and cultural contexts in the colonies. At the same time, in the pursuit of the colonizers’ agenda, colonial governments often paid scant attention to the relationship between malaria and ecological changes. As Liu points out in chapter four, construction of water reservoirs and the exploitation of new lands in Taiwan increased malaria infection and expanded the malarious zone. Finally, the colonial model tended to expand the colonial state’s penetration into and control of local society through the imposition of regulations and rules of behavior in the name of health protection for the good of society.

**Malaria Eradication: The Technological Model**

The interwar years not only saw the continuation of the debate between supporters of the anti-parasite or anti-mosquito approaches, but also the advocacy of the concept of malaria as a social disease whose elimination demanded general social amelioration. The Malaria Commission of the League of Nations, for example, recommended that the
elimination of poverty should be a major concern in any anti-malaria efforts. These various approaches, however, were soon overshadowed by the discovery of a powerful chemical agent, dichloro-diphenyl-trichloroethane (DDT), and the development of a new technological approach in dealing with malaria.

The success of DDT in eliminating malaria transmission in many countries during the last years of World War II raised the expectation among some policy makers that there could be a united approach in malaria control or even eradication. In chapter six Stapleton provides a much needed historical perspective on the role of the Rockefeller Foundation in the development of various public health and anti-malaria programs in Asia during the interwar years, and its intimate involvement in the initial experimentation and subsequent support of DDT residual spraying to destroy the mosquito vector as the method of malaria eradication. The technological model rose to prominence in the postwar period when the hegemonic position of the U.S. made it possible for many other countries to follow this approach of disease control and eradication, with WHO providing the leadership in a global eradication program.

In Asia, the Foundation became closely involved in the preparatory stage of malaria eradication in Taiwan through its epidemiological work and spraying experiments between 1946 and 1950. Yip’s chapter on postwar Taiwan highlights several important themes in the eradication effort. DDT spraying began in 1952—even before WHO finally approved a global eradication program based on DDT residual spraying in 1955. In Okinawa, the Wheeler Plan based on the use of DDT was introduced by the U.S. military government. What is significant is that the states in both Taiwan and Okinawa, with the support of a powerful ally, the U.S., assumed critical roles in the development, implementation, and enforcement of the technological approach. Both Iijima and Yip however, argue that the colonial legacies in Okinawa and Taiwan, especially the social support system developed by the Japanese in Okinawa and the anti-malaria infrastructure established in colonial Taiwan, proved important in the respective postwar programs. Hong Kong’s government briefly conducted DDT spraying after the war, but this was soon abandoned as improvements to infrastructure and other health programs made spraying unnecessary. The development of overall health services was also a factor in the success of Hong Kong and Taiwan’s anti-malaria efforts.

The success stories in Okinawa, Taiwan and also in Sri Lanka, which came close to eradication, were not duplicated in other countries, however. Progress in some countries was slow, as resistance to DDT had developed. Moreover, the eradication strategy proved to be impractical in highly malarious sub-Saharan Africa. WHO decided to abandon the time-limited global campaign in 1969. Many reasons accounted for the failure of this global effort based on the technological model. The misguided belief that there could be a unified approach and a universal epidemiological model blinded its advocates to an appreciation of the relevance of local conditions and factors in the anti-malaria effort. Many developing countries spent a good part of their health resources on malaria eradication even though basic health services were still largely non-existent. In the 1970s and 1980s, when international funding for malaria control and research diminished, many countries had neither the funds nor the political will to continue with the eradication program.
During the 1950s and 1960s, when WHO’s global campaign was being implemented, leaders in the People’s Republic of China (PRC) were developing disease control and prevention programs, including an anti-malaria strategy that relied on their experience in political and social mobilization. Not being a member of WHO and without massive foreign aid, the country was too poor to invest heavily in DDT technology. Yip’s chapter on the PRC’s anti-malaria efforts examines the tactics of mass mobilization employed by the government in health campaigns in the 1950s and 1960s, and how policy-makers tried to use local resources and labor to compensate for the lack of modern biomedicine and medical technology. The state played a critical role in these developments as it exalted the people to attack pests in the name of national strengthening and modernization. Health preservation was the patriotic duty of every citizen.

Yip’s study also emphasizes the PRC government’s attempts to develop comprehensive epidemic prevention and health services to combat communicable diseases affecting the majority of the population. Such a health infrastructure, which was absent in many developing countries that embarked on malaria eradication with the use of DDT, enabled the implementation of an integrated approach to both control and treatment of malaria. The role played by the state and a strong political will proved to be essential in these efforts. Similar conditions existed in Taiwan, which benefited from the use of DDT as well as from massive foreign aid. These conditions might not be duplicated in other countries, but they do point to the importance of local factors and the need to develop a solid primary health care system to support anti-malaria programs.

