

political chaos. If food shortages caused an increase from the 1989 average death rate of 21 per 1,000 to only 22 per 1,000 population, this small rise would mean the deaths of an additional 1.5 million people per year in this region.

### Use as a structural fumigant

Methyl bromide is used extensively as a structural fumigant, and this application currently accounts for about 5% of U.S. production (3,500 tons in 1990). The current use of methyl bromide as a structural fumigant is widespread because of its efficacy, applicability for a wide variety of sites and pests, suitability for use on accessible and inaccessible pests, short fumigation period (about one day), lack of insect resistance, cost effectiveness, and because it does not damage food, structures, or equipment if used correctly. There are at present no alternatives for a number of applications, including: pest control for some food-processing facilities, warehouses, aircraft, and historic buildings, as well as quarantine treatment of structures against exotic pests and diseases. Quarantine treatment of structures against exotic pests currently requires that all pest control options be available, including methyl bromide. Banning the compound would:

- Increase the cost of wood products and buildings, including repair and replacement. The total direct and indirect costs of wood damage and replacement would exceed \$132 million per year, and increase each succeeding year as damaging insect infestations spread and become established over the United States. The cost of each real estate transfer (closing costs) would increase by \$900 to \$1,200, reflecting the additional cost for termite control. In southern California alone this would represent an additional cost to homeowners of \$135 million to \$180 million per year. In addition, some priceless historical artifacts and structures would be lost. Because they can harbor dangerous exotic new pests, the importation of wicker, bamboo, and tropical woods into the United States as baskets, furniture, and decorative items would end.

- Result in food supplies that are less safe and less palatable, because no methods will be available to control pests such as larvae, roaches, and rats in flour mills and food production, storage, and transportation facilities. The public expects its food to be free of insect filth and rodent feces.

- Wipe out the world's stored grain reserves. Countries would no longer have the ability to store excess food production for use in years when production is low. Grain would have to be used immediately, or be lost to insects and rodents. The 20 million bushels of feed grain (corn) and the 147 million bushels of wheat held as a disaster reserve in the United States would be vulnerable to infestation by hitchhiking pests. The United States could be forced to become a produce-and-consume society, having lost its ability to feed itself during lean production years or disasters.

## Hitler, too, was an environmentalist

*We reprint here the opening remarks by Marjorie Mazel Hecht, managing editor of 21st Century Science & Technology magazine, to a Sept. 30 forum in Washington, D.C. aimed at debunking the ozone hole scare.*

*The forum was held to reach representatives of the air conditioning and refrigeration industry, gathered in convention at the time, after an anti-CFC group within the industry refused a challenge from 21st Century Science & Technology to debate the issue.*

*The fight to reverse the ban on CFCs and other so-called ozone-depleting chemicals escalated recently, when French volcanologist and former government minister Haroun Tazieff presented a statement to the Nov. 17-25 Copenhagen conference of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol. His statement, which is co-signed by over 100 scientists from 12 nations, is entitled "Seven Good Reasons to Reverse the Montreal Protocol." Copies of the statement were distributed to attendees at the Copenhagen meeting, and Tazieff's action was reported as front-page news in the French daily Le Figaro on Nov. 23.*

*Tazieff wrote the foreword to the book *The Holes in the Ozone Scare*, published by 21st Century Science Associates, in which he presents a withering refutation of the ozone depletion theory, on which the international ban on production and use of CFCs, halons, and other allegedly ozone-depleting chemicals is based.*

We published *The Holes in the Ozone Scare* for one urgent reason: If CFCs are phased out as planned under the Montreal Protocol, it won't just cost consumers billions of dollars. People will die as a result, people will pay with their lives for the ozone scare. The estimate of the refrigeration industry is that 20 to 40 million people will die worldwide as a result of the disruption of the cold chain. But how many Americans know that? And how many so-called environmentalists think that these deaths are okay, because the world is overpopulated and they want us to get rid of some of the surplus?

Most Americans know only the scare story—that man-made CFCs are poking a hole in the ozone layer through which increased ultraviolet radiation will hit them and cause cancer. This scare story has been repeated so much in the media, that people don't question it. . . . Sen. Al Gore talks

about blind sheep in Patagonia, whose blindness comes from cataracts caused by the ozone hole, and people don't question it. The ozone depletion gang holds a press conference to warn of a new deep ozone hole right over President Bush's house in Kennebunkport, Maine, and the President doesn't question it. Within days, the President announces an acceleration of the phaseout of CFCs to 1995, to stop the growing ozone hole.

