

Chemtrails

T. J. COLES

CHEMTRAILS, HAARP, and the "Full Spectrum Dominance" of Planet Earth

Elana Freeland

Feral House: Port Townsend, WA, 2014, \$21.95

ISBN: 978-1-936239-93-1

There's not enough information about weather warfare. Most books on the subject are either obscure academic histories or off-the-wall conspiracy theories. For example: the late Jerry E. Smith's *Weather Warfare* (Adventures Unlimited Press, 2006) begins as a sober, scholarly history of weaponized weather systems but — just as it gets to chemtrails and HAARP — deteriorates into outlandish nonsense: that aliens and demons may be to blame. Likewise, internet sites are full of dis- and misinformation, ranging from the subtle to the ridiculous.¹

Books and articles that address chemtrails and HAARP with integrity are a precious commodity.

So, what are chemtrails and what is HAARP?

In the mid-to-late 1990s, a growing number of people

¹ Examples of misinformation: wingtip vortices being generated as commercial jets land are posted online as 'BUSTED Pilot Forgets to Turn Off CHEMTRAILS While Landing', <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=F-xD0QxGIGM>>; footage of a US Forestry Service plane dropping water, posted as 'CHEM TRAILS [sic] PLANE SPRAYING', <<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mzc60zl70Gk>>; and footage of a crashed Omega refuelling tanker, posted as 'Omega Chemtrail plane crash', <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IGFKb4cHIzk>>. See also 'Visual Proof: Chemtrails transformed into sylph forms', 23 July, 2008, < <http://tinyurl.com/ppq7aa3>>.

People who know nothing about refuelling tankers, aerial fire-fighters, and wingtip vortices will be diverted. More intelligent people who come to the chemtrail 'conspiracy' will be put off, thinking that those who believe in chemtrails are fools.

across Europe and North America began witnessing something they had never seen before: long white trails coming out of jet aircraft, 'stretching from horizon to horizon' (former Rep. Sen. Karen Johnson), expanding into cirrus clouds.² These trails are distinctly different from the short, dissipating trails and occasional longer persisting ones that characterised aviation flight-paths from the mid 1940s to the late 1990s.

There should be no doubt that most of the uncharacteristically long and persisting trails are 'chemical clouds' (Air Force Phillips Lab and Materiel Command) being sprayed from specially designed, non-commercial aircraft in order to mitigate the effects of ionising radiation on electromagnetic systems (e.g. satellites) – experiments acknowledged by the military.³ Another, broader objective is 'owning the weather' (US Air Force 2025),⁴ a project which received Congressional funding in 1998, disproving detractors' comments that 'owning the weather' is merely a military *idea*.⁵

In 2009, the UK Parliament's *Regulation of Geoengineering* report acknowledged that the government had been financing 'low level cloud development' (Minister of State for Energy and Climate Change, Joan Ruddock,) and that 'those carrying out tests do so in secrecy'.⁶ The UK Ministry of Defence said that out to 2040, 'Weather modification will continue to be

2 Johnson interviewed in Michael J. Murphy, *What in the world are they spraying?*, Truth Media Productions, <<http://tinyurl.com/mk7xk32>>.

See also Erik Meijer, 'Parliamentary questions WRITTEN QUESTION by Erik Meijer (GUE/NGL) to the Commission', 10 May, 2007, E-2455/07, <<http://tinyurl.com/nxlsmcw>>.

3 Air Force Materiel Command and Air Force Phillips Laboratory, 'FY97 Geophysics Technology Area Plan', 1 May, 1996, Ohio: Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, <<http://www.fas.org/man/dod-101/usaf/docs/taps97/geophys.pdf>>.

4 Col. Tamzy J. House, Lt. Col. James B. Near, Jr., *et al* 'Weather as a Force Multiplier: Owing the Weather in 2025', *Air Force 2025*, August 1996, <<http://tinyurl.com/o38vrrz>>.

5 The Federal Plan for Meteorological Services and Supporting Research: Fiscal Year 1997, June 1996, <<http://www.ofcm.gov/fedplan/fp-fy97/text/toc.htm>>.

6 House of Commons Science and Technology Committee, *The Regulation of Geoengineering*, Fifth Report of Session 2009–10, HC 221, 18 March, 2010, London: Stationary Office, pp. 38, EV 28, < <http://tinyurl.com/38fv2rw>>.

explored'.⁷

Witnesses often report that the offending jets are silvery-white, unmarked, and fly at altitudes lower than normal condensation trails can form, let alone persist.⁸ NASA-sponsored studies dating back to the 1970s show that contrails can only persist for two hours maximum, even in the most ideal circumstances: i.e., at high altitudes, in exceptionally cold regions, like the Alps, the Rocky Mountains, or Chicago in late-Autumn-Winter.⁹ A 1980 press report on the radiative effects of contrails and how they might affect the climate barely mentioned persistent contrails, noting fewer than 3,000 sightings across the entire United States in one year.¹⁰

Take a look at the skies now, in any region, in any climate, at any time of year, and the sky is frequently hazed over by persistent trails. If this is the result of an increase in commercial aviation, why are there a disproportionate number of *persistent* – rather than dissipating – trails being generated?

Since jet aviation began, air forces have had a special interest in contrails because enemies can detect them (and thus aeroplane movements) on radar. In 1953, the Appleman Standard of contrail prediction was established, and fighter pilots were advised to fly lower than approximately 25,000 ft.¹¹

7 Ministry of Defence (UK), *Strategic Trends Programme: Out to 2040*, 12 January, 2010 (4th ed.), Swindon: MoD, p. 156, <<http://tinyurl.com/pujkmac>>.

8 Bob Fitrakis, *Star Wars, Weather Mods, and Full Spectrum Dominance*, (Columbus, Ohio: CICJ Books, 2005, \$13.50).

9 R.G. Knollenberg, 'Measurements of Growth of the Ice Budget in a Persistent Contrail', *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, volume 29, October, 1972, pp. 1367-74.

10 Philip J. Hilts, 'Jet trails change weather', *Washington Post*, 26 December, 1980, <<http://contrailscience.com/1980-nbc-news-report-on-contrails/>>. The article appears to be authentic, but is only further evidence that chemtrails are real because it shows the disparity in persistence from 1980 to the present time: 'Over a year, the maximum possible cloud points would be 2920.'

11 Herbert Appleman, 'The formation of exhaust condensation trails by jet aircraft', *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, volume 31, 1953, pp. 14-20.

A 1992 US Air Force report into contrail formation took into account advances in jet fuels and turbofan engines and concluded that these were mostly insignificant for contrail formation. The report mentioned contrail *persistence* once.¹² This indicates that until 1996 – the year in which the US announced it would ‘own the weather’ and test ‘chemical clouds’ out to FY99 – persistent contrails were a rare and thus insignificant phenomenon, minus potential effects on climate change.

Around the same time, the US Air Force, Navy, Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, and (what became) BAE-Systems began developing a giant ioniser in Alaska to ‘mimic what the Sun’s energy does to the atmosphere’ (Office of Naval Research).¹³ The ioniser is officially called the High-frequency Active Auroral Research Program, HAARP. The sun provides the electromagnetic energies necessary for vapour to adhere to submicron particles and thus form clouds.¹⁴

The Air Force Materiel Command document quoted above mentions HAARP and ‘chemical clouds’ in the same document. It has been speculated by chemtrail researchers that jets are spraying chemicals in order to make cirrus clouds¹⁵ – or chemtrails, as they are referred to in one US government draft

12 Captain Jeffrey L. Peters, ‘New Techniques for Contrail Forecasting’, August, 1993, AD-A269 686 AWS/TR--93/001, Illinois: Scott Air Force Base, <www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a269686.pdf>. The reference to persistent contrails, in full, is: ‘In at least one case, the pilot of an AWACS aircraft reported a persistent contrail behind a U-2 when the U-2 pilot could not see it’ (p. 10).

13 Office of Naval Research, ‘Naval Research: Airglow, Aurora, and Other Lights in the Sky’, *Science and Technology Focus*, no date, <<http://www.onr.navy.mil/focus/spacesciences/research/aurora1.htm>>.

14 See, for instance: Philip Kauffman and Arquimedes Ruiz-Columbié, ‘Artificial Atmospheric Ionization: A Potential Window for Weather Modification’, <<https://ams.confex.com/ams/pdfpapers/88063.pdf>>; NASA, ‘The Sun-Weather Connection’, <<http://history.nasa.gov/EP-177/ch3-5.html>> and R.G. Harris, ‘The global atmospheric electrical circuit and climate’, Department of Meteorology (Reading University), <<http://arxiv.org/pdf/physics/0506077>>.

15 For instance, The Carnicom Institute, <<http://www.carnicominstitute.org/>>.

bill.¹⁶ Ionisers meanwhile, mainly HAARP, are exciting those particles to jam enemy communications and enhance cloud formation.¹⁷

Elana Freeland's book, *Chemtrails, HAARP, and the Full Spectrum Dominance of Planet Earth*, cites none of the above sources, yet quotes equally compelling ones. Her argument is identical to the one put forth by this author¹⁸ and by Professor Bob Fitrakis, author of *Star Wars, Weather Mods & Full Spectrum Dominance*:¹⁹ that the US military is committed to a doctrine of global militarism, which it calls Full Spectrum Dominance, and that chemtrails and HAARP play a huge part.²⁰

By creating an artificial haze over the planet, the electromagnetic frequencies upon which telecoms, internet, banking, RFID, etc. depend can be enhanced or degraded, depending on the given objective. Even more disturbing is a suggestion made public in 2002 by the Defense University (US), that nanosensors (too small to see or feel) could be sprayed in an aerosolised form and ingested by humans to provide real-time data on location, bodily functions, etc.²¹ Freeland, again citing different but no-less-compelling sources, reaches the same conclusion.

Freeland is a great investigator, documenting not only the Welsbach patent owned by Hughes Aircraft, which

16 Dennis Kucinich, 'The Space Preservation Act (2001)', United States Library of Congress, HR 2977 IH, 1st Session, 2 October, 2001, <www.fas.org/spp/congress/2001/hr2977.html>

17 SPACECAST 2020, 'Space weather support for communications', no date, circa 1994, <www.fas.org/spp/military/docops/usaf/2020/app-g.htm>

18 My 'Chemtrails: The proof and the purpose' in *Lobster* 64, at <<http://www.lobster-magazine.co.uk/free/lobster64/lob64-chemtrails.pdf>> and 'Weather weapons' in *Lobster* 62, at <www.lobster-magazine.co.uk/free/lobster62/lob62-weather-wars.pdf>.

19 See note 8.

20 US Space Command, *Vision for 2020*, February, 1997, <<http://www.fas.org/spp/military/docops/usspac/visbook.pdf>>

21 John L. Petersen and Dennis M. Egan, 'Small Security: Nanotechnology and Future Defense', *Defense Horizons*, March, 2002, No. 8, <<http://tinyurl.com/kd97b4a>> and Armin Grunwald, 'Nanotechnology – A New Field of Ethical Inquiry?', *Science and Engineering Ethics*, No. 11, 2005, <<http://tinyurl.com/oc4pw45>>.

discusses spraying aluminium to mitigate climate change, but the merger/buy-out of Hughes by Raytheon, which, as others have noted, appears to be running software at HAARP through its E-Systems connection.

Like Michael J. