

The next step for the movement against climate modification and HAARP

*(Address to the seminar on climate modification and HAARP organized by the **Healing Sound Movement**, Amsterdam, 7th December 2014)*

(English subtitles for the videos can be activated by clicking the rectangle under the You-Tube picture to the left of the cogwheel)

Over four years ago, in May 2010, I had the honour to be invited by Peter Vereecke to participate in the Belfort Group's first international symposium on climate modification and HAARP that was held at Ghent in Belgium.



The Belfort Group's symposium was the first tangible indication of the existence of a pan-European - more than that, an international - movement against the global phenomenon of clandestine spraying from aircraft that was being kept entirely out of official politics, and out of the mainstream media, everywhere in the world. .

The centerpiece of the Belfort Group symposium was the Case Orange Report, which focused attention on the physical characteristics of what it implied were "normal" aircraft condensation trails. It argued for a conceptual separation between these trails and the deliberate spraying that was the real concern of the participants. The fact that such systematic and total suppression of the facts in relation to this distinction was and is possible remains something unbelievable for probably the majority of the population.

Another characteristic of the Case Orange report was that it was framed in the petitioning mode. Its concern was to persuade established authorities to face up to their responsibilities to citizens, to public health, to vegetation, to all higher forms of life. In pursuit of this concern the report was distributed to the embassies of all major countries, to relevant

government ministries, to all the key media outlets. **And there was absolutely no response from any of these agencies.**

There were other important testimonies at the Belfort Group symposium: from Désirée Röver on the medical consequences of the spraying, from Saskia Messenger on the economics of budget airlines and the probable connection with the spraying. And the review of the Case Orange report itself by aerospace engineer Coen Vermeeren also focused the attention of the minority of the public that had access to the Symposium's message and was receptive to it.

But the overall conclusion that emerged from the Symposium was not encouraging. It was that the ears of authority were closed to the appeal that the Symposium was making.

The attitude of the majority of delegates to the Belfort Group symposium was fairly consistent on two issues: on the mainstream climate change debate, where most delegates tended towards anthropogenic climate change skepticism, and on European integration, where there was more or less a consensus that the European Union is totally on the wrong track, moving further and further away from its citizens, and also a probably predominant view that that the European Union, and the euro currency, are not worth trying to save.

So the direction from which the next idea for a move forward came may have been unexpected for some of the participants in the Belfort Group symposium because it was from the European Parliament. In the closing decade of the twentieth century and the first decade of this century there were perhaps more dissidents in the European Parliament than there are today. One of them was [Giulietto Chiesa](#) (in the centre of the photograph below),



who had been Moscow correspondent for the Italian Communist newspaper *Unita* in the perestroika-glasnost period and was later elected to the European Parliament. He had made a film, entitled [“Zero”](#), on the real story of the 11th September 2001 attacks in New York and Washington and had [screened it in the European Parliament](#) in 2008, to meet with an almost total boycott both from the media and from his fellow European parliamentarians. His showing of the film made him into a *persona non grata* for the official political world in Brussels and he sought re-election to the European Parliament on the ticket of the Latvian Russian Union, defending the interests of the persecuted Russian minority in Latvia. In the European Parliament the Latvian Russian Union is part of the Greens-European Free alliance group. Giulietto Chiesa was not elected from Latvia but his political ally **Tatjana Zdanoka** (on the left of the photograph above) has been a European Parliamentarian since 2004 and was re-elected in the last European elections. Tatjana Zdanoka’s support was indispensable for the next stage of our campaign.

Her support was enlisted by the Spanish Green activist and parliamentary candidate **Josefina Fraile** (on the right of the photograph above), who was not a complete stranger to Brussels and was able to proceed with organization of what became the second important meeting of climate modification activists in Europe, the Skyguards meeting of May 2013.



Skyguards was able to draw on what was probably the “Last Hurrah”, the last significant action, of the anti-nuclear movement, a report presented in 1998 to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Security and Defense Policy of the European Parliament on the subject of the [Environment, Security and Foreign Policy](#), by Swedish Europarlamentarian and anti-nuclear activist **Maj-Britt Theorin**.