Only later, and without publicity, does the truth appear: The blind sheep in Patagonia have a bacterial infection—conjunctivitis—that made them blind. And NASA's ozone depletion theorists retract their alarm on the ozone danger in the north. Meanwhile, the real blind sheep, the American public, go on believing in the ozone scare. . . .

Yes, the book is political—because this ozone scare issue is itself political and it has to be fought politically. If policy questions in this nation were decided on the basis of scientific evidence, there would be no Montreal Protocol, there would be no phaseout of CFCs. . . .

Now, let me say something about the politics of this situation. I have a simple test: Is the environmentalist agenda—and I mean here the environmentalist groups with their \$8 billion-plus a year of funds—really one of depopulation? Call Greenpeace, call Worldwatch, call any other of these many groups and ask them if they think there are too many people in the world, if overpopulation is the problem. When I ask, they have always said yes. Then inquire further about the world population they think is desirable: 4 billion, 3 billion, 1 billion? And since the world is now close to 5 billion, ask where they will start eliminating people? How many cousins do they have? Are they prepared to kill off one-sixth of their family? I think the answer will be obvious that it is the darker-skinned people of this world that they have in mind for population reduction. And that some of them are quite happy if this happens through disease and starvation—as will be the outcome of the Montreal Protocol.

This anti-population lobby is not new. I was horrified many years ago, when researching the Holocaust, to find that immediately after World War II, when millions of people had been killed, the U.S. anti-population lobby geared up a population reduction program. These are the intellectual fathers and the moneybags for the environmentalist movement today. These are the people who mobilized the eugenics movement in the 1920s and 1930s—to sterilize the people they considered inferior. Virginia was one of the first states to adopt a eugenics sterilization policy. In fact, Hitler's eugenics law came straight from the Commonwealth of Virginia.

I think this is an important point to make: Hitler himself was an environmentalist, putting nature and beasts first, above individual human beings. For it is only when one's ideology excludes the idea that human life is sacred, that what distinguishes every human being from animals is the

spark of the divine, the power of reason, of creativity—only when one excludes that idea can one then justify killing, as Hitler did and as today's environmentalists do.

We define every human being as sacred and see it as our role to create a world where every individual can develop his or her full potential. Today's environmentalists, in contrast, define a human being as someone who produces three-quarters of a ton of solid waste a year. . . .

### The eco-lobby's 'kept' scientists

Now, this population reduction lobby would not be able to carry out the ozone scare without some support in the scientific community. And indeed, many of the scientists involved in the ozone scare have the same ideology as the population extremists. You can read in Chapter 11 of the book how, back in 1975, many of the scientists involved in today's hoaxes met at a meeting convened by Margaret Mead, the grand dame of the New Age, to discuss how the only way they could get people to go along with cutting back was to scare them, and how they had to fudge the facts in order to scare them. You can read atmospheric scientist Stephen Schneider's quote along these lines on page 96, "Each of us has to decide what is the right balance between being effective and being honest."

And then there is the case of Dr. Sherwood Rowland from the University of California. As you can read in the book, Rowland was one of the originators of the ozone depletion theory in 1974. Today he is the president of the AAAS. He is also one of the chief signers of the Morelia Declaration. This was published as a one-third-page advertisement in the *New York Times* twice at the end of last year. In its last paragraph, the Morelia Declaration states: "If the latter half of the 20th century has been marked by human liberation movements, the final decade of the second millennium will be characterized by liberation movements among species, so that one day we can attain genuine equality among all living things." . . .

This brings me to my last point: Can we win this political fight? My answer is yes, of course we can, if the American sheep will wake up and take their blinders off. . . .

We don't have the millions of dollars our opponents have. But we do have a powerful weapon—the truth, and we encourage you to find this out for yourselves. Buy our book. Subscribe to our magazine. Instead of baahing like a blind sheep, put the EPA, your legislators, the head of the Alliance for Responsible CFC Policy, and others like them on the spot: Ask them if they are aware of the consequences of their policy to ban CFCs. Are they aware of how many people will be killed, especially poor people? Ask the AAAS. Ask Sherwood Rowland, its head. Let's dump the Montreal Protocol and get this country back on the track of being a world leader in technology, science, and development, for it is only through advanced technology that we can have a reasonable environment.