Recent changes in China’s health system have certainly affected anti-malaria efforts. As Yip’s chapter points out, with the development of a market-oriented economy since the early 1980s, the treatment of malaria has to some extent been taken over by private-sector providers in some areas. Government investment in health matters, including those for combating parasitic diseases has also declined. Although the surveillance system remains sound, it is clear that malaria remains a problem in some provinces, especially in Yunnan and Hainan. As noted earlier, the situation in Yunnan is complicated by the active cross-border trade between Yunnan and its southern neighbors.

With increased international travel, the possibility of travelers and migrants introducing malaria into different parts of the globe has become a major health issue. The chapter on Hong Kong points to the fact that the influx of Vietnamese boat people into the colony in 1989 was accompanied by a spike in the number of malaria cases. In Taiwan, malaria eradication had been achieved without vector extermination, and the continued existence of malaria in other countries poses a serious threat to the island, and indeed, to countries in a similar situation. The development of a sound surveillance system is therefore vital to protecting people against a renewed threat from the disease.

Studies in this book will do much to illuminate an important and neglected dimension of the history of malaria and the development of global anti-malaria strategies in the modern period. The resurgence of malaria, the continued widespread human suffering, and the search for ways to relieve the burden of the disease in the
world, especially on those parts least able to shoulder it, all remind us of the value of looking back to lessons learned from a time when optimism ruled and different models of malaria control or eradication were developed and tested. The single most important historical lesson, perhaps, is that there is no one single model that might work by itself. The solution may be an integrated approach, and that may indeed be discovered in the history that we have presented in this book.
This book has examined both the temporal and spatial aspects of the development of various approaches to combating malaria during the colonial and postcolonial periods in Hong Kong, Okinawa, Taiwan, and mainland China. The essays consider the historical development of malaria and its control or eradication in modern East Asia as a dynamic process of interaction between the interests and objectives of the state (colonial or sovereign), international interests, the emergence of new medical knowledge and technology, changing concepts of disease and health, local environmental conditions and local society, as well as the political, social and economic forces at work in a particular locality at a particular time. They have demonstrated the complexity required in the formulation and implementation of anti-malaria policies, and highlighted factors central to the health of a society.

For the colonial states, the essays have validated Mark Harrison’s assertion in his study of public health in British India, that in trying to understand the relationship between colonial priorities and health policies, we need to move away from the rigid dichotomy of the “authoritarian, paternalistic” state versus the “liberal and decentralist” state to a paradigm that would accommodate both conceptions of empire. Colonial health policies were in many cases the result of a combination of these characteristics of the state and were based on political, economic, and social concerns. Certainly, the critical roles played by colonial states in formulating approaches to combating malaria should be acknowledged. Although the state’s policies were often informed by a strong “civilizing” mission, they were constrained in their implementation by indigenous responses and competing priorities for resources. Indeed, these studies on Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Okinawa have shown the importance of local factors, including prevailing perceptions of malaria, and local actions, including resistance and the inertia of vested interests in shaping anti-malaria policies and facilitating their implementation. In practice, theoretical formulations often proved impractical or unworkable.

At the same time, relationships between the metropolis and colony were often affected by broader international forces. Hong Kong’s proximity to China greatly affected the colonial government’s public health efforts, including its anti-malaria activities. The isolation of Hong Kong as a plague port in 1894 by the international
community forced both London and Hong Kong to take immediate countermeasures. Development and advances in medical knowledge also changed the dynamics of center-periphery interactions. Anti-malaria efforts in Okinawa were based on experience gained by Japanese malarialogists in Taiwan, and the colony contributed both concepts and personnel to the development of Japanese colonial medicine.

When the technological model for combating malaria held sway in the early postwar period, the state often tried to provide direction and determine the allocation of resources, including the use of dichloro-diphenyl-trichloroethane (DDT), yet local and international interests also affected the actual policies and their implementation. Hong Kong’s government found that its health resources could be better used in continuing its sanitation approach to combating the disease and developing a public health infrastructure. Okinawa and Taiwan benefited from the adoption of DDT technology as well as the support and largess of a powerful ally—the U.S.—which dominated postwar Asia. Even when an alternative anti-malaria model was developed and adopted, as in the People’s Republic of China, the state made the mobilization of labor as well as other resources possible. But such state actions would not be successful without community co-operation and action, even when the state has the coercive power to force compliance. The interests and concerns of colonialism as well as those of the state, constrained by factors present at a specific locality at a particular time, constitute central themes in the history of malaria in modern East Asia.

There is also a significant aspect to the state’s role in the anti-malaria story. In both mainland China and Taiwan the state promoted health protection and anti-epidemic activities as part of their attempts to strengthen the state, and health protection was deemed not so much as a right, but an obligation of the individual citizen. This position could in fact be traced to the Nationalist state’s claim before 1949 that public health was a function of the state and health was essential to the welfare of the nation. After the Nationalists relocated to Taiwan, this theme continued to dominate the government’s health propaganda, especially with its emphasis on the need to strengthen the population in its struggle against communism.

On the other hand, anti-epidemic and public health campaigns constituted part of the patriotic health movement in the People’s Republic, which was dedicated to the strengthening and modernization of the country. The government was at the same time ideologically committed to the equitable distribution of health resources. As we have seen, the introduction of new economic policies in the late 1970s and early 1980s, as well as subsequent changes in the health system, have however, created tension between the commitment to providing health care for the people, including protection from diseases, and financial and political constraints. The state has responded with active intervention in the health sector to reduce the potential for social conflict and resistance resulting from the emergent inequities in health care. It is certainly too early to predict the outcome of such actions by the state.

While international developments have helped to shape anti-malaria efforts in East Asia, experiences in individual East Asian countries have in turn helped to chart new directions in the global anti-malaria campaign. The lessons of the People’s Republic
of China’s success in the 1960s to control many infectious and parasitic diseases through the mobilization of labor and the development of a strong primary health care system that would support anti-epidemic efforts were not lost on the World Health Organization (WHO), which, after declaring the formal end to its global program of malaria eradication, was searching for a new strategy to control malaria. During the 1970s, WHO turned increasingly to the primary health care model for the development of a solid health infrastructure. In 1978, it endorsed a new anti-malaria approach that stressed careful study of local epidemiology, ecology, and social and economic conditions, as well as an integration of specialized and general health care services. There was no longer a universal control theory; it was now held that malaria control planning should be adapted to local conditions, and the understanding of these diverse conditions—termed the “stratification” of the malaria problem—would help determine the selection of control measures.

But the technological model—or modifications of it—has not disappeared. The end of the global malaria eradication initiative was followed a few years later by the ban on the use of DDT in the U.S. because of environmental concerns. Persistent objection from environmental groups led to its removal from the anti-malaria arsenal in most countries. Yet the problem, as we have seen, is not in the technology itself (although the toxic effect is certainly a major concern) but in the belief that massive indoor residual spraying of DDT would be enough to wipe out an entire species. DDT, if used properly, could indeed help to save millions of lives. Some countries in Africa have continued to use it on a highly restricted basis. In 2006, WHO announced plans to promote DDT as a cheap and effective tool against malaria, and the U.S. government also increased its financial support for malarial insecticide spraying in Africa.

We have also noted the serious problem of the rise of multi-drug resistance in malaria parasite strains. In the early 1960s, there were reports from South America of chloroquine resistant strains of Plasmodium falciparum, and similar resistance was reported in Yunnan in 1973. Fortunately, artemisinin, first developed in China in 1972 and which has proved to be highly effective, is available from China and is used in Asia. However, WHO did not approve the widespread use of the drug until 2001 (partly out of the fear that parasites would soon develop resistance to this potent anti-malarial) and it was not until three years later that a concerted effort was made to introduce the drug to countries afflicted by malaria in Africa.

Malaria remains one of the most serious diseases in the world due to global political and economic changes, as well as the dynamics of locally changing patterns of disease, ecology and population behavior—not to mention the changing biology of parasites. In October 1992, WHO held the Ministerial Conference on Malaria in Amsterdam to evaluate anti-malaria efforts since 1978 when they had endorsed the primary health care initiative, and to formulate appropriate responses to new realities. The summit reiterated some of the points proposed in 1978, but emphasized even more strongly the need for community involvement, environmental management, and sanitation. It also urged governments to consider malaria control as an essential part of overall health development with sustainable progress as the major objective.
In 1998, the world body announced a new initiative, Roll Back Malaria, to mobilize worldwide support for the fight against malaria. The project endorses the use of insecticide-treated bed-nets, artemisinin-based combination drug therapy, and rapid diagnosis and treatment. Most important of all, it insists that partner countries in the project must be fully committed to the terms of their respective agreements in implementing anti-malaria measures that are sustainable. The fight against malaria, as WHO has recognized, requires, among other things, a strong political will on the part of individual states. Significantly, the anti-malaria experiences in Hong Kong, Okinawa, Taiwan, and mainland China have offered similar lessons. Malaria control programs should be part of overall health development so that they become an integral part of a well-organized health service. Intervention should be adapted to local conditions, taking into consideration epidemiological, economic, and social factors. Anti-malaria efforts should also be integrated into plans of national development that aim to raise living standards and improve socio-economic conditions. And these programs need to be sustained through continual support of the state and society.
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