



**PLANETARE BEWEGUNG FÜR  
MUTTER ERDE – PBME**

**PLANETARY MOVEMENT FOR  
MOTHER EARTH - PMME**

**MOVIMIENTO PLANETARIO  
PARA LA PACHAMAMA - MPPM**

## ***11th Information - Letter***

July 2015

### ***5 Years of PMME!***

A break and now: **New** [www.pbme-online.org](http://www.pbme-online.org)

1. Call for a **campaign** against Geo-engineer David Keith's plan to **spray the earth** with **sulfuric acid** – which has been planned for the end of **2015** – apparently as a measure against global warming – in reality with **unforeseeable consequences for life on earth**, as he himself admits! (compare to Der Spiegel, June 2015)

2. Balance:

### 5 Years of the Planetary Movement for Mother Earth

Questions: Daniel Krcal, Rokko's Adventure, Vienna – Answered by: Claudia von Werlhof, 2014; Addendum 2015 – Basis for a Quer-Denken.tv-Interview to be seen since 12.9.2015.

Topic:

#### **„From Weapon to Wreck – the Misuse of the Earth as a Mega Machine“**

1. Have you stayed on the topic of the manipulation of the earth?

Yes indeed, so we actually founded the „Planetary Movement for Mother Earth“ for this purpose in 2010 ([www.pbme-online.org](http://www.pbme-online.org)) and as its chair woman, I have published 11 informational letters in three languages (German, English, and Spanish) on the website. Our organisation now counts 800 members.

My life and my approach to life, as well as some aspects of my thought processes and some of my behaviors, have changed due to my involvement with these topics, which until then had been unknown to me. A kind of „planetary consciousness“ has emerged, which I had not been aware of before.

Our most important new insights are based on those proposed by Dr. **Rosalie Bertell**. These refer to connections between the new **climate and weather phenomena** and the facts of an increasingly noticable **destruction of the atmosphere**, which is absolutely essential for the sustainance of life and the unique and protective Blue of the planet. As a result of this destruction increasing amounts of solar and cosmic radiation, predominantly UV rays (skin cancer, damage to vegetation), gamma rays, micro and x rays from the electromagnetic spectrum of the solar system are able to penetrate the atmosphere.

It is not simply CFC that is responsible for the destruction of the **ozone**, as we are still made to believe, but rather **radioactivity** – the accident at **Fukushima**, for example, has produced an ozone hole over the Arctic for the 1st time and continues to weaken the atmosphere overtime; this especially impacts the northern hemisphere. And, an end to the damage and the successive continuous MCA, which was probably caused by the combined use of modern military technologies, is not foreseeable in the near future (Jim Stone/Leuren Moret). Therefore, radioactivity is destroying so called „Orgon“, the light iridescent blue energy of life, according to W. Reich, that is draped around the earth, and is unique to this planet.

In addition, the effects of over 2000 **nuclear experiments** between the 1950s and 1998 are yet expected to manifest with a time lag of 40-60 years. This essentially means that we are at the very beginning of the expected negative effects (See Interview Bertell 2010 on the topic: „Are we the last generations? Radioactivity as the gradual extinction of life“ in the 8th Information-Letter 2013, [www.pbme-online.org](http://www.pbme-online.org)). For starters, the further expansion of the ozone holes, could mean the **End of agriculture** on earth, as Bertell states.

Currently, it is predominantly the ionospheric heating and slicing of the atmosphere through artificially pulsed and billions of watts strong **electromagnetic waves**, produced in facilities like HAARP – so called **plasma weapons** – that contribute to the destruction of the atmosphere in addition to supersonic flights and rocket launches. The development of these technologies is based on Nikola Tesla's (1856-1943) discoveries (s. HAARP- patents of the physicist Eastlund). Meanwhile, these type of facilities exist in Europe as well in addition to ca. 2 dozen facilities globally, including floating ones, and the newest one appears to be stationed in Rostock, Northern Germany.

These facilities are also important with regard to global **earthquakes** and in correlation to the diminishing of the earth's **magnetic field** and with it, the planet's movement – 1 second has recently been added to the world's official time. Questions about these connections must be raised particularly since the electromagnetic waves also pass through the core of the earth, where the magnetic field originates from. In this context, the explosion of hydrogen bombs and the effect on the Van Allen Belt of the earth's atmosphere, which marked the beginning of the **military geoengineering** project started by the hydrogen bomb's inventor Edward Teller (1958/62), is the basis for an understanding about these connections (see the „South-Atlantic Anomaly“). Recently, an Austrian team at the University of Graz was able to measure a decline of the earth's magnetic field by 10% - a possible end to this tendency was not mentioned. Also, numerous other military technologies for the manipulation of weather, and actually to instigate „**weather wars**“, have been added. An example of this can be seen in the displacement of the **jet stream and the vapour belts around the earth** in order to produce drought or flooding, cold blasts or heat waves, as well as tornadoes throughout the entire globe (Interview II Bertell 2010 on the topic „Planet without a future? New weapons through the destruction of mother earth“ in the 9th Information-Letter, 2014, [www.pbme-online.org](http://www.pbme-online.org)). This kind of technology may have led to the unusually hot month of July, 2015, in Europe, which brought with it drought and severe weather due to the unobstructed flow of hot air from Africa to Northern Europe, which could have been made possible by lifting the path of the jet stream towards North. There is currently no proof for this, however, this scenario could be produced by these technologies, and therefore we cannot be sure anymore, as Rosalie Bertell stated, which phenomena are natural and which ones have been artificially manipulated and created.

The UN attempted to ban any hostile use of technologies to manipulate the environment, in the manner described, with its 1977 **ENMOD-Convention**.

Finally in 1961 the phenomenon of the **spraying of life endangering substances into the atmosphere was continued after the Vietnam war** with the application of billions of copper needles, supposed to form of an artificial orbit surrounding the earth in its atmosphere. This was done with the purpose of enhancing the conductivity of communication technology and in

order to cancel out the atmospheric disturbances in communication – all of which by the way did not work. In addition, airplanes are used, much as in agriculture where they spray pesticides, to spray so called „chemtrails“ consisting of chemical substances, versus contrails that are normally emitted by airplanes and consist of condensed water. This practice has been employed in the United States since the 1980s and was also used during the Vietnam War as a weapon spraying the toxin „Agent Orange“ which was produced by Monsanto; in Europe this method has been utilized since the late 1990s. Tons of toxic substances are sprayed across the skies; apart from sulfur dioxide (made responsible for acid rain), aluminum, barium, strontium, lithium, and polymer fibers, radioactive substances, viruses, and bacteria in the size of nano particles have been distributed throughout the atmosphere through the use of many kinds of airplanes. These metals are good **conductors for electromagnetic waves** originating from the large antenna facilities, the so called ionospheric heaters such as HAARP, that are positioned throughout the globe and also serve to bridge the gap created by the ozone holes, which would negatively impact the transmission of these waves. Spraying, therefore, creates a **substitute atmosphere**.

In many countries, especially in the USA, damages to the body and to life, to the air we breathe, to the earth, the bodies of water, animals and plants, as well as to agriculture have been detected and have led to **protests by civilians** (e.g in the community of Long Island, NY, and in the Shasta community, CA, 2014). An increase of alzheimers and dementia, autism and allergies as well as of other disorders such as Morgellens' disease is correlated to these findings (Michael Murphy: Why in the World are They Spraying? Und: What in the World are They Spraying? Films on YouTube; 2015 „OVERCAST“ by Mathias Hancke from Switzerland, <http://www.dedalfilms.com/?id=31>).

While these facts are still being negated, Monsanto has developed **aluminum resistant seeds** and has marketed these while the stockmarket speculates on „weather derivatives“.

**The officially announced reasons for so called climate change that have been identified as being caused by CO2 emissions, proves to be a falsehood deliberately introduced into the world** in order to **obscure the reasons for the large number of changes occurring in nature**. At the same time, this creates the possibility of engaging people in a pointless fight around the reduction of CO2 while believing that an „alternative“ in life styles can help in the seemingly necessary and alleged „Planet-saving“ reduction of greenhouse gas emissions (see Naomi Klein: Capitalism versus Climate, 2015).

However, even if such a reduction were to succeed, this would not change anything pertaining to the reality of the situation! CO2 was not even mentioned as an agent of climate change before the late 1980s. On the contrary, it was discussed as being the **result** of a warming (see R. Bertell: Planet Earth: The latest weapon of war, 2011/13).

It has become more and more difficult to ignore a change that has occurred in the environment. According to Bertell **natural disasters have increased tenfold since the 1970s**. The reasons for this continue to be concealed.

One aspect of this can be found in the apparent planning of a **thawing of the arctic region** through the employment of ELF waves since the 70s of the 20th century, according to Lowell

Ponte in Bertell. Except for the outcome, nobody appears to have noticed anything about the process originating it (see Ponte on classified contract between SU-USA in Wladiwostock 1974). However, a securing of the resources that have been hidden under the ice, has already begun (see Süddeutsche Zeitung, Nr.109 v. 2015: „In der Arktis darf gebohrt werden“).

Around half of the ice has become nonexistent during the summer and the north-west and north-east passages have increasingly become ice-free and are passable for ships. In this manner the much longer routes through the Suez Canal and the Panama Canal can be avoided.

The effect of a melting of the ice, which is also one of the largest **fresh water reservoirs** on the Planet, has already led to a **slowing of the Gulf Stream** by 30%, as currently documented by the University of Southampton; a more dramatic slowing could cool Europe down significantly or even cause an ice age on the continent.

At the same time, the increased emission of **methane Gas**, resulting from the thawing of permafrost soil in the arctic region, has long term consequences on the green house effects by enormously amplifying this process and causing persistently higher CO2 levels, the reduction of which would therefore not accomplish nearly anything.

Overall, **sea levels have increased** globally, impacting 2/3 of civilization by threatening most large cities situated on the coast. Also, fresh water stored in the ice would be impacted by the melting as it would decrease dramatically.

## 2. What has been going on? New initiatives, supporters, plans?

We have had public appearances and lectures in Austria and Germany, also at the congress „Science Meets Spirituality“ 2013 with 900 visitors at Heidenheim, Germany. Currently I have been out and about with **Franz Miller**, a Tyrolean activist against climate-engineering, and have been touring the country. Interest is also growing due to the effects that have been noticed by farmers, who are searching for explanations for these. Particularly the young farmers and their networks have begun to engage in this topic.

The Bertell book is selling like hot cakes among them. A third edition is therefore in the planning. Before the year's end, I will be presenting the **Spanish version of Bertell**, which is currently underway, at an international conference in Mexico.

All of my international publications mention and cite the topics and agenda of our Planetary Movement for Mother Earth – PMME – since 2014 this also applies to my book which has been published in Italian („In the Age of the Boomerang“, Milano 2014). A series of radio and internet TV programs with me in connection to this topic, recently also at *Quer-Denken.tv* in Germany, as well as articles in several magazine in Germany, Switzerland, Italy, and the USA, have been done. Currently – as mentioned previously – a Mexican version of Bertell is in creation („El Planeta Tierra. La última arma de guerra“, Guadalajara 2015), which was translated thanks to donations, for Latin America and particularly for the awakend **indigenous population**. A Spanish book by me will be released around the same time („Madre Tierra o Muerte“, Oaxaca 2015) and contains further analysis and references to the topic.

In 2013 we met with 48 other European activists on the topic of „**Civil Society versus Geoengineering**“ at the **European Parliament** in Brussels. Mike Murphy, an American activist and film maker was present with his movie „Why in the World are they Spraying?“. Meanwhile the petition, which had been drafted in the Spring of 2013, has been officially accepted by the petitions committee of the European Parliament in 2014. This means that the EP will concern itself with this topic for the first time since 1999 and will investigate it. Initially, in 1999, Rosalie Bertell was involved. However, the critical comments of the EP was then rejected by the EU Commission with the reasoning that since HAARP is a military facility, this institution and these topics do not fall within the responsibility of the EP. – All of that after it had continually been stressed by HAARP itself that it is nothing else than a civilian scientific facility. A similar situation is to be expected this time, in which case civilian protests, organized for instance via our European activists group „**Skyguards**“ (and former MEP Josefina Fraile, see the general section here in the 11th Informational letter) will be significantly more articulate. This is because the different initiatives have been cooperating more closely at the European level.

Meanwhile, the citizens' advocate **D. Storr** has also become legally active against geoengineering. The problem of the matter is that legal implications are not to be found in the law or are denounced, which results in a situation that does not provide opportunity to prosecute anyone. Storr's main argument: Geoengineering is not a topic of the future as proclaimed by civil geoengineers (especially David Keith and Ken Caldeira) who, well funded (also by Bill Gates) emerge as the „**saviors of the planet**“, but rather, this has become common practice since decades (see 10th informational letter, 2014)! Civil geoengineering techniques, such as SRM (Solar Radiation Management), which does not mean anything else than the spraying, really don't serve to fight climate change, but rather are completely unconnected to the topic ever since they originated. In fact, they even have the potential to cause certain weather phenomena, such as **dryness**, since the clouds produced during this process bind the humidity. Apart from that and as discussed earlier pertaining to the Vietnam war, this approach can be easily used as a weapon of war.

SRM which is not different from the spraying we know already, will undergo field experiments. By the end of 2015, as Keith has announced, he intends to spray nothing less than **sulfuric acid** (not simply sulfur dioxide, which causes acid rain) across the earth in order to achieve a cooling effect (the so called „Pinatubo effect“ which occurred after the eruption of the volcano Pinatubo in 1991). However, he also admitted that he does not know whether the process may also finish off life on earth (Der Spiegel, June 2015)! A **global campaign** against this must be organized! This could also present an opportunity to convince people that **it is not CO2 causing the big problem, but rather geoengineering, regardless of whether it is a secret military project or a public civilian one!**

Rosalie Bertell's book „**Planet Earth – The Latest Weapon of War**“, which has been translated into German by us and represents the foundational work for the rest of the discussion, raised all of these questions in detail; no definite conclusions were reached in the book simply because a lot of the facts and happenings remain unknown and are in the dark. This book is now also being translated into French and Italian. We would like to see a second,

extended English edition, especially since the first edition from 2000 was never circulated due to the bankruptcy of the publisher. We are continuing our search for a publisher. We are calling on publishers who are interested, to contact us!

**Rosalie Bertell** died in 2012 at the age of 83. I was invited to her commemoration in Toronto by the IICPH (International Institute of Concern for Public Health) which she had founded, as a guest of honor. Ever since, I have been working together with the Canadians and also with the Mother Superior of her congregation „The Grey Nuns of the Sacred Heart“ in Pennsylvania, USA, in order to manage and maintain her spiritual and intellectual heritage, and her many publications.

In addition to the Zapatist advisor Gustavo Esteva of Mexico, the Indian environmental activist, physicist, and eco feminist Dr. Vandana Shiva, and the scientist Anna Tilman, Vicepresident of the IICPH, are the actual members of the international Advisory Board of PMME. Our organization is supported through **donations**. These have been sufficient in order to maintain our current activities in the form of translations and events.

I would say that, looking at the bigger picture, our topic continues to be withheld by the media and even internationally renowned intellectuals such as Noam Chomsky and famous journalists like Naomi Klein are obviously not aware of it and have no information pertaining to it. However, more groups and official information are emerging, confirming Bertell's analysis (eg. Ntv and The Guardian, London; as well, Prof. Schnellhuber, Potsdam Klimaforschungsinstitut, who confirms the application of geoengineering since ca. 2005 and states that there are plans for it until ca. 2040).

Interestingly, in his Encyclica „Laudato Si“ even **Pope Francis** has concerned himself with the need for an economic alternative in regards to climate change, and he supports the **UN Conference in Paris** which is planned to take place at the end of 2015. He has not, however, – much as the public in general – heard about Bertell and is therefore insufficiently informed. We shall send him a Spanish version, after all Bertell was a catholic nun, and together with Josefina Fraile, will attempt to pay him a visit!

3. How has the issue at the Institute of Political Science developed? Have you experienced consequences?

I am regularly retired from the institute as a tenured professor since 2011. Until then I continued my teaching as usual, however, since having been labeled an „institutional pest“, have publically denied the administration my support. **The conflict was never resolved at the institute.** After 23 years of work there, the head of the institute did not even bother to say goodbye. Solely the university rector, who later became the Minister of Science, officially stood by me in the wake of an international solidarity campaign, by supporting freedom of opinion especially in the academic field. Instead, I was ridiculed and defamed by certain „science“ blogs which published diffamations of the institute against me, and those that had been produced by all kinds of people, resulting in hate filled, misogynistic and generally misanthropic character assassination. It seems as though we are dealing with so called



„skeptics“ there, who obviously follow the order from above pertaining to everything that does not follow the mainstream. Lately, they have „converted“ a West German Radio employee and his opinion in Cologne, who had already made an interview with me on the topic. A program at Bavarian Radio in Munich was announced under Bertell's title, however, did not contain any of her topics and filled the content with wrong information, „occupying“ the subject matter, and misleading the audience.

Interestingly, the diffamations can be also be found by everyone on Wikipedia. Since their emergence I have been labeled a „**conspiracy theorist**“ and worse. This is now a label also being put on Rosalie Bertell, who after all has been awarded 9 honorary doctor's degrees, has been a world renowned expert in her field and has worked in an unprecedented scientific manner; this accusation towards her is simply grotesque.

4. In the course of the publication of Bertell's book disagreements with the publisher occurred. What was the nature of these?

The publisher was unable to recognize Bertell's meaning and believed that she – and other women figures in history – could be denounced in a patriarchal manner. The reason for publishing her in the first place was unclear at the time. Meanwhile, after having published a first edition which sold 5.000 copies, a second edition of 2.500 copies has been published containing additional photographs and addendums, and this without misrepresenting the original author. In the end, **the publisher has recognized what a truly remarkable woman Bertell was.**

5. Many publishers and protagonists who concern themselves with the same topic apparently do this from a right/obscure/and naive belief in conspiracy background. Many of the „right“ questions are apparently asked in the „wrong“ context to these problematic areas. So what actually is your approach to these problematic areas?

I am astonished at how, approached from an opposite viewpoint, **politics of all walks, the Left, Greens, Alternatives, Esoterics, and ecological and women groups of all kinds – not to mention civil science – do not concern themselves in any way with these topics** – not even when they are asked, informed, or „pestered“. On the contrary, they declare these topics as „conspiracy theories“, without ever having informed themselves and without having the slightest idea about any of the facts or the topic itself. This equally applies to publishers and to the mainstream/official media. The topic **is hushed up by all means, everywhere.** Or – as heard in esoteric groups – there is talk about a transformation of the earth into something higher, which is in grotesque opposition to reality which has been described by Bertell as a **transformation of the Planet into a weapon of war and, consequently, into a „wreck“.**

Aside from the obvious pressures occurring in the background, it is important to realize that the acceptance of the facts – for what they are about – would threaten entire world views about technology and the belief in modernization, trust in politics and those „up there“ so



massively that most people would prefer not to acknowledge any of it for as long a time as possible. So, the question then becomes, when will this not be possible anymore – e.g. due to an increase of disasters – and what is left to be done about this ongoing insanity?

There have, after all, not been any explanations for why the situation has gotten this far. In my view the reason is to be found in a **project of „military alchemy“**, in which the objective is to transform the earth into a „better“ and „hogjher“ (sic!) one through the destruction of it in its current state, so that it can be manipulated from the outside like a **mega machine. To be god** – this is the dream of the military, and they do not recognize that mother earth is not suitable for violent projects and that she cannot be tamed like a kind of mega-witch. Her male-patriarchal re-creation cannot succeed – understanding this and stopping the efforts to do this, that is our task today. In order for that to happen, we must be on her side, reject all this hubris, the absurd and deadly projects of the MIC (the military-industrial complex), and turn to a **planetary conciousness** in which we **take a stand for our planet earth as the cosmic being she is**. What else?!

An ecocide, a terracide, or as Bertell stated, an **„omnicide“**, the death of all, would otherwise become a possible reality. A pro earthly life approach, the sense of an **earth-spiritual awakening**, that is what the military least wants and most fears as a reaction by **civil society**.

6. HAARP has now officially come to an end. What do you think are the reasons for this?

I am unable to determine whether this is true or what this means for the future. In any case, it is obviously not being demolished. Maybe it has been handed over to another major player, e.g. the Univeristy of Alaska. R. Bertell had speculated that the largest **facility has been constructed at the South Pole**, making HAARP redundant in its current capacity. Also, a new facility supposedly exists in Rostock/Marlow, and is merging with the one in southern Sweden (LOIS) to create an **enourmous facility**. The rumour about HAARP maintains that due to the warming caused by HAARP (7 degrees) in Alaska, the permafrost on which the towers stand has begun to disappear. In any case, the facility is out of the line of fire due to these kinds of information. For now, it is still active (2015).

7. Summary and perspectives:

The German publication of Bertell is, in some ways, also the first one and we consider it to be **one of the most important books of the 21st century**. Indeed, barely anyone is familiar with the **planetary dimension** of the problems pertaining to survival, as published there, and which adds to all the other crises including the global economic ones, the techonological ones, and the political one. Obviously the planetary dimension was not intended to leak into public awareness, for this awareness presents a disturbance of politics that has been operating on the **preaching of the CO2 thesis** in 2001 (beginning with Al Gore) in order to successfully move public opinion of all walks towards the **hopeless and ineffective „combatting“ of CO2**.