The report analysed the geo-strategic changes in security following the end of the Cold War, proposing among other things that the military resources that could now be freed should be allocated to non-military purposes, one of which could be protection of the environment.

In paragraph T of the Report's text it states that despite the existing conventions, military research is in progress on environmental manipulation as a weapon, as demonstrated for example by the Alaska-based HAARP system.



Defined as “a weapons system which disrupts the climate, outside of any legal framework”, HAARP is a matter of global concern and has to be regarded as “a serious threat to the environment, with an incalculable impact on human life.”

The Petition submitted by Skyguards

The Petition read in part as follows: *“For over a decade Europe has been subjected to massive clandestine aerosol spraying, for purposes assumed to include attempted mitigation*

of an officially identified global warming/climate change problem and/or facilitation of the operations of HAARP (High Frequency Active Auroral Research Project) and HAARP-related activities such as those of MUOS in Sicily.

2. These actions are being implemented outside of any legal framework, national or international, without the knowledge or informed consent of the population, and in violation of the most elementary precautionary principles.

3. The consequences of these actions for peoples' health and life on the planet are incalculable;

4. National governments, which have the duty of authorizing the use of national airspace, deny that these actions are taking place.

5. Institutionalized denial of obvious facts that violate fundamental human rights (the right to health, to security, to physical and psychical integrity) leaves citizens totally defenceless.

We demand that this petition (and the annexed documents), be admitted and, given the seriousness of the facts reported, that the Committee on Petitions grant the demands submitted by us. HAVING REGARDS that weather modification programs / geoengineering are an accomplished fact in Europe, we appeal to the European Parliament for thorough investigation to be made at all levels, including analysis of soil, water, air, flora, fauna, persons and animals, by independent experts, for the purpose of compiling evidence for legal action against those responsible for these actions against public health and security, and those aiding and abetting them.

The Committee on Petitions replied on 25th March 2014.

Dear Mrs Fraile Martin,

I would like to inform you that the Committee on Petitions considered your petition and decided that the issues you raise are admissible in accordance with the Rules of Procedure of the European Parliament, insofar as the subject matter falls within the sphere of activities of the European Union.

The Committee began its examination of your petition and decided to ask the European Commission to conduct a preliminary investigation of the various aspects of the problem. The Committee will continue its examination of your petition as soon as it is in receipt of the necessary information.

I will keep you informed of any further action taken on your petition in due course.

Yours sincerely,

Erminia Mazzoni

Chairman

Committee on Petitions

So that is the state of the game at the moment.

As I said, the Case Orange report was submitted in petitioning mode, but in fact the same is true of Skyguards. Case Orange also assumed that it was under an obligation to prove the reality of a distinction between what it identified as normal aircraft condensation trails and aerosol spraying from aircraft.

This necessity for proof was arguable at the time when the main focus of our movement was on dispelling the disinformation that was launched at the same time as the huge increase in atmospheric spraying that began at the end of the nineties, namely that what people were beginning to see in the sky was just what they had always seen when jet aircraft flew over. I am going to play part of a meeting organized by the IPCC, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, and held in Melbourne, Australia, last year. Anti-spraying activists were present in the audience. They made an intervention in the meeting and they also demonstrated outside the meeting. The man we are going to see asking a question is Paul Mac, an extremely energetic, committed and knowledgeable activist who is more or less the undisputed leader of the anti-spraying movement in Australia. He is also an anthropogenic climate change sceptic, and I will examine the way that this influences his intervention.

[\(Link\)](#)

Paul Mac succeeds in extracting from Professor Neville Nicholls an acknowledgment that geoengineering is already happening, that it is not merely a proposal for the future on which

the public is being consulted prior to a decision being made for or against global implementation. That in itself is an achievement, because the record in the past was one of persistent denial that there was any connection between what was being seen in the sky and what advocates of geoengineering were proposing. But what should activists do once they have secured that admission? References to the way that geoengineering is poisoning the planet can be countered, and will be countered, by arguments that however bad the side-effects of geoengineering are, the effects of out-of-control climate change will be worse.


Once they have got Professor Nicholls to admit that geoengineering is already being implemented, Paul Mac and his supporters seem to lose their bearings. They abandon the confrontation with authority and start playing to the aisles, preaching to the choir, as we say. We see the placard: “The People Demanding that you pay Carbon Tax are the same people poisoning the planet.” This accusation will cut no ice with the IPCC. They want us to acknowledge, and to respect, the idea that there is a political differentiation between their positions and the positions of “climate change sceptics” in the pay of oil companies who have imposed on climate science dubious solutions such as commodification of climate parameters, taxing schemes and geoengineering. Nicholls’ equivalent in my part of the world, i.e. in Greece, were saying years ago that we should not talk about geoengineering or bring the issue to the attention of the public because to discuss it is to encourage it. The fact of the matter is that the most single-minded advocates of geoengineering have been people, mostly coming from the nuclear weapons laboratories, who question whether there is really a problem of anthropogenic climate change, *but then propose solar radiation management as the most appropriate response to anthropogenic climate change.*

Look at what Edward Teller, father of the H-bomb and of the Star Wars anti-missile system, forerunner of HAARP, had to say in this connection, in a paper from 2002 entitled “Active Climate Stabilization: Practical Physics-Based Approaches to Prevention of Climate Change.”

Edward Teller: “....if you’re inclined to subscribe to the Rio Framework Convention’s directive that mitigation of global warming should be effected in the “lowest possible cost” manner – *whether or not* you believe that the Earth is indeed warming significantly above-and-beyond natural rates, and *whether or not* you believe that human activities are largely responsible for such warming (....) – then you will *necessarily* prefer active technical management of radiation forcing of the Earth to administrative management of greenhouse gas inputs to the Earth’s atmosphere”

“....if you’re inclined to subscribe to the Rio Framework Convention’s directive that mitigation of global warming should be effected in the “lowest possible cost” manner – whether or not you believe that the Earth is indeed warming significantly above-and-beyond natural rates, and whether or not you believe that human activities are largely responsible for such warming (....) – then you will necessarily prefer active technical management of radiation forcing of the Earth to administrative management of greenhouse gas inputs to the Earth’s atmosphere” **(In other words, whatever you think about the reality or otherwise of anthropogenic climate change, solar radiation management is the best way to deal with it.)**

Solar radiation management is acknowledged by Teller to have been the brainchild of the physicist Freeman Dyson.



In his short piece published by the Hoover Foundation “The Planet needs a Sunscreen” Teller says: “In 1979, physicist Freeman Dyson, in his characteristically prescient manner,

proposed the deliberate, large-scale introduction of ...particles into the upper atmosphere to offset global warming, which he thought even then would eventually become a human concern.”

But what does Dyson say about global warming? Here he is talking to Boston University's school of management in 2005 [\(Link\)](#)

In March 2009 an interview with Dyson in *The New York Times Magazine* created controversy among supporters of the IPCC by claiming that the climate models used to forecast the effects of increased atmospheric carbon dioxide are unreliable and that in any case because carbon dioxide is good for plants, a warmer planet could be a very good thing. And if CO₂ does get to be a problem, the problem could be solved by genetic engineering of plants to generate a species of super-tree that can suck up the excess carbon dioxide.

At the end of the interview Dyson is asked the question: *“Is it important for you that people not take drastic actions about a problem that you are not convinced exists?”*

Dyson replies: “Yes. And I feel very strongly that China and India getting rich is the most important thing that's going on in the world at present. That's a real revolution, that the center of gravity of the whole population of the world would be middle class, and that's a wonderful thing to happen. It would be a shame if we persuade them to stop that just for the sake of a problem that's not that serious. And I'm happy every time I see that the Chinese and Indians make a strong statement about going ahead with burning coal. Because that's what it really depends on, is coal. They can't do without coal. We could, but they certainly can't. I think it is very important that they should not be under pressure. Luckily they are, in fact, pretty self-confident; (neither) of those countries pays too much attention to us.”

This remark by Dyson is revealing in the way that it suggests he is not necessarily intellectually or politically committed to NATO and the so-called West and would be quite happy, for example, with a BRICS alliance (Brazil, Russia, India, China, South Africa) that wholeheartedly embraces fossil fuels and nuclear fission as a way of generating electricity.

Now take a look at this: [link](#)

The speaker here is the climate change sceptic Donna Laframboise.



But the insanity, the expensive policy decisions she is referring to are carbon taxes, carbon trading schemes. **She is probably completely unaware of the fact that a man who shares her views on climate change, and her views against the IPCC, Freeman Dyson, is also the man who thought up the most expensive and destructive idea of all for dealing with climate change: solar radiation management.**

As a result, neither Donna Laframboise or, more seriously, a member of our own movement against the spraying, Paul Mac, can ask the most devastating possible question of a spokesman for the IPCC such as Professor Nicholls: **why he and other members of the IPCC have not stood up more courageously to the absurdity of the politics of climate change skeptics advocating solar radiation management for mitigation of climate change, i.e. advocating a solution to a problem which they do not recognize as a problem.**

An input from Berkeley

A powerful new contribution to the debate around these questions was published recently by the Daily Planet web newspaper in Berkeley California. Written by activist Vivian Warkentin and called "[The Real Inconvenient Truth](#)", the article refers obliquely to the Al Gore documentary of the same name on climate change. Warkentin puts the word "environmentalist" in inverted commas and describes what she calls the environmental establishment as "the environmental wing of the war on terror". "The Democratic left" she says "has been hijacked and infiltrated, our ideals and beliefs distorted and twisted into a

disciplinary social agenda, which demonizes rank and file humanity, and deflects responsibility away from the real perpetrators of the destruction of our natural world.”

“So many are now feeding at the trough of climate change disaster capitalism that a rational open debate is almost impossible.” “Most shockingly, the left, who claim to have the corner on environmental stewardship, are the ones giving credence to geoengineering-solar radiation management, (the spraying of chemical nanoparticle pollution, such as aluminum oxide and sulphur dioxide via jet aircraft into the atmosphere in order to block the sun), as a solution for global warming.” “Why are environmental groups and left media putting on rigged debates legitimizing and normalizing a preposterous technology, which poisons and desecrates nature, and can only cause irreparable harm, when they should be screaming warnings from the rafters that scientists are recklessly playing God with our world.”

“Fear of climate change is being manipulated to get the left to aid in the stealing of citizen rights and the corporatization of our local government, land, business, nature and weather.”

While the environmentalists are stuck on climate change, the nuclear accidents, toxic spills, pesticide contamination, deep sea oil drilling, fracking, tree cutting, electromagnetic radiation, introduction into the ecosystem of new dangerous technological compounds and organisms like GMOS, synthetic biology, nanoparticles, the geoengineering of our skies, destructive war and weapons, and much more, continue unabated.”

Much of what Warkentin says, though totally accurate, is also part of the repertoire of the average rank-and-file climate change skeptic and this is the source of a confusion that limits its political effectiveness. If one takes a climate change skeptic position one will want to dispute the statements of Professor Nicholson on climate change, simply on the grounds that anthropogenic climate change is a hoax, so that there is no need to do anything about it. But as we have said, such a statement will get one nowhere with the IPCC. **And interventions of the kind made by Paul Mac would also get one nowhere in a meeting of mainstream climate change skeptics because mainstream climate change skeptics do not acknowledge, as the IPCC’s Professor Nicholson now does acknowledge, that geoengineering is already happening.**

What has been constructed around questions of climate and geoengineering is a bipolar game to parallel the bipolar political system of the United States, with Republicans as the climate

change skeptics and Democrats as the IPCC supporters. Much of the credit for the construction of the system must go to Edward Teller and the nuclear weapons laboratories he established, and which then established him. With the ending of the Cold War between the United States and the Soviet Union he had the tactical flexibility to find new terrain on which to erect bipolar conflict scenarios, and he was helped in this, of course, by the intimate interconnections between climate science, which arose to a very great extent out of the necessity to monitor the effects of atmospheric nuclear testing, and the weapons laboratories.

Under the terms of the bipolar scenario, supporters of the IPCC in the European Commission attempt to insert aircraft emissions into the European Union's emissions trading scheme on the grounds of the argument that aviation contributes to global warming, while at the same time advocates of solar radiation management assert that pollution from aircraft emissions should be used to cool the planet, to mitigate global warming. Both of these contradictory propositions have numerous scientists at their disposal to prove that anyone who disagrees with them is ignorant and/or politically unacceptable.

The European Parliament has, through its acceptance that the concerns raised in the Skyguards petition are admissible in accordance with its own rules of procedure, now struck a first blow against the domination of European politics by American bipolar scenarios, but the hard work still lies ahead. The problematics of the rank-and-file climate change skeptics on the one hand and the IPCC supporters on the other are still remote from the consciousness of a television watching mass public whose thinking has not risen above the level of ridiculing so-called conspiracy theorists. There are admittedly some politicians who are ahead of their constituencies, not only in Greece but in other European countries. The Greek conservative parliamentarian Costas Collias, for example, has been scathingly critical of the information he has received from official Greek government sources on the question of the spraying:



This is some of what he wrote in 2012: *“The voices insisting on the existence of spraying are growing more numerous every day. And we are not referring only to concerned and observant citizens. We are referring to respected scientists, working in great centres of scientific research, both in our country and abroad. There are scientists who confirm the presence of metals and chemicals in the atmosphere. There are specialists who attribute the spraying to an attempt to control the climate in response to climate change and the greenhouse phenomenon.*


The skepticism of many citizens is not attributable either to lack of education or to conspiracy stories. It is a product of the lack of official information in response to complaints concerning the existence of dangerous substances in the atmosphere. I consider that the only response that can provide reassurance will be one from official bodies, who must be assigned the task of investigating the more serious and best documented complaints, so that citizens may be convinced that their health is being safeguarded.”

Costas Collias is in the Greek parliament, but he is not there on the strength of campaigning over the spraying. And, like all parliamentary politicians, he is dependent on the goodwill of the mainstream media, particularly television, which in Greece in the space of a single generation has moved from being a state and military monopoly to what amounts to a private corporate monopoly.

And [what do the mainstream media in Greece have to say](#) about us, and about politicians who say what Mr. Collias (and not only Mr. Collias) has said?

The two people appearing at the end of that video are Stavros Theodorakis, who made his name as a television journalist on the mainstream private Mega channel, and the scientist

Giorgos Grammatikakis. There have been numerous attempts in Greece in the course of the current crisis to establish new parties, including social democratic parties and parties of the political centre. The only such non-populist and non-Eurosceptic attempt to have achieved any significant success has been the party launched by Stavros Theodorakis, taking advantage of his visibility as a mainstream television personality. His new party Potami, or River, now has two deputies in the new European Parliament, one of whom is Giorgos Grammatikakis.




Here you can see Stavros Theodorakis making his first public relations trip to Brussels as leader of a political party.



You can see the politicians he sees as allies, and who see him as an ally. First and foremost Guy Verhofstadt (left) former prime minister of Belgium, founder along with Daniel Cohn-Bendit of the Spinelli Group,



whose aim is to re-establish the confidence of European citizens in the European integration project, and also prime mover in support of NATO's and the European Union's successful regime change project in Ukraine.



What the anti-fascist political prisoner of Mussolini Altiero Spinelli would have had to say about his name being linked to this project of 'defending European values in Kiev' is something we cannot ask him. But we can ask his daughter



and we can ask his former secretary, the leading European federalist Virgilio Dastoli



So what can be the next steps?

Josefina Fraile is registered to attend a geoengineering conference next March at Cambridge University, having attended a similar conference in Berlin in August and won a certain degree of recognition as a voice of civil society.

In Paris recently there was a climate change conference with a difference, organized by a group called the [ClimaConf project](#) and entitled “Confidence, credibility and authority in climate sciences and politics”. The ClimaConf project was conceived in 2010, shortly after the failure of the Copenhagen Climate Summit, at a time of criticism of the IPCC that led certain activists to perceive a necessity ‘to reflect on the issue of confidence in models and simulations, on links between sciences and politics, on expertise and its diagnostics, and on UN governance.’ Despite the self-critical profile adopted by the group, one activist from our movement Daniel Hofnung who participated in the November 21 ClimaConf conference said: “I wanted to ask a question about geoengineering but they wouldn’t give me the microphone so I asked it in private during the pause. The private answer I received was that no experimentation is being carried out in Europe.” Daniel Hofnung’s conclusions was that “there seems to be complete separation between researchers and those responsible for the chemtrails. Only personal discussions are possible. Anything else is perceived as aggression.”

In the United States things are different. There has admittedly been nothing at the level of central politics comparable to our European Parliament meeting. But at the level of municipal, regional and even state politics, the movement in the USA is ahead of Europe.

Public meetings have been organized at the initiative of activists of our movement and under the auspices of local government in [Suffolk County, Long Island](#), at [Shasta County in California](#), in [Arizona](#), in collaboration with the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality. The limitations on the effectiveness of these initiatives have to do with the fact that in the US legislation at the county level cannot override State, Federal and Federal Aviation Administration regulations on air quality and aircraft emissions. At the national level, air quality falls under the jurisdiction of the Department of Environmental Conservation.

Planned next steps here in Europe should include attempting to organize initiatives where the agenda is set and meetings hosted by our movement - but with mainstream scientists and climate change activists feeling under an obligation to attend and present their viewpoints in OUR forums.

The slight progress that we have made at the level of municipal government, and even in national parliaments such as in Cyprus, could help with this.

[Link:](#)

I have been asked by members of the informal group that came together to express support for the mayor of Aegina in the video we have just seen to say that I have come here as a representative of that group.

The text that Enouranois proposes as the basis for citizens' mobilization is our [“Statement on Geoengineering”](#), which was also distributed by Josefina Fraile last August in Berlin in the name of Skyguards.

To narrow down the clandestine aerosol spraying as a phenomenon to the declared purposes of solar radiation management or even geoengineering generally leaves huge areas out of account: the phenomenon of Morgellons disease, the ambitions of Ray Kurzweil and the transhumanists, the use of electro-magnetic radiation to manipulate, and even trigger, storms and earthquakes, the presence of dessicated blood cells and nanoparticles in the emissions. All this has to be investigated, and is being investigated, but it surely can only be introduced to audiences who have managed to overcome their reflexes of denial for the less totally shocking aspects of the clandestine activity that is going on around us.

The clandestine aerosol spraying and the fact that it can go on for decade after decade, remaining clandestine, testifies to a dysfunctional political system, and this is where attention has to be focused rather than on continuing forever trying to persuade people who don't want to be persuaded, that chemtrails are something different from contrails.

The chemtrails/contrails argument raged in the early days following the massive global increase in spraying in the late nineties. It was a reaction to the official position of governments and mainstream media everywhere that chemtrails are contrails. Activists were reacting on the basis of what they saw in the sky and were in protest mode. They were initiating the discussion and they were the plaintiffs so it was natural that they should be required to be the ones to provide the evidence. But this changed with the Climategate scandal and the ensuing Copenhagen climate summit, when the climate change sceptics gained the political upper hand. From this time onwards climate change activists were on the defensive and the sceptics' preferred "solution" of geoengineering, and specifically solar radiation management, began to be canvassed more aggressively. This produced a reversal of roles: the advocates of geoengineering were now initiating discussion and were canvassing for support, which meant, in accordance with the precautionary principle, that all the burden of evidence was on them, not on uninvolved citizens. This burden of evidence would also of course include the necessity of the geoengineers proving their own assertion that aerosol spraying is not already in global application. Under the precautionary principle political blocking of a danger that has not been absolutely proven but for which there is strong supporting evidence is permissible. The precautionary principle is recognized in the European Union but not in the United States. In the United States only judicial blocking of a proven danger is permissible and the burden of proof is on the plaintiff. Under the [Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership](#) at present being negotiated in secret between the US and the European Union, the US is attempting to impose this mode of operation on the EU also. If they are successful, the way that the geoengineering issue has been dealt with will be generalized: for all controversial innovations there will be no precautionary principle and the burden of proof of danger will always lie on those opposed to the innovation. Anti-nuclear activists, opponents of genetically modified foods, opponents of smart meters and other surveillance devices, opponents of fracking, will all be demoted to

the present status of chemtrails activists. **In other words everyone will become a “conspiracy theorist”.**

**Wayne Hall,
Aegina, Greece**