

## CFCs: STILL A HOT ISSUE

If a contest were held to award the most scientifically baseless, politically oppressive, morally bankrupt, economically destructive environmental farce, the hands-down winner would be the banning of chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs). Due to government intervention, the automotive industry is being forced to scrap billions of dollars in unamortized Freon-based equipment and spend billions more on equipment dedicated to new refrigerants (R134a) since the two are not compatible. Meanwhile, automotive A/C customers will see their "repair" bill go from \$25 to \$800 as retrofits become required.

Whenever a major action is being dictated, especially at the national level, ask yourself, "Who benefits?" If your answer includes "arrogant scientists," "trendy politicians" and "faceless corporate bureaucrats," you can safely assume that scandal is not far behind. These do-gooders will proclaim that *you* are going to benefit because they are doing you a big favor... one you don't remember requesting.

### Unanswered Questions

When I began studying the theory that CFCs were affecting the ozone layer, I found less and less, *not* more, credibility. This trend continues at an accelerating pace. A review should include these questions:

1. The Rowland/Molina theory seeks to convince you that chlorine from CFCs is responsible for "destruction of the ozone layer." If this is true, why did Mother Nature evolve oceans that emit an average of 600 million tons per year, 80,000 times the chlorine theoretically supplied by CFCs? What about volcanoes such as Mount Erebus which emits an average of 1,000 tons of chlorine each day? When Mount Pinatubo recently erupted, 10

### Why is the auto industry letting the government dictate...again?

By Paul V. Sheridan



Whenever a major action is being dictated, especially at the national level, ask yourself, "Who benefits?"

million tons of chlorine was ejected. Chlorine from this planet's 6,500 volcanoes has been deposited directly into the stratosphere for billions of years! Why weren't natural sources even mentioned in the theory?

2. Why are the major chemical companies pushing for a ban of CFCs? What is the status of the international patent rights to CFC production? Is it merely a coincidence that the scheduled ban of CFCs coincides with the expiration of the patents? Is it coincidence that the companies that are shoving this ban down your throat are the very same companies that hold the "approved" patents? Is it coincidence that these bureaucrats are also major stockholders of media mouthpieces such as *Time*? Is there any correlation between the business plans of selected chemical companies, and the subsequent emergence and widespread media promotion of this theory?

3. Gordon Dobson, the father of atmospheric science, discovered seasonal fluctuation of the Antarctic ozone layer in 1956. Why is this natural phenomenon never discussed? What is the implication given that CFCs were not widely used when Dobson made his historic observations? What is the significance of the Scandinavian claim that their research on ozone-layer fluctuations dates back to 1925...when CFCs had not yet been invented!

4. If the ozone layer is being "depleted," why has the ultra-violet radiation reaching the Earth's surface been declining for the last 50 years?

5. Why the Tazieff Resolution? Why would hundreds of respected scientists sign a document that states that the CFC/ozone layer issue is a fraud? Why is this resolution avoided like the plague by the American news media? the EPA? Why is the Tazieff Resolution hidden from the public?

6. Why did Vice President Al Gore fire Dr. William Happer of the Department of Energy, who was pursuing a scientific review of available data? He was also proposing more accurate instrumentation to ensure credible conclusions. What does this incident indicate about the ethical stature of the present administration? Has Gore decided that the scientific method should be replaced by "political correctness?"

7. Why House Resolution 547? This legislation calls for a complete investigation of this fraud and will probably result in criminal proceedings. Why haven't our friends in the news media told you about HR-547?

8. The original design criteria for refrigerant chemicals was to be durable, non-flammable, non-corrosive and non-toxic. After 20 years of development and tests, and more than 40 years of use, CFCs have completely proven themselves. By

stark contrast, R-134a is flimsy, explosive, corrosive and downright poisonous! Recognizing that they themselves will not be routinely exposed to this unproven chemical, what criteria did the EPA use to pronounce from their ivory towers that R-134a was "acceptable"?

### Requests Denied

I called the EPA (202/233-9155) and requested its human-toxicity studies on R-134a. Under the Toxic Substance Control Act, the EPA is required to release these findings. It flatly refused my requests. The important issue is the health risk imposed on our technicians who will unknowingly be exposed to a substance that is at least 100 times more carcinogenic than the CFCs it replaces! The EPA does not want you to know the details contained in the toxicity studies.

That this fraud is backed by those who would dissolve organizations such as SEMA is demonstrated by Mr. Gore, who explains in his book that the automobile is a "mortal threat...more deadly than that of any military enemy we are ever again likely to confront." Certainly, politics, greed and fascism are not new to humankind. What is new is the context of these implementations: the environment!

The 15th-century Europeans were told of sea monsters at the edge of a flat earth. In truth, the market share of silks and spices enjoyed by the major traders were being threatened by the smaller mariners. Similar to the lies told of the earth's flatness, SEMA is being told, "The ship has sailed...it's too late." That money-making ploy did not work for the greedy mariners of the 15th century, and SEMA members need to ensure that it doesn't work today. An excellent start is to write to your congress-person and demand that he or she support HR-547. ■

Paul V. Sheridan, president, Doctor Detroit Motorsports, is also product planning manager for Chrysler's 1996 minivan.