All of the opposing views, such as those of „**climate sceptics**“ – to whom, except for the military itself (!), especially the Neocons in the USA belong – have since been openly rejected, and actually have even been excluded from the debate by the IPCC, the „scientific“ interantional climate council.

The third possible **position, on which Bertell is based** does not even exist in the public awareness yet. This is the position that I represent here, and this means:

*Yes, there is a problem. However, it has nothing to do with CO2. CO2 pollutes after it has enabled an anti-ecological energy generation, production and correlating consumption. But, it is barely detectable in the atmosphere, which has been impacted in completely different areas and struggles with very different problems – for, the heating effects are seen in the higher layers of the ionosphere, and not in the lower troposphere, where CO2 accumulates. Therefore, it is important to identify which problems are the consequence and how we can get rid of them:*

- **Damages from prior decades** are difficult to remedy, particularly those that have occurred in the ozone layer and are caused by radioactivity which is still accumulating (Fukushima as a permanent MCA, the poisoning effects of nuclear plants, including those of the military), and beyond that, an intensification of problems that are caused due to a time lag of 40-60 years in response of earth-time (the main victim so far: Australia).

- However, other **damages that are being caused currently** could be avoided if the focus were to shift there: further nuclear facilities, rocket programs, supersonic flight, spraying of „chemtrails“, and other experiments which we have yet to learn about, as well as predominantly: the EM activities of the global ionospheric-heater-radar facilities like HAARP!

- For the **future** a conducting of the **field experiments of geoengineers, no matter if they are openly military in nature or „civilian“ in disguise**, must be ruled out – and with that their incalculable effects, which have been acknowledged by all sides, for macro system earth. The new geo engineers – the earth-war artists! – have announced these experiments or have already begun with them clandestinely (e.g. through ocean „fertilization“ in order to accelerate CO2 degradation). They, therefore, act in **service of the military**, which works to gain control over the earth and to dominate the entire planet as well as for the **transformation of its immense energies into an „easily operable“ weapon of war – a mega machine of destruction**. This weapon can be employed anywhere and without any declaration of war in the form of „natural disasters“ and is ready for any kind of „**environmental warfare**“ (see J.D. Hamblin: Arming Mother Nature, 2013).

In any case, presidential advisors and ministers in the USA (McDonald, Cohen...) have pointed out this possibility since the 1960s, stating that activities could occur from the ground or from „space“. The prognosis made by the US Air Force in 1996 about „Weather as a Force-Multiplier. **Owning the Weather in 2025**“ (YouTube) has begun to be realized already within 2/3 of the time proposal it made.

Bertell's response: „New wars are always fought with different weapons than the old ones“. And she states that now different nations are preparing for terrible **wars which will be conducted through „weather wars, plasma weapons, and geoengineering“**.

And to those, who believe that nothing can be done against the military, she answered: **„When the military tackles our life conditions themselves, it must be stopped by civil society!“**

Where, actually, could a change of our „lifestyle“ as discussed and planned by so many movements in their fight against CO2 emissions, lead to when the basis of life has been transformed into „dead zones“ or has gotten diminished, due already to the disastrous effects of a poisoning through industrialization and developments such as „land grabbing“? What actually does it mean, that the new attacks even occur on an truly elementary level, impacting the soil, water, air, and light, the solar energy itself, from a dimension that has been unknown until date and is now being used against us?

But, civilian society is clueless, for: **„The military is ahead of everyone else by 50 years“.**  
**We have overslept and missed the entire development until now!**

In part this can still be changed. But, **decades of destruction have passed unnoticed**. How has that been possible?

What does it tell us about our relationship to nature, to our Mother Earth? What do we have except her? It tells us that we believe in the propaganda of technical progress as a „creation“ that comes out of destruction, as it is not only propagated by „military alchemy“, but also by all „progress“ of modernity and its „alchemy“, as I call it. For, according to this belief, nature can be destroyed in good conscience, for what will follow is supposedly „better“, and we will be in a position to create this better world from her corpse. I call this the **„alchemy“ of patriarchy**.

Only when this has been recognized will it be possible to clearly identify the obscene and delusional project of military alchemy. This, then, is the point at which we will need to say farewell to the belief in miracles about this civilization and make a decision to **REJECT** this project with all its manifestations! A long road? In any case, the only one...

And what we need now in order to not be misled: reputable scientists, who investigate what is really going on with our planet and take on the **succession of Rosalie Bertell** while understanding the true meaning of it all! This is an **APPEAL!**

### 3. General Article

Josefina Fraile, “Skyguards”:

#### **Climate Engineers in Berlin** **Coup d’Etat against global democracy**

- Summarized report of a critical environmental activist

#### **THE CONFERENCE FRAMEWORK AND THE CORE MESSAGE**

The ultimate aspiration of the pseudo scientists of the twenty-first century who for decades have been engaged in manipulating the earth’s climate systems, allegedly in the common interest, is – while totally ignoring the citizenry – to secure legitimacy for the geoengineering option before a political class unable to take decisions on the matter.

On July 18th 2014 a four-day conference on climate engineering was held in Berlin. Among the more than 300 participants from 40 countries were many of the most questionable geo-engineers to be found in an increasingly questionable *international scientific community*.

The organizing body was the recently-created IASS (2102) which, to judge from its sponsors, has found a comfortable spot for itself under the big beach umbrella of climate change. This body has set itself the task of promoting the necessary dialogue between the scientific community and civil society on climate engineering subjects, an objective that will not be attained if the present 9-to-1 ratio of scientists to civil society is maintained.

The public varied from persons in their sixties to young people in their twenties. The most prestigious universities in the world sent their most experienced researchers and an endowment of goodwill. The event was promising, though it was a clear example of how the debate on such a lofty subject is being confined to the academic and scientific level, without descending to the level of society. Its lack of impact on the media testifies to how its exposure is being controlled by those who fear that public opinion could put a rapid end to the nonsense being retailed by the same deaf mutes that run the world generally.

Four blocks per day were proposed, each dealing with at least four different topics, including a minimum of four papers per subject. Given the fact that the four blocks were taking place simultaneously, this program meant that a participant had to sacrifice twelve options. The titles are indicative of their importance: these are vital issues for people who, because of their positions, are now being obliged to pay attention to what is happening and what it implies for public safety and public health.

Among the issues discussed, we consider the following worthy of emphasis: (a) The Past Decade of Climate Engineering Research (b) Climate Politics at the Crossroads: Is Climate Engineering a Wrench in the Works or a Tool in the Toolbox? (c) Exploring the Politics of Climate Engineering (d) International Law for the Regulation of Climate Engineering (e) Risks and Conflict Potential of Climate Engineering. (f) Climate Engineering and the Meaning of Nature (g) Civil Society and Geoengineering: Who’s Engaging Whom? (h) From Geoengineering to Geo-weaponering: The Security Dimensions of Climate Engineering (i) Novel SRM Techniques: Cirrus Cloud Thinning and

Marine Sky Brightening. *(j)* Climate Geoengineering and the Potential Role of Human Rights Regimes. *(k)* Climate Engineering Governance — is the Climate Convention the Right Place for It? *(l)* Climate Engineering and Human Engineering: Social and Technological Challenges in the Anthropocene *(m)* The International Control of Climate Engineering and Research: Debating Why, How and Who. *(n)* Local Laws, Global Liability: Using National and Local Laws to Regulate Climate Engineering and Allocate Responsibility for Its Impacts *(ñ)* *Presenting Theories and Evidences of actual programs of aerial fumigation with aerosols. (Presentation of Groups of the Civil Society in a Free Session).*

## OPENING SESSION AND MASTER LECTURERS

Mark Lawrence

The opening session was brilliantly presented by the Research Director of IASS Mark Lawrence, who insisted on the importance of differentiating between climate engineering and geo-engineering. Nevertheless, it soon became evident that the scientists could not agree on the semantics, since over the four following days both terms were used interchangeably to denote the deliberate manipulation of the climate at global scale for the purpose of mitigating anthropogenic global warming caused by the use of fossil fuels producing greenhouse gases such as CO<sub>2</sub>. This lack of agreement was papered over by statements such as that in future we won't speak of geoengineering but of specific techniques and technologies.

In the opening session, against a background of impending climate emergencies or climate disasters, German politicians proved to be past masters in the art of swimming while watching one's clothes. They stated that the idea of developing a climate modification tool to be kept in a toolbox, just in case CO<sub>2</sub> emissions cannot be controlled (this being the official hypothesis) is not to be encouraged given the associated inherent risks. There is always the possibility that someone will be tempted to use it. Though some of the speakers were critical of geo-engineering, insisting on what they call mitigation (reduction of emissions and carbon capture), they, nevertheless, argued that research must continue. More radical speakers proposed transition to a nuclear-free and decarbonized society, so eliminating the need for implementation of geo-engineering. There was no way that the voice of the United States could be missing from this session, and it was duly included in the person of Jane C.S (picture below), whose long list of distinctions was comparable for noteworthiness only with the implacably harsh content of her intervention: nuclear energy, "fracking", geo-engineering, none of these could be "taken off the table". She concluded by adding a personal observation, apparently unperturbed by the egregious contradiction: "of course, things have to be done with respect for mother earth".

## Opening Panel

One of the most clear-sighted interventions was that of the President and founder of IASS, Klaus Töpfer, outstanding German politician and a senior official at the United Nations, who predicted the end of parliamentary democracy due to the fact that the multinational corporations have so much power that key decisions affecting society are no longer taken in the national parliaments. Given this situation, it makes little sense to pay a bunch of politicians to carry out ineffectual rearguard pretend-work because they will end up merely placing a legislative patina over decisions made by those who control the markets. Another of Mr Töpfer's pearls was that the system spends thousand of millions of dollars coining words and shaping public debate because those who control the lexicon control the topics. Both statements are extremely pertinent to the subject of geo-engineering.

It is obvious that decisions relevant to this subject are not taken in the Parliament, and that European politicians are activated by a code similar in some ways to the omertà principle, closing ranks in a manner that simultaneously nullifies any claims of public authority and/or demands for accountability by citizens, denying the existence of climate manipulation and ostentatiously defaming anyone who publicly provides information on such manipulation. It is also obvious that a powerful strategy exists for diversion of language towards exotic and inappropriate terms that nobody understands, such as the term *chemtrails*, for the purpose of regulating opposition, undermining public debate, thwarting social reaction and action and avoiding parliamentary control. It is like the fish that bites its own tail. The end result is that a decade of public exposure has been lost, social self-defense has been hindered and the climate manipulators have been given the time they needed to consolidate their position on governance of their criminal activities outside of any legal framework, national or international.

### **SOCIAL SCIENTISTS, PHYSICISTS AND CIVIL SOCIETY**

Right from the start of these conferences there have been two easily identifiable groups of scientists: physicists and social scientists. The physicists are in turn divisible into: 1) those who have for years been working on projects related to climate control (which was developed initially as a military weapon, banned by the United Nations' ENMOD Treaty in 1977 due to its destructive potential), but insist that geoengineering will never be deployed because of the risk it poses for the planet, and moreover deny that field experiments have ever been conducted. And: 2) those who urgently proclaim the necessity for deployment to cool the planet given that other attempted mitigation measures are not working. The key names are Alan Robock, Ken Caldeira, Clive Hamilton. They are all vying with each other to inject an aura of prestige into a debate that has never really existed.

Both groups agree that geo-engineering is something that for the moment remains theoretical: a matter for hypotheses and mathematical computer simulations. The difference between them is that whereas the first group does not care to spend time and money, whether public or private, on developing technologies that, given their risks, will never be implemented, the latter group is not shy of starting deployment without prior testing of climate manipulation, even though they cannot be sure of the consequences because the atmosphere is not a closed laboratory in which all variables are controlled. Both scientific groups were exposed when a Pakistani biologist asked the question of whether or not they had investigated the impact that these technologies would have on the planet and on the people. The silence that followed his question spoke volumes.

The social scientists, for their part, launched a full-scale offensive to secure the role of intermediaries between civil society and the natural scientists. This is something to which the latter took exception, stating that they had no need for intermediaries. Did the idea represent a challenge to their hegemony? To pursue their line of argument the social scientists submitted some studies from an ostensible "public debate" employing marketing formulas and based on 15-person samples! Guardacielos and Skyguards openly questioned the reliability of this method on the grounds that related public debate simply does not exist. They also queried whether the proponents of this kind of study are taking due cognizance of the fact that such studies lead to the elaboration of social profiles for use by promoters of geoengineering in minimizing social resistance to it.

Some Oxford University luminaries, as a sequel to their celebrated text "The Five Oxford Principles of Geoengineering", proposed signature of the "Berlin Manifesto", granting themselves the power to act in the name of civil society. In justification of this innovation they pleaded the urgency of the situation and the lack of time to open a public debate. Everything for the people, without the people. Would these scientists be able to earn a living if it weren't for the climate change gravy train?

## **GOVERNANCE OF GEO-ENGINEERING**

As regards geo-engineering governance, despite the cross-border impact of geo-engineering, its practitioners claim freedom of research privileges under the London Protocol. The bottom line is that the more countries reach agreement the greater will be the legitimacy accorded to geo-engineering deployment. Nevertheless, in the light of the difficulty of reaching consensus, action might be decided on by a smaller number of countries. They would undoubtedly be the same countries as those that have been experimenting for years in open skies. Consequently, among friends, the modification of existing treaties is seen as more probable than the elaboration of a new one.

## **CIVIL SOCIETY REPRESENTATION**

Few invitations to speak were extended to representatives of civil society. The only such participants were Third World Network, the ETC Group, RALLT and Biofuelwatch. The absence from this debate of groups traditionally regarded as guardians of the environment such as Greenpeace and Ecologists in Action, was unsettling. One day they will have to explain the reasons for their convergence with the opportunistic side of the climate change problematic, closer to political, military & industrial interests than to those of society.

It is obvious that no financial support is available for organizations outside an identifiable institutional consensus. Nevertheless, when it comes to environmental issues and their effect on public health, such factors cannot be allowed to determine priorities. If these “gatekeeper” groups prefer to lose thousands of supporters as a result of their refusal to confront the geoengineering issue, that is their loss, not ours.

Biofuelwatch sounded the alarm about leading people to believe that biofuel does not generate CO<sub>2</sub>, showing how citizens of less developed countries are being deprived of agricultural land needed for their subsistence because of practices such as biochar. Other speakers related how in the Philippines, Canada and the Galapagos islands (Ecuador), experiments in marine geo-

engineering are being carried out by Australian companies. These experiments include the fertilization of oceans with iron oxide, among other compounds, for the purpose of altering the marine chemistry so that the oceans can absorb carbon from the atmosphere. Shortly after the commencement of these disastrous tests, Ecuador initiated an international campaign to put an end to this type of experimentation in its seas, modifying its Constitutional Charter in order to incorporate into it the Rights of the Land. However, satellite images indicated that the experiments continued.

Despite being banned by the London Protocol, these practices are being carried out in the name of freedom of research. Attention was drawn to the fact that companies from rich countries have chosen poor countries as the sites for conducting their experimentation rather than pursuing the possibility of experimenting in their own countries. Various associations agreed that these experiments were being carried out without the knowledge of or authorization from the governments and citizens of the countries in question. But none of those environmentalists made any reference at all to ongoing atmospheric geo-engineering, Solar Radiation Management (SRM) or the dispersion of metallic oxides in the atmosphere/troposphere is something they do not believe could ever happen! Had it not been for a small group of activists against geoengineering from the UK, Austria and Spain, the phenomenon would have been passed over in silence, making the conference more like a meeting of friends than a debate on a subject of extreme relevance. Members of the civic platforms Guardacielos and Skyguard were present in this small group, and their interventions in



defence of civil society made the difference on a number of occasions between being substantial and being inconsequential.

### **CIVIL SOCIETY AGAINST GEO-ENGINEERING FACES GEO- ENGINEERS**

The fact that civil society does not need intermediaries to talk to scientists was made crystal clear throughout the conference by Josefina Fraile, spokesperson for the abovementioned platforms. When a British physicist started his intervention in a round table discussion stating that when it comes to geoengineering he and his colleagues were legitimated to make the needed decisions by the fact that they are financed out of public funds, Josefina Fraile responded that in reality they are being paid with corporate money and that this in itself renders them unworthy of trust. She added that we are in a democracy and that in a democracy legitimacy is the hands of citizens and expressed through democratic electoral processes for selection of representatives. The truth of the matter, though, is that those representatives have the same zero credibility as the scientists because they deny the existence of ongoing geo-engineering. Josefina Fraile warned that when the debate on geo-engineering - at present confined to scientific circles - finally gets through to public opinion, civil society will never accept such nonsense. She warned the scientists that they had better take good note of this because sooner or later they will be held accountable. Josefina added that science must be at the service of the society and not at the service of corporations. She also made the point that it is unacceptable for the old up-down communication pattern to be maintained for “educating” society. The real purpose in any case is not education but indoctrination. Josefina Fraile closed her intervention by telling scientists they must ask society what kind of world they want for themselves and their children. It is on this that their investigations must be based.

The influence of the “urgency” lobby whose message is that immediate action must be taken to mitigate global warming could be felt in each and every session of the conference. The tenacity of its interventions was reminiscent of those of the nuclear lobby, something in no way coincidental because the two share roots, targets and resources. One clear and rational voice from the academic community was that of Professor Mojib Latif. Deploying few but accurate words, he said that geo-engineering was a dangerous proposal of limited life expectancy. We could and should just forget about it. Geoengineering was a “band-aid” proposal with a feasible duration of implementation of 25 years at most. It had been devised to combat the symptoms of a disease, not the disease itself. If CO<sub>2</sub> is the problem, it could be solved within 20 years. Society has the resources to adopt a different mode of production and consumption employing renewable energies and related technologies, making the manipulation of the climate unnecessary and so avoiding the risks that it represents for the survival of the planet.

### **ACTIVISTS AGAINST GEO-ENGINEERING MANAGE TO GET A SPACE OUTSIDE THE OFFICIAL AGENDA WHERE THEY CAN PRESENT THEIR CONCERNS**

Although the balance of forces at the event was weighed disproportionately against them, the six activists against geo-engineering succeeded in securing from the event’s organizers a space in which to hold a meeting for presentation of alternative views.

Introducing a session entitled *Presenting Theory and Evidence of current atmospheric aerosol programs*, the activists staked the claim to be expressing the concerns of society vis à vis the established fact that spraying is being carried out by unidentified aircraft. Solid evidence was presented. Whatever the claims made (e.g. by conference speaker Susanne Dröge) to the effect that the EU does not want to take sides on the issue of geo-engineering, these activists succeeded in casting doubt on the wisdom of any such approach.

One subject that was brought up in this unprogrammed session was a point that had been tabooed in all other sessions, namely the way that the law of cause and effect had been reversed and geoengineering gone from being an experiment in mathematical computer simulation to being a real experiment on the open laboratory of Planet Earth, causing anthropogenic climate change as required by the political-military-industrial complex.

Given the lack of publicity and the fact that this session had been inserted into the program to take place during a lunch break, attendance was not overwhelming. Nevertheless, sixteen people came, almost twice the number present at other official sessions. They included Mr. Ken Caldeira, who left, however, after listening for a few minutes.

Following the spontaneous but well-documented presentations of the participants from the United Kingdom, the spokesperson for Guardacielos & Skyguards outlined the initiative presented on 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> April 2013 to the European Parliament. The purpose of the European Parliament conference had been to explain the concerns of civil society regarding climate manipulation. At the end of the conference a formal request for an independent investigation had been submitted and subsequently admitted for processing.

Along similar lines, the local government of Shasta County in Redding, California, had unanimously approved a motion to investigate the complaints against geoengineering submitted by civil society. It had been a huge meeting, and Skyguards had had the honor to be there, along with ex-pilots, army meteorologists, biologists, medical doctors, farmers, victims of “collateral damage”, all presenting their testimonies.

Josefina Fraile’s Berlin intervention ended with a reference to the Statement on Geoengineering presented by Skyguards and distributed in the poster session. It is worth pointing out that 200 pins with the text “Stop Climate Manipulation” and “Climate Manipulation No Thanks” were left on the table as a complimentary offer to participants and met with a positive reception. Even geoengineers took them as souvenirs.

### **SOME OF THE BEST AND WORST COMMENTS MADE BY PARTICIPANTS**

There were too many speakers in the sessions at this conference. With no more than ten minutes available for speakers to present their papers, there was no time for debate. All that was heard was a succession of statements from the four blocks extending over four days. Here are some of the most interesting comments:

☒ The agenda behind geo-engineering has nothing to do with science. It does, however, have a lot to do with politics and finance. (Participant from Africa)

☒ We cannot take decisions on the basis of mathematical computer modeling (American lawyer)

☒ The system spends thousands of millions of dollars coining words and shaping public debate because those who control the lexicon control the topics.

☒ Pressure is being exerted to go into action for the purpose of saving lives and properties, But good decisions can never ever be taken under pressure of fear or desperation.

☒ Only rich countries speak about geo-engineering; countries which are rich, white and techno-obsessed.

☒ **Have the religions of the world been taken into account during the shaping of these policies? (no answer).** In this connection we had the opportunity to talk to an American scientist about the immunity from responsibility or liability that appears to be enjoyed by the scientific community. They

seem to place themselves in a legal protection-zone from where they have a license to destroy life with accountability to no one and with nobody to question their actions. We suggested to this scientist the creation of an international corporation to monitor scientific developments, with competences to judge scientists working on projects proven to constitute crimes against humanity: The scientist agreed with this suggestion.

There were also a number of statements that seemed, to say the least, eccentric. One of them was the proposal that geoengineering be considered a human right. Another was a proposal from a futurologist (adviser to governments and institutions!) who stated *that we are not as dangerous to the planet as the planet is dangerous to us. He added that the planet has always emerged from the worst scenarios. No matter what we do to the planet, it will always survive.* Any comment on this would surely be superfluous.

## **ASSESSMENT OF THE EVENT**

The event was rather biased toward the officialist side of climate change discourse, based on an entrenched thesis that nobody questioned. It must be very difficult to try to organize a conference covering the multifarious aspects of a very complex issue, but it would have been desirable, we believe, for there to have been some involvement of scientists questioning the official thesis of climate change: the scientists who have been marginalized in the IPPC.

Scientists at this conference did not explain, and did not have to explain, how and why we moved from the topic of global warming to the topic of climate change. Moreover, there was not a single climatologist willing to touch on the subject of the potentially terrible consequences of intervening in the planet's climatic systems. Nor was there a single solar scientist to explain to the audience how **it is the sun** which determines the climate of the planet and not CO<sub>2</sub> (with the corollary that controlling the sun is the key to controlling the climate. Perhaps this is why in geoengineering schemes the proposal of controlling solar radiation takes precedence over that of reducing man-made CO<sub>2</sub>.) There was not a single paper to give a documented account of the climate change industry: Who is benefiting and who is not benefiting from the astronomical global budget being allocated to it. Nobody said a word about the many companies worldwide that are offering climate modification services, or how it is that they can offer an end product when there has not been a prior experimental phase of geo-engineering. Nor was there anyone to focus attention on the winners and losers from implementing climate control technologies. Last but not least, it would have been desirable for some attention to be paid to the military research on techniques of climate manipulation that has been going on for more than 60 years: the practical tests it has conducted and its impact in the climatic system. On this subject all speakers remained conveniently silent, mentioning Popeye, Gromet, Argus, etc., but with no reference at all to, for example *"Owning the weather in 2025"*

From the logistics viewpoint it would have been desirable to have fewer speakers, more space for debate and a sequential distribution of the papers instead of parallel sessions. If that had been done nobody would have had to miss any of the contributions on such an important issue. There was no need for testimonial sessions. Nor was there any need for the presence of certain futurologists

All in all it was a good event with room for improvement in future. The generally commendable level of moderators should be acknowledged. They did a good job, even insisting on audience respect for divergent opinions when this was needed. The attention to participants and the catering were also excellent.

Our overall evaluation of the conference was very positive. It has allowed us to claim our space as civil society, a space that had been usurped by social scientists from universities that have been working for decades on climate manipulation. It has also allowed us to speak directly to geo-engineers and tell them to their faces what we think and what we expect of them.

From Guardacielos / Skyguards / Terra SOS-tenible, we thank IASS for the organization of this event because it has allowed civil society to emerge with greater strength. We also thank our collaborators for enabling our participation in this event.

Josefina Fraile Martín / Spokesperson Portavoz de Guardacielos / Skyguards

---

Skyguards is an international platform comprising civic associations from more than 20 EU countries. It was founded by the Spanish association Terra SOS-tenible to address climate manipulation/geoengineering issues and defend citizens' interests at all possible levels: research, educational, corporate, institutional, political, judicial, etc.

Within this perspective Skyguards took the concerns of European civil society to the European Parliament on 8th and 9th April 2013 and filed a formal petition in May to demand an independent investigation. The Committee on Petitions has accepted the demand.

***Terra SOS-tenible, a Spanish Association with Registration Nº 170352, has the support of local and international scientists, physicists, chemists, biologists, meteorologists, geologists, aeronautical engineers, researchers, environmental activists and farmers' organizations.***

<http://ce-conference.org/>

Josefina Fraile interviewed in the spanish TV 2013

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GUVrD5pkZ\\_4](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GUVrD5pkZ_4)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zizhWeIQYWk>

Reader on the CEC Conference: [www.ce-conference.org](http://www.ce-conference.org).

Further Links:

CE-Conference Berlin, Videos <http://ce-conference.org/conference-videos>

CE Berlin. Newspaper articles <http://www.iass-potsdam.de/de/media/iass-den-medien>

CE Berlin: Warning regarding Geoengineering <http://www.zeit.de/2014/35/klima-geo-engineering>

CE-Conf. Berlin: 1. Speaker and Clive Hamilton

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aY300uz6scU>

[http://www.democracynow.org/2013/5/20/geoengineering\\_can\\_we\\_save\\_the\\_planet](http://www.democracynow.org/2013/5/20/geoengineering_can_we_save_the_planet)

The military as „climate elephant“

<http://www.workers.org/articles/2014/09/04/pentagon-climate-elephant/>

Patents for nanoparticles for Spraying?

<http://www.google.com/patents/EP1134302A1?cl=fr>

<https://www.google.com/patents/EP1134302A1?cl=en>

Private ocean fertilization in Canada

<http://www.sueddeutsche.de/wissen/umstrittenes-geoengineering-projekt-im-pazifik-meeresduengung-entsetzt-umweltschuetzer-1.1501135>

The Oxford Geoengineering Programme from 2010

<http://www.geoengineering.ox.ac.uk>

Critique on Climate Engineering in mainstream media:

[http://www.geoengineeringwatch.org/mainstream-covers-climate-engineering/?utm\\_source=rss&utm\\_medium=rss&utm\\_campaign=mainstream-covers-climate-engineering](http://www.geoengineeringwatch.org/mainstream-covers-climate-engineering/?utm_source=rss&utm_medium=rss&utm_campaign=mainstream-covers-climate-engineering)

The Methangas problem

<http://arctic-news.blogspot.com/>

## 4. The scientific proof of the ongoing poisoning of the Earth

SCIENCE, VOL. 108, NO. 12, 25 JUNE 2015 2173  
The author is in Transdyne Corporation, 11044 Red Rock Drive, San Diego, CA 92131, USA  
e-mail: [mherndon@san.rr.com](mailto:mherndon@san.rr.com)

### **Aluminum poisoning of humanity and Earth's biota by clandestine geoengineering activity: implications for India**

by

*J. Marvin Herndon*

*In response to an urgent call through an article in Current Science for assistance to understand the geological association of high aluminum mobility with human health in the Ganga Alluvial Plain, I describe evidence of clandestine geoengineering activity that has occurred for at least 15 years, and which has escalated sharply in the last two years. The geoengineering activity via tanker-jet aircraft emplaces a non-natural, toxic substance in the Earth's atmosphere which with rainwater liberates highly mobile aluminum. Further, I present evidence that the toxic substance is coal combustion fly ash. Clandestine dispersal of coal fly ash and the resulting liberation of highly mobile aluminum, I posit, is an underlying cause of the widespread and pronounced increase in neurological diseases and as well as the currently widespread and increasing debilitation of Earth's biota.*

*Recommendations are made for verifying whether the evidence presented here is applicable to the Ganga Alluvial Plain.*

**Keywords:** Aluminum poisoning, biota, clandestine geoengineering activity, coal fly ash.

In their article entitled 'High mobility of aluminum in Gomati River Basin: implications to human health', Jigyasu *et al.*<sup>1</sup> state that 'Systematic multi-disciplinary study is urgently required to understand the geological association of high Al mobility with human health in the Ganga Alluvial Plain, one of the densely populated regions of the world'. The present article is intended in part to address that urgent call.

Life on Earth came into being and evolved under circumstances of extreme immobility of aluminum (Al), an element that comprises by weight about 8% of the crust. Consequently, the biota of our planet, including humans, failed to develop natural defence mechanisms for exposure to chemically mobile aluminum. Globally, for the past decade or more, with dramatically increasing intensity, our planet is being deliberately and clandestinely exposed to a non-natural substance which releases toxic mobile aluminum into the environment. Here I provide evidence on the dispersal and nature of the non-natural substance, describe its potential causality in a host of increasing human<sup>2-11</sup> and biota debilitations<sup>12</sup>, and discuss the implications for India in light of recently published extreme levels of chemically mobile aluminum observed in water from the Gomati River, a major tributary of the Ganga River in the Ganga Alluvial Plain in North India<sup>1</sup>. The 'global warming' agenda had its beginnings in the 1980s, especially with the 1988 formation of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) by the United Nations. The first report by the IPCC in 1990 claimed that the world has been warming and that future warming seems likely; the supposed culprit being anthropogenic, additions to the atmosphere of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), allegedly causing a 'greenhouse' effect. Then, along came the modellers, with grand climate models based upon the false assumptions that heat from the Sun and heat from within the Earth are both constant. With those predominant variables unrealistically held constant, the tiny greenhouse effect of increases in carbon dioxide might appear significant. The intended result of those climate models is to demonstrate that human activities are indeed causing global warming and that the consequences are dire, threatening our entire planet and its very life-forms. Driven by political, financial and self-aggrandizement interests, the idea of anthropogenic global warming/ climate change took hold. But there is another explanation that has nothing to do with human activity<sup>13</sup>. Since 1996, the IPCC in its reports has mentioned the possibility of 'geoengineering', the idea of emplacing reflectant substances into the upper atmosphere (stratosphere) to reflect a portion of the incident sunlight back into space to compensate for alleged anthropogenic global warming. The impetus for that geoengineering idea is the observation that, after a major volcanic eruption, ash can remain in the stratosphere, where little mixing occurs, for a year or more, dimming incident sunlight and lowering temperatures globally. There is much information and evidence on the Internet and in books that clandestine geoengineering activities

have been taking place for years, perhaps going back to at least as early as the beginning of the 21st century. Notably and alarmingly, profound increases in geoengineering activity have been observed since early 2013 (refs 14–16). But there has been no public admission, no understanding, no academic investigations, no informed consent, and no disclosure as to the nature of the toxic substances being dispersed into the air. Instead, there appears to be a systematic pattern of disinformation, efforts to brand concerned observers with the pejorative moniker, ‘conspiracy theorists’, and to falsely imply that the observed geoengineering toxic chemical trails are simply the formation of ice crystals from the exhaust of commercial jetliners flying at high altitudes<sup>17</sup>.

I have lived in the same house since 1977 and viewed the same area of the sky nearly every day. After the morning marine layer burns off, the sky in San Diego, California, USA, has been often cloudless; rain is infrequent here. The air is warm and dry, not at all conducive for the formation of ice crystals from high-altitude jet aircraft exhaust. Since the spring of 2014, I observed that the common occurrence of toxic geoengineering trails in the lower atmosphere (troposphere), which mixes with the air we breathe, was increasing in frequency (Figures 1 and 2). By November 2014, the spraying from tanker-jet aircraft had become a near-daily occurrence, sometimes to the extent of causing the otherwise blue sky to be

**Figure 1.** Clandestine geoengineering toxic chemical aerosol trails early in the daily emplacement activity in San Diego, USA on 8 August 2014. The trail from the tanker-jet dissipates, first forming wispy white ‘clouds’ as shown, and eventually forms a white haze.

completely overcast with artificial clouds (Figure 3). Disturbingly, the Mayor and Chief of Police, San Diego issued no health warnings, even to the most at-risk members of the community: children, pregnant women, the elderly, and those with compromised immune and respiratory systems.

If natural volcanic ash were used for geoengineering, which is not the case, it would not be without health risks; acute respiratory conditions such as shortness of breath, wheezing and coughing have been noted as well as irritation to the eye and nasal passage<sup>18</sup>. But to my

**Figure 2.** Multiple clandestine geoengineering toxic chemical trails above a recognizable area of San Diego, Kearney Mesa, on 16 January 2015.

**Figure 3.** Heavy jet-tanker toxic chemical emplacement by clandestine geoengineering activity on 23 November 2014 over San Diego. Initially the sky was pure blue on that day, devoid of any natural clouds. The toxic material does not remain in the atmosphere, but contaminates the air breathed by the San Diegans, the rain and the soil.

knowledge release of mobile aluminum into the environment does not occur from natural volcanic ash. Mining and milling rock to produce artificial volcanic ash in sufficient quantity, 10–12 million tonnes/yr, to implement a full-scale geoengineering programme to cool the planet would be outrageously expensive. Artificially produced chemicals would likewise be prohibitively expensive, except for peripheral clandestine use in weather modifying/weaponizing experiments.

There is, however, a readily available, almost unlimited amount of an extremely low-cost waste product with proper grain size for aerosol dispersing, one that requires



extra processing – coal fly ash, which makes up the second largest industrial waste stream of the US economy. Although details of the government's massive tropospheric geoengineering activities are secret, and even unacknowledged to date, as described below, there is reason to believe that coal fly ash is the principal ingredient used for geoengineering.

**Figure 4.** Aluminum content of captured rainwater samples as a function of date collected. The gap between 2002 and 2006 does not indicate an absence of clandestine geoengineering; numerous photographic data are available during that interval.

**Figure 5.** Fingerprint similarity in Al/Ba ratio range between postgeoengineering rainwater and coal fly ash leachate. Placement on the horizontal axis is arbitrary to spread out data points.

Coal burning by industries in the West, mostly electric utilities, produces heavy ash that settles out, as well as fly ash that earlier went up the smokestack into the atmosphere, but is now captured and stored because of its wellknown adverse human health effects and damage to the environment. Coal fly ash poses danger as a stored waste because water leaches out toxic elements<sup>19</sup>. Leaching experiments on coal fly ash are typically aimed at understanding/ mitigating chemical mobility caused by groundwater<sup>20,21</sup>. Moreno *et al.*<sup>20</sup> investigated laboratory leach behaviour of 23 coal fly ash samples from different European power plant sources. The selection covered most of coal fly ash types produced in the European Union. All except one were collected at electrostatic precipitators. The leach procedure employed required mixing 100 g of coal fly ash with 1 litre of distilled water in 2 litre bottles for a period of 24 h. The authors report the abundance of 38 elements in the leachate, including radioactive uranium and thorium and, of particular interest here,

**Figure 6.** Fingerprint similarity in Sr/Ba ratio range between postgeoengineering rainwater and coal fly ash leachate. Placement on the horizontal axis is arbitrary to spread out data points.

**Figure 7.** Location map of the Gomati River Basin (courtesy: Jigyasu *et al.*<sup>1</sup>).

**Figure 8.** Seasonal distribution of dissolved Al concentration along with discharge in the Gomati River water at Chandwak (courtesy: Jigyasu *et al.*<sup>1</sup>).

aluminum, barium and strontium. Together, aluminum, barium and strontium appear to be the fingerprint of the principal clandestine geoengineering toxic substance. During the period between July 2011 and November 2012, 73 rainwater samples were collected and analysed for aluminum and barium; 71 were collected from 60 different locations in Germany, 1 from France and 1 from Austria. Aluminum was detected in 77% of the rainwater samples, at an average concentration of  $17.68 \cdot \text{g/l}$ . The average barium concentration was found to be  $3.38 \cdot \text{g/l}$ .

Strontium, with an average composition of  $2.16 \cdot \text{g/l}$ , was also observed in 23 rainwater samples<sup>22</sup>.

To my knowledge there have been no leaching experiments on coal fly ash that has been exposed to conditions such as one might expect from atmospheric aerosol dispersal, like exposure to UV light, particle contact abrasion or electrostatic discharge. In one set of rainwater measurements in a non-industrial area of northern California, rainwater collected during an electrical storm contained

3,450 · g/l of aluminum, whereas similar sampling 10 days earlier yielded 850 · g/l of aluminum<sup>16</sup>; the difference may or may not have anything to do with electrical discharge.

Figure 4 shows measurement of aluminum content of collected rainwater samples from 2001 to 2014. Generally, the samples were collected by independent scientists who paid the analytical laboratory fees out of their own pockets, hence the paucity of data; government supported academic scientists either have not made comparable measurements or else have not published them. Rainwater evaporation concentrates the aluminum content. In one lined pond fed by rainwater and well water with undetectable aluminum content, the aluminum concentration

of the pond water was found to be 375,000 · g/l (ref. 16).

Through the use of ratios it is possible to compare directly the composition of rainwater with the composition of coal fly leach experiments. Figure 5 is a side-by-side comparison of aluminum to barium (Al/Ba) weight ratios of rainwater<sup>16,22</sup> and coal fly ash leachate<sup>20</sup>. The range of Al/Ba values for the rainwater and coal fly ash leachate is virtually indistinguishable, even though the rainwater samples were collected at different times, in different locations, under different degrees of toxic aerosol emplacement, and the coal fly ash samples varied by location and composition.

Figure 6 is a side-by-side comparison of strontium to barium (Sr/Ba) weight ratios of rainwater<sup>16,22</sup> and coal fly ash leachate<sup>20</sup>. The range of Sr/Ba values for the rainwater and coal fly ash leachate is virtually indistinguishable, even though the rainwater samples were collected at different times, in different locations, under different degrees of toxic aerosol emplacement, and coal fly ash samples varied by location and composition.

The data presented above constitute evidence that coal fly ash is the principal material being employed in clandestine geoengineering activities for a period of at least 15 years in America and for unknown periods in Western Europe, New Zealand, and perhaps elsewhere.

Such clandestine geoengineering activities have exposed humanity and Earth's biota to highly mobilized aluminum, a toxic substance not generally found in the natural environment and one for which no natural immunity had evolved. During the period of coal fly ash utilization for clandestine geoengineering, aluminum-implicated neurological diseases showed explosive growth profiles, including autism, Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, ADHD and others<sup>2-11</sup>, as well as manifold destruction of plant and animal life. Highly mobilized aluminum from the geoengineering-dispersed coal fly ash, I posit, is the cause. How can that assertion be verified? In principle, one might show a correlation between the amount of coal fly ash emplaced into the atmosphere for geoengineering and the occurrence of aluminum-implicated neurological diseases. It is unlikely, though, that the clandestine coal fly ash geoengineering data will ever be forthcoming. After the US President Barack Hussein Obama was sworn in for a second term in office on 20 January 2013, geoengineering activities escalated sharply, becoming a neardaily occurrence in many parts of America<sup>14-16</sup>. If coal fly

ash geoengineering activities are the principal cause of aluminum-implicated neurological diseases, then there will be a sharp spike in their occurrences after 20 January 2013; proof, albeit horrific proof, of crimes against humanity and Earth's biota of a magnitude and severity never before experienced.

The Ganga Alluvial Plain, as shown in Figure 7, abuts the Himalaya Mountains, a natural barricade to the passage of clouds. Seasonally, as discovered by Jigyasu *et al.*, rainfall delivers toxic quantities of highly mobile aluminum to the Gomati River Basin (Figure 8). I suggest that the primary source of highly mobile aluminum is aerosolized coal fly ash. This suggestion is relatively easy to verify by taking rainwater samples and analysing them for aluminum, barium and strontium. If aerosolized coal fly ash is indeed verified as the major source of highly mobile aluminum, then another more difficult question should be addressed: What proportion of the aerosolized coal fly ash derives from clandestine geoengineering activities and what proportion comes from industrial coal burning in India? One forensic approach that should be considered is direct sampling of the coal fly ash in the monsoon clouds and in the clouds before they enter the Indian airspace. These samples may then be compared with the Indian industrial coal fly ash samples. Although the above described forensic investigation may be difficult and expensive, the results might help India improve the health of its citizens.

1. Jigyasu, D. K. *et al.*, High mobility of aluminum in Gomati River Basin: implications to human health. *Curr. Sci.*, 2015, **108**(3), 434–438.
2. Bondi, S. C., Prolonged exposure to low levels of aluminum leads to changes associated with brain aging and neurodegeneration. *Toxicology*, 2014, **315**, 1–7.
3. Yokel, R. A. *et al.*, Entry, half-life and desferrioxamine accelerated clearance of brain aluminum after a single (26) Al exposure. *Toxicol. Sci.*, 2001, **64**(26), 77–82.
4. Good, P. F. *et al.*, Selective accumulation of aluminum and iron in the neurofibrillar tangles of Alzheimer's disease: a laser microprobe (LAMMA) study. *Ann. Neurol.*, 1992, **31**, 286–292.
5. Prasunpriya, N., Aluminum: impacts and disease. *Environ. Res.*, 2002, **82**(2), 101–115.
6. Rondeau, V. *et al.*, Aluminium and silica in drinking water and the risk of Alzheimer's disease or cognitive decline: findings from 15-year follow-up of the PAQUID cohort. *Am. J. Epidemiol.*, 2009, **169**, 489–496.
7. Moreira, P. I. *et al.*, Alzheimer's disease: an overview. In *Encyclopedia of Neuroscience* (ed. Bloom, F. *et al.*), Elsevier, 2009, pp. 259–263.
8. Chandra, V., Incidence of Alzheimer's disease in a rural community in India. The Indo-US study. *Neurology*, 2001, **57**(2), 985–989.
9. Poddar, K. *et al.*, An epidemiological study of dementia among the inhabitants of eastern Uttar Pradesh, India. *Ann. Indian Acad. Neurol.*, 2011, **14**(3), 164–168.
10. Das, K. S., Pal, S. and Ghosal, M. K., Dementia: Indian scenario. *Neurol. India*, 2012, **60**(6), 618–624.
11. Tripathi, M. *et al.*, Risk factors of dementia in North India: a case-control study. *Aging Mental Health*, 2012, **16**(2), 228–235.
12. Sparling, D. W. and Lowe, T. P., Environmental hazards of aluminum to plants, invertebrates, fish, and wildlife. *Rev. Environ. Contam. Toxicol.*, 1996, **145**, 1–127.
13. Herndon, J. M., Variables unaccounted for in global warming and climate change models. *Curr. Sci.*, 2008, **95**(7), 815–816.
14. <http://stopsprayingcalifornia.com/>
15. <http://www.endgeoengineering.com/>
16. <http://www.geoengineeringwatch.org/>
17. Oliver, J. E. and Wood, T. J., Conspiracy theories and the paranoid styles of mass opinion. *Am. J. Polit. Sci.*, 2014; doi: 10.1111/

ajps.12084.

18. Bolong, R. J., *Volcanic Hazards: A Sourcebook on the Effects of Eruptions*, Academic Press, Australia, 1984, p. 424.

19. Izquierdo, M. and Querol, X., Leaching behavior of elements from coal combustion fly ash: an overview. *Int. J. Coal Geol.*, 2012, **94**, 54–66.

20. Moreno, N. *et al.*, Physico-chemical characteristics of European pulverized coal combustion fly ashes. *Fuel*, 2005, **84**, 1351–1363.

21. Cheng-you, Wu, Hong-fa, Yu and Hui-Fang, Z., Extraction of aluminum by pressure acid-leaching method from coal fly ash. *Trans. Nonferrous Met. Soc. China*, 2012, **22**, 2282–2288.

22. <http://www.cielvoile.fr/article-concentrations-de-metaux-lourdsdans-l-eau-de-pluie-en-allemagne-118778899.html>

## 5. Greeek activists against geoengineering

### **A STATEMENT ON GEOENGINEERING**

**Enouranois group, Greece (<http://enouranois.eu>)**

(Definition of geoengineering: the deliberate large-scale intervention in the operations of the planet. The proposed geoengineering projects are represented as measures for dealing with climate change. They include spraying of the upper layers of the atmosphere with sulphates (this is called “Solar Radiation Management”), fertilization of the oceans; storage of carbon dioxide in the earth, etc.)

*Over much of the planet, for years, in fact decades now, aircrafts have been seen flying at high altitudes, engaged in what - to countless concerned citizens, including parliamentarians and a few scientists and military people - appears to be chemical spraying. When attempts have been made to raise the question of “what is going on”, inquirers are given in response, officially and unofficially, descriptions of aircraft condensation trails and their properties. It soon becomes evident from dealings with authorities – everywhere – that citizens today are required to believe that what they are seeing in the sky is the traditional unintentional – and presumably not desired – pollution that has always been associated with jet air travel. It is not some kind of deliberate spraying. If people wish to believe that they are “being sprayed”, the burden of proof rests on themselves (because they are the ones who are “making the allegation”).*

***All this changes when a new factor is introduced: a public relations campaign aimed at securing public acceptance for geoengineering (and in particular what is called “solar radiation management”). For example: 1.***

***<http://harvardmagazine.com/2013/07/buffering-the-sun#article-images>***

***2. <http://www.geoengineering.ox.ac.uk/oxford-principles/principles/>***

***3. <http://www.ies.be/files/20130628%20geoengineering%20governance%20-%20ies%20policy%20forum.pdf> (examples could be multiplied at will).***

**Under the precautionary principle, in such public relations campaigns, all burdens of proof rest on those who are canvassing for support for the practices in question. Those who want the public to accept geoengineering must persuade the public that what they say about it is true. David Keith’s [December 2013 interview](#) with Stephen Colbert can surely only have increased disbelief and the demand for honesty.**

The burden of proof therefore rests on the David Keiths, the Ken Caldeiras, the Oxford Geoengineering Programmes, etc., to prove that they are not lying or misinformed when they say that “research on geoengineering is at a very early stage”, (asserting or implying that geoengineering, and specifically programmes of solar radiation management – possibly also serving other undeclared purposes – is/are merely a proposal and not a reality of historically unprecedented enormity, in full-scale global application).

Because it is the advocates of geoengineering, not uninvolved citizens, who are initiating the discussion, citizens are entitled to assert the following:

1) Any person or organization seeking to involve the public in a debate on the advantages and disadvantages of geoengineering techniques such as solar radiation management, or the global dispersal of light-reflecting particles in the atmosphere to reduce the level of sunlight reaching the earth, should be obliged to admit that such activity is already in global implementation, or prove that it is not. Wilfully false statements in this connection should be a penal offence, punishable by imprisonment.

2) No person or organization in any way associated with assertions or insinuations that global warming/climate change is not anthropogenic in character should be legally entitled to advocate geoengineering methods as a means of countering anthropogenic climate change/global warming.

3) Enforcement of the ENMOD Convention is a prerequisite for any attempt to secure “social acceptance” for any form of geoengineering.

4) Enforcement of the AARHUS Convention is a prerequisite for any attempt to secure “social acceptance” for any form of geoengineering.

5) No person or organization involved in any way with production of the problems for which geoengineering is being canvassed as a “solution” shall be entitled to be employed in implementation of any geoengineering programme.

6) It is not acceptable that the moratorium on most types of geoengineering voted at Nagoya in 2010 at the UN’s Convention on Biodiversity should be violated and/or ignored.

7) Penal sanctions should be attached to violations of the provisions of the ENMOD and AARHUS conventions.

8) An international court for environmental crimes must be established, with the power to impose sanctions on offences against points 1) and 2) above, in addition to other already acknowledged environmental crimes.

9) Geoengineers’ declared intention to “aim at legitimization through public involvement and transparency” lacks all credibility in the absence of any believable response to the present statement.

10) The representation of aircraft emissions as a net contributor to global warming, as put forward as an alleged motive behind the [European Emissions Trading Scheme](#) for aviation and in numerous scientific studies, undermines the plausibility of spraying from aircraft as a method of Solar Radiation Management, suggesting other motivations for the spraying,

including political aggression and financial speculation. The former would place the activity in violation of the ENMOD Treaty.

The citizens' organization Skyguards staged a conference in the European Parliament on 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> April 2013 on the issue of geoengineering and clandestine aerial spraying and have presented a formal demand for an independent investigation of facts reported in the conference.

- a. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Environmental\\_Modification\\_Convention](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Environmental_Modification_Convention)
- b. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Aarhus\\_Convention](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Aarhus_Convention)
- c. <http://www.handsoffmotherearth.org/2010/10/great-news-un-agrees-moratorium-on-geoengineering-experiments/>
- d. [www.skyguards-net.org](http://www.skyguards-net.org)

### **The ENMOD Convention**

An international treaty prohibiting the military or other hostile use of environmental modification techniques.

The Convention bans weather warfare, which is the use of weather modification techniques for the purpose of inducing damage or destruction.

It opened for signature on 18 May 1977 in Geneva and entered into force on 5 October 1978. Seventy-four countries are signatories to the Convention.

The text comprises ten articles, with an annex covering a Consultative Committee of Experts.

### **The Aarhus Convention**

The UNECE **Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters**, usually known as the **Aarhus Convention**, was signed on June 25, 1998 in the Danish city of Aarhus. It entered into force on 30 October 2001. As of May 2013, it had been ratified by 45 states and the European Union. All of the ratifying states are in Europe and Central Asia.

The Aarhus Convention grants the public rights regarding access to information, public participation and access to justice, in governmental decision-making processes on matters concerning the local, national and transboundary environment. It focuses on interactions between the public and public authorities.

The Aarhus Convention is a multilateral environmental agreement through which the opportunities for citizens to access environmental information are increased and transparent and reliable regulation procedure is secured. It was drafted by governments, with the highly required participation of NGOs, and is legally binding for all the States who ratified it.

The Aarhus Convention is a rights-based approach: the public, both in the present and in future generations, have the right to know and to live in a healthy environment.

### **Nagoya, Japan – Moratorium on Geoengineering**

**The moratorium on geoengineering was voted by 193 countries at the UN Convention on Biodiversity that was held at Nagoya in Japan in October 2010. According to a representative of the anti-geoengineering ETC Group, which participated in the meeting and promoted the moratorium, “any private or public experimentation intended to manipulate the planetary thermostat will be in violation of the moratorium.”**

**It should be noted that present-day advocates of geoengineering proposals who present solar radiation management as a solution to global warming are the same companies and the same individuals who to this day have denied the existence of anthropogenic climate change.**

**The agreement asks governments to ensure that no geoengineering activities take place until risks to the environmental and biodiversity and associated social, cultural and economic impacts risks have been appropriately considered, as well as the socio-economic impacts.**

## **6. Targeted Climate Manipulation: The Bundeswehr and the Bundestag side with Geo-Engineers**

The Bundeswehr

[http://www.planungsamt.bundeswehr.de/portal/a/plgaww/!ut/p/c4/JYvBDslgEET\\_iC0HYvRmgwevetB6Q9iQTSiQ7bZe-vGFOC-ZObwMfKCR3UbRCZxsErXh8nT5\\_IRN0bVZkDfyqBZZA2GGV38EVL5kIN6CWah1ZCeFVS0sqZuVuRIFAAzB23HQjX\\_0fran29NoY-x9fECd5-sBU1sjUw!!/#](http://www.planungsamt.bundeswehr.de/portal/a/plgaww/!ut/p/c4/JYvBDslgEET_iC0HYvRmgwevetB6Q9iQTSiQ7bZe-vGFOC-ZObwMfKCR3UbRCZxsErXh8nT5_IRN0bVZkDfyqBZZA2GGV38EVL5kIN6CWah1ZCeFVS0sqZuVuRIFAAzB23HQjX_0fran29NoY-x9fECd5-sBU1sjUw!!/#)

The Bundestag

Geo-Engineering moves into the German Bundestag (Drucksache 18/2121 vom 15.07.2014)

<http://dip21.bundestag.de/dip21/btd/18/021/1802121.pdf>

Statements about the topic:

A further core question asks whether, and in which form, correlating research (beyond the activities that have taken place until now) should be specifically targeted....

Within the framework of decisions, as they pertain to research policy, considerations about Germany's role as a leading nation in context to research on climate engineering, must be taken into account.



## AT THE EUROPEAN LEVEL

Summarizing the information establishes that to date the EU has not issued any legal acts, such as legal prohibitions or bans, pertaining to CE activities of its members.

## AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL

Similarly, no specific regulations exist within the national legal framework either, which address CE research or provisions in this area.

## RESEARCH REGULATIONS

A fair question about whether an expansion of international regulations pertaining to CE research appears to be necessary at this time or whether, given the enormous gap in knowledge, it would even be beneficial to the topic at this time, is raised. After all national laws and self-responsibility on part of science and the scientific community may be sufficient, in order to ensure responsible CE research (including the conducting of small scale field experiments) and in order to develop a scientific foundation as a basis for future political and legal evaluation, as well as in the creation of effective regulations at the international level.

...And the **Federal Environmental Agency** reassures:

... your concerns are certainly unfounded from our point of view.

We would like to refer to the Federal Environmental Agency, which is responsible for this and has also commented on the topic online:

<http://www.umweltbundesamt.de/publikationen/chemtrails-gefaehrliche-experimente-atmosphaere>

Kind regards

Denise Bergmann

Press and Public Relations, German Weather Service (Presse- und Öffentlichkeitsarbeit, Deutscher Wetterdienst (DWD))

Frankfurter Straße 135, 63067 Offenbach am Main

## 7. New Info Material

- Very critical new movies on geo-engineering

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=umxIOiEbUiw>

OVERCAST: <http://www.dedalfilms.com/?id=31>

Speech at the geo-engineering Demo - Berlin - 25.04.2015

20 minute Film <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hPu2IJmrOhk>

TO CLIMATE - ENGINEERING:

WWW.FRANZMILLER.AT | CLIMATE@FRANZMILLER.AT

» INFOPORTALE «

› US-InfoPortal › „Dane Wigington“

[www.geoengineeringwatch.org](http://www.geoengineeringwatch.org)

› US-InfoPortal › „Cliff Carnicom“

[www.carnicominstitute.org](http://www.carnicominstitute.org)

› DE-InfoPortal › „Dominik Storr“

[www.sauberer-himmel.de](http://www.sauberer-himmel.de)

› DE-InfoPortal › Blauer Himmel

[www.blauerhimmel.info](http://www.blauerhimmel.info)

› PMME | PLANETARY MOVEMENT FOR MOTHER EARTH | PROF. CLAUDIA VON WERLHOF

[www.pbme-online.org](http://www.pbme-online.org)

› NZ-InfoPortal | NORTHLAND NEW ZEALAND CHEMTRAILS WATCH

<http://chemtrailsnorthnz.wordpress.com>

› Chemtrails-De | WERNER ALTNICKEL

[www.chemtrails.de](http://www.chemtrails.de)

## Interviews with Claudia von Werlhof:

a) with Jeff Philipps, New Zealand:

<https://soundcloud.com/jeff-kataklysmos/on-the-brink-radio-104-claudia-von-werlhof-mother-earth-as-targetweaponplanetary-consciousness>

PROF. CLAUDIA von WERLHOF & DR. ROSALIE BERTELL

<http://geo-terrorism.blogspot.com.au/2011/06/claudia-von-werlhofdr-rosalie-bertell.html>, April 2015/July 2015

b) with Janie Rezner, USA:

Interview with Claudia von Werlhof and the voice of the late Dr. Rosalie Bertell, author of "Planet Earth: The Latest Weapon of War." <http://www.radio4all.net/index.php/program/51153>

c) with Michael Vogt, D.:

in QUER-DENKEN.TV, Sept. 12, 2015, zum Thema „Von der Waffe zum Wrack – der Missbrauch der Erde als Mega-Maschine“

Interview Maria Heibel mit Pat Mooney, ETC

German: <http://www.ilcielosufirenze.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/Testo-intervista-tedesco.html>

- **Books:**

Tom Bearden: Oblivion – America at the Brink, 2004 Drafted Sept. 11, 2004 on the Third Anniversary of 9/11/01, revised and updated 2005, Cheniere Press, Santa Barbara, California 93109 (Buch über EM-Skalar-Waffen)

Judy Wood: Where Did the Towers Go? Evidence of Directed Free-Energy Technology on 9/11, The New Investigation, 2010 (Buch über die Anwendung bisher unbekannter Technologien zur Ent-Materialisierung – „dustification“ – bei 9/11) [www.WhereDidTheTowersGo.com](http://www.WhereDidTheTowersGo.com)  
[http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/cms/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=387&Itemid=60](http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/cms/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=387&Itemid=60)

David Keith: A Case for Climate Engineering, Boston Review Books, Boston 2013

Jacob Darwin Hamblin: Arming Mother Nature. The Birth of Catastrophic Environmentalism, Oxford/New Yor, 2013, Oxford Univ.Press

Rosalie Bertell: El Planeta Tierra – La Última Arma de Guerra, Guadalajara, La Casa del Mago 2015

Claudia von Werlhof: Nell'Età del Boomerang, Mailand, Unicopli 2014

Claudia von Werlhof: Madre Tierra o Muerte, Oaxaca, El Rebozo 2015

- **A new threat from above**

Global Union Against Radiation Deployment from Space (GUARDS)

GUARDS is an international coalition of diverse groups that have joined together in order to stop the implementation of global WiFi from space, which threatens all life on earth.

Planned Global WiFi from Space Will Destroy Ozone Layer, Worsen Climate Change, and Threaten Life on Earth

Five companies are gearing up to provide high-speed global WiFi coverage from space within the next three to four years. This would be an ecological and public health nightmare.

The extensive satellite networks required will endanger the ozone layer and significantly contribute to climate change. Rocket exhaust contains ozone-destroying chlorine, water vapor (a greenhouse gas), and aluminum oxide particles, which seed stratospheric clouds. Complete ozone destruction is observed in the exhaust plumes of rockets.

The New York Times (May 14, 1991, p. 4) quoted Aleksandr Dunayev of the Russian Space Agency saying

**"About 300 launches of the [space] shuttle each year would be a catastrophe and the ozone layer would be completely destroyed."**

At that time, the world averaged only 12 rocket launches per year. Maintaining a fleet of (ultimately) 4,000 satellites, each with an expected lifespan of five years, will likely involve enough yearly rocket launches to be an environmental catastrophe.

A second area of concern is WiFi itself. Although widely perceived as an unqualified good, WiFi operates using extremely rapid pulses of microwave radiation - the same radiation used in microwave ovens. And a parade of studies continue to be published and ignored implicating wireless technology in the die-off of forests, the demise of frogs, bats, and honey bees, the threatened extinction of the house sparrow, and damage to the DNA of the human species. It is vital to the continuation of life that large parts of the earth be spared from the incessant radiation that accompanies wireless technologies.

**"The human body",** says Dr Gerard J. Hyland, of the University of Warwick, UK, **"is an electrochemical instrument of exquisite sensitivity"**, noting that, like a radio, it can be interfered with by incoming radiation. **If a signal can operate a mechanical device, it can disturb every cell in the human body.**

On February 7, 2014, the U.S. Department of Interior stated that "the electromagnetic radiation standards used by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) continue to be based on thermal heating, a criterion now nearly 30 years out of date and inapplicable today" in reference to guidelines governing WiFi radiation frequencies.

In 2011 the World Health Organization classified radiation emitted by cell phones, and other wireless commercial infrastructure such as WiFi and smart meters as a Class 2B possible human carcinogen, along with lead, engine exhaust, and DDT. Yet, **the global WiFi projects would make this exposure ubiquitous and inescapable.**

A recent letter sent by 88 organizations, representing over a million people, to the European Economic and Social Committee outlines how governments are betraying the public trust by ignoring the hazards of radio frequency/microwave (RF/MW) radiation.

Studies show wireless radiation can adversely affect fetal brain development, in addition to causing double-stranded DNA breaks and causing a wide spectrum of illnesses. GUARDS believes that **continuing and expanding involuntary exposure of the public to this known toxin violates the Nuremberg Code of Human Rights for non-consensual experimentation.**

#### Satellite Deployment Plans

The five companies seeking to provide global WiFi radiation include:

- SpaceX: 4000 satellites, 750 miles high <http://www.spacex.com/>
- OneWeb: 2,400 satellites, 500-590 miles high <http://www.oneweb.world> and <http://www.cnbc.com/id/102340448>
- Facebook: Satellites, drones, and lasers. <http://thenextweb.com/facebook/2014/03/27/facebooks-connectivity-lab-looking-drones-satellites-lasers-provide-internet-access/>
- Google: 200,000 high altitude balloons (62,500 feet) ("Project Loon") <http://www.google.com/loon/>

- Outernet: Low-orbit microsatellites <https://www.outernet.is/en>. Receive-only service to begin in 2015, two-way WiFi in four years.

WLAN aus dem Himmel / [www.stopglobalwifi.org](http://www.stopglobalwifi.org)

## Threat from Below:

Fracking USA – planned to be utilized more frequently in Europe and the Ukraine.

<http://www.msn.com/en-us/news/us/how-human-activity-is-causing-earthquakes-across-the-united-states/ar-AAbCStt?ocid=U146DHP>

## 8. The Misled Ones

Avaaz, an organization not to be trusted, called for “the largest mobilization for climate change in history”. In New York, 80 blocks in Manhattan were filled with demonstrators. Similar scenes were seen in London, Berlin, Bogota, Paris, Delhi, and Melbourne. A total of 675,000 people are said to have been marching the streets. All of them feeling threatened by climate change.

[https://secure.avaaz.org/de/climate\\_march\\_reportback/?bKMhbab&v=46387](https://secure.avaaz.org/de/climate_march_reportback/?bKMhbab&v=46387)

Quote: “Together we have written a piece of history, but this is only the beginning. In 15 months from now, the crucial Climate Change Conference in Paris will be held – we need a global treaty that is agreed upon. The respective countries have committed to creating national guidelines by March 2015. For this reason, our movement will divide into smaller groups in order to target these national goals. However, until the Paris Conference, we will re-unite on a global scale every few months – repeatedly and growing continually stronger – in order to let our demands for change and 100% clean energy sound loudly, and so that the decision makers will have to listen. The movement for which we have waited has awakened.

In gratitude

Ricken, Emma, Alice, Iain, Nataliya, Patri, Oliver, Diego, Rewan and the entire Avaaz-Team

PS – In order to have made this day possible, we have worked with thousands of organizations and are especially committed to our friends at the organization 350. However, our community can congratulate itself on this important step that we have taken. The Avaaz-team and the community have played a central role at nearly all demonstrations and events that have been organized. The British newspaper “The Guardian” called this “an organizational triumph” for Avaaz, and BBC commented “The marches brought more people on to the streets than ever before, partly thanks to the organizational power of the e-campaign group Avaaz”. We have engaged hundreds of organizations and thousands of volunteers, and our community has supported the project with donations that have run into the millions. In the face of the challenges of our times, we all must rise above. This is precisely what we have done together and therefore are growing to become a new and effective type of movement which now exists online and offline. We would like to express our deep gratitude towards everyone who was involved. “

Well, what could be expected if people knew that they have been deceived and realized the true nature of the problems?

## 9. Last but not Least

Oceans

Dr. Stefan Lanka writes:

Suppressed and forgotten are the global threats caused by the pollution of the oceans:

These produce 80% of the atmosphere's oxygen. The remaining 20% are produced by terrestrial plants. When the oceans have undergone a process of eutrophication, as has begun in 2002 off Oregon's coast and which is rapidly spreading into California and Washington, then human kind will suffocate. If human beings do not retrieve the sunken barrels containing the waste from nuclear plants and from the production of nuclear bombs, as well as other extremely toxic materials, then human kind will suffocate as soon as these barrels are perforated by rust. We must, therefore, get them out again.

++++