

Haarp vor dem Europaparlament, Brüssel, 28.2.1998

### **The HAARP project and non-lethal weapons.**

#### **Experts alarmed - public debate needed.**

The hearing on the HAARP project and non-lethal weapons was held in connection with a European Parliament own-initiative report, to be drawn up by Maj Britt THEORIN (PES, S), on the possible use of military resources in environmental strategies.

#### **Non-lethal (or non-deadly) weapons - a varied scenario**

As Peter TRUSCOTT (PES, UK) said in his introduction, "There is an invisible line between what is acceptable and what is suspect". This is the nub of the issue.

Non-lethal weapons constitute a trend in military thinking which has developed since the end of the Cold War. The world is dealing with a different sort of crisis, which is less easily identifiable and less easy to manage with traditional methods and weapons - hence the desire to master the violence by means other than the same violence. Non-lethal weapons are compared by some authors to "straitjackets" and defined as "any action capable of modifying the behaviour of the adversary while avoiding his annihilation". This appears to be a significant element of crisis prevention but can be - and is - also used in civilian situations (e.g. crowd control).

Mr Luc MAMPAEY, a researcher at GRIP, the Brussels-based European institute for research and information into peace and security, said he believed the expression "non-lethal weapons" was semantically contentious. He argued that the term had reassuring connotations. It was the politically correct term, and one which could delude the public into thinking that nowadays a clean war was possible and hence morally acceptable. In fact, as he himself and the Red Cross representative, Mr Robin COUPLAND (Geneva), pointed out, the dividing line between deadly and non-deadly weapons was not clear. Some weapons might result in death, while others could incapacitate their victims permanently or temporarily. Mr COUPLAND was quite categorical: the term "non-deadly", he said, was ultimately a marketing slogan.

The problem of definition "by default" led all the experts to stress that there was no single type of non-lethal weapon and that a careful distinction must be made between the various types, from the simplest to the most sophisticated. These new weapons covered a broad spectrum of technologies, from optical systems with a dazzling or blinding effect, through sound and electro-magnetic waves, chemical, medicinal, adhesive, slippery, super-caustic and acidic substances, biological agents, bacteria and micro-organisms, to rubber bullets and electric-shock batons.

#### **Dangers to health and the environment**

The effects on health and the environment were also described as variable. Any weapon designed to disrupt an organism, as well as weapons capable of affecting an organism indirectly, by chemical or biological means, or optical, acoustic or neurological stimuli, could become fatal under certain conditions. Adhesive foam, it was said, could also have extremely dangerous side-effects.

Only if a precisely calculated dose were perfectly delivered could it be guaranteed that sensory (or xenobiotic) stimuli would not have irreversible, or indeed, fatal effects. In practice, this perfect control over the degree of disruption was the first thing likely to go by the board under extreme conditions, where the desire for a swift and decisive solution would rapidly override considerations of ethics or toxicology.

### **The risk of abuse in democratic societies**

However, it was argued, health and environmental issues were not the only concerns raised by the use of non-lethal weapons. Mr COUPLAND expressed concern about an overlap of civil, police and military applications. He was also afraid that these weapons might be used not to replace conventional weapons but in addition to them.

In Mr MAMPAEY's view, as non-lethal weapons developed, links were bound to be created between military and law-and-order operations, which, he said, would enable certain current conventions to be bypassed. There was a danger of growing militarisation of domestic police forces, which would have access to more sophisticated weaponry. This could raise problems in any state which was supposed to be based on the rule of law and to be mindful of human rights and individual freedoms.

### **The HAARP project**

Tom SPENCER (EPP, UK), chair of the Foreign Affairs Committee, said that the United States had been invited to state its viewpoint on this matter to the hearing. Although the US had declined an initial invitation, Mr SPENCER reiterated his offer, saying that the Americans could send a representative to address the committee in future if they wished.

Ms Rosalie BERTELL, from Toronto (Canada), is one of the best-informed experts about HAARP (the *High Frequency Active Auroral Research Programme*), a programme which has been developed by the US military.

She described the background to HAARP. The ionosphere is a high-altitude layer of the atmosphere with particles which are highly charged with energy. If radiation is projected into the ionosphere, huge amounts of energy can be generated and used to annihilate a given region.

The HAARP project involves the manipulation of the earth's ionosphere, whose natural role is to moderate energy transfer from the sun to the earth and is used as a missile trajectory and as a reflector for radio communication. The aim of HAARP is to control and manipulate the ionosphere so as to enable the manipulator to wipe out communications at will on a global scale, or to make them resilient in the event of a nuclear war.

It also enables communications to take place with submerged submarines and can, in theory, create geomagnetic pathways to guide particle beams which could then deposit large amounts of energy anywhere on the globe. In simpler terms, HAARP, with its power of intimidation, of delivery or denial of electrical energy on a global scale and its control of communications, is an element of a system which could control the global village in some frightening ways.

According to Dr Nick BEGICH, an expert from Alaska and author of one of the leading publications on the subject\*, the HAARP programme would allow such concentrations of energy to be attained that an entire region of the planet could be deprived of water.

Electromagnetic waves can cause earthquakes or tidal waves. Mr SPENCER pointed out that, under international conventions, any actions leading to climate change were prohibited.

Mr BEGICH said that in his eyes the project was purely and simply "Star Wars technology". Moreover, it was a secret project, as the US Congress had refused to finance Star Wars. The USA, he claimed, had allocated 91 million dollars to the main programme, to which must be added the related programmes. Over the last 50 years, he said, certain levels of security had been developed which were protected from public scrutiny. State secrets were acceptable in themselves but if they involved such major repercussions for human beings and the environment they must be made public. In his view, the international community should be allowed to evaluate the risks of the HAARP programme.

Eurico DE MELO (EPP, P) said he regarded the revelations as terrifying and said that there was a need for a campaign to inform the public about it.

Winding up, Magda AELVOET (Green, B) told the hearing that there was a saying: "War is too important to be left to the generals". She feared we had forgotten this truth.

Further information: Etienne BASSOT - tel. 284 47 41

\* *Angels Don't Play This Haarp*, Advances in tesla technology, Earthpulse Press, USA, 1995

---

### **Open letter to**

**H.E. Catherine Ashton, High Representative of the European Union  
for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, and  
Vice-President of the European Commission**

H. E. Baroness  
Catherine ASHTON  
High Representative of the  
European Union for Foreign Affairs  
and Security Policy,  
and Vice-President of the European  
Commission  
Rue de la Loi 200  
BE - 1049 Brussels

Belgium

Thursday, 1st April 2010

Your Excellency,

Along with the President of the European Council, Mr. Herman Van Rompuy, you have been the target of criticism from - particularly British - nationalist politicians using the forum of the European Parliament, as embodiments and symptoms of a “democratic deficit” in the European Union. This deficit is in their view best illustrated by the fact of senior political positions in the European Union being occupied by people lacking, or arguably lacking, a popular electoral mandate.

The Capodistrias-Spinelli-Europe Initiative, the Belfort Group and the Greek Movement against Chemical Aerial Spraying would like to convey to you their view that the European Union’s “democratic deficit” has worse manifestations than this. For example, although the European Parliament has made four calls for a moratorium on the use of depleted uranium weapons, the most recent being in May 2008, when the call was supported by 94% of the parliamentarians, because European Parliament resolutions on “defense matters” are **not binding**, this overwhelming evidence of massive popular opposition to the military use of depleted uranium has been without resonance at the official level in the European Union.

Similarly, after the recent earthquake in Haiti, you were the target of criticism owing to your unwillingness to go there immediately, as US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and other senior politicians did. You are quoted as having described such a reaction as “disaster tourism”, and as having said: “I am not a doctor, nor a firefighter. I had nothing to contribute on the ground other than taking up valuable space when planes were unable to land because of the state of the airfield.”

You will doubtlessly be familiar with the allegations that the Haiti earthquake was caused deliberately. The charge has been made not only by Venezuela’s ViveTV and by Hugo Chavez, backed by other Latin American leaders, but is also in wide circulation among less well-known people. The use of “earthquake weapons” was brought to the attention of the public in the mid-1990s by 90 deputies in the Russian state Duma, who focused their criticism in particular on the United States’ HAARP installations in Alaska.

The existence of earthquake weapons has moreover been acknowledged by US official spokespersons. At a news briefing in 1997, Secretary of Defense William Cohen said: “Others are engaging even in an eco-type of terrorism whereby they can alter climate, set off earthquakes, volcanoes remotely through the use of electromagnetic waves.” In a book published in the 1970s, former U.S. National Security advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski looked forward to a future in which “technology

will make available to the leaders of the major nations a variety of techniques for conducting secret warfare, of which only a bare minimum of the security forces need be appraised...”

If true in the case of Haiti, the earthquake warfare interpretation would help to explain the strong pressures on politicians to show humanitarian concern rather than investigate what has happened, or is happening, when such disasters occur. Pressures of this kind were also seen last year in the context of the Swine Flu vaccination campaign and appear to be intensifying and becoming more frequent.

HAARP was one of the subjects dealt with in the 1999 European Parliament report, ref.nr. A4-0005/99, “On the environment, security and foreign policy”. It is worthwhile pointing out that, unlike the United States government, the European Commission, in the person of Commissioner Wallström (*3<sup>rd</sup> July 2003*) is on record as acknowledging that HAARP is “a military programme”. The European Parliament has characterized HAARP as “*a weapons system that disrupts the climate*”, adding that “*by virtue of its far-reaching impact on the environment, HAARP is a global concern, whose legal, ecological and ethical implications must be examined by an international independent body.*”

Just as with depleted uranium, European Parliament resolutions on HAARP are **not binding**. Even the European Commission “*has no competence, nor indeed the expertise, to act in relation to such matters.*”

Your Excellency, would you not agree that if the European Commission and the European Council (*and indeed the European Parliament and constitutionally empowered civil society institutions free from pressures from the corporate or state mass media, and free from pressures from demagogic nationalist parliamentarians*) had in 1999 set about acquiring the competence and the expertise to research into the real capacities and purposes of the HAARP installations, Europeans might now be in a position to know how much truth there is or is not in the allegations that “disaster capitalism” is now routinely committing atrocities in the form of earthquakes, tsunamis, hurricanes and floods, “natural disasters” which are then smothered in layers of hypocritical mass media pseudo-humanitarianism, into which politicians and the general public are conscripted?

Would the critics who attacked you for your unwillingness to drop everything to go to Haiti and “wave the flag for Europe”, as French Europe Minister Pierre Lellouche said you should have done, then not be somewhat more restrained in these criticisms?

Is the European Union’s inability to take positions on such issues as depleted uranium, HAARP, and other more deeply censored matters that are currently categorized as being “the province of conspiracy theorists”, not the most significant aspect of the European Union’s “democratic deficit”?

The Capodistrias-Spinelli-Europe initiative, the Belfort Group and the Greek Movement against Chemical Aerial Spraying would appreciate it, Your Excellency, if you could inform us of your own position on the above-mentioned thoughts and reflections.

In presenting our most respectful regards to you, Your Excellency, we remain

Yours sincerely,

Mr. Wayne HALL

Mr. Peter VEREECKE

Ms. Aiki STEFANO

**Capodistrias-Spinelli-Europe Initiative**

Represented by Mr. Wayne Hall

Porinou 8.

GR - 117 42 Athens, Greece

**Belfort-group**

Represented by Mr. Peter Vereecke

Hooiwege 20

BE - 9940 Evergem, Belgium

**Greek Movement against Chemical Aerial Spraying**

Represented by Ms. Aiki Stefanou

61 Esfigmenitou St.

Volos, Greece

**Copie:** H.E. Mr. Herman Van Rompuy,  
President of the European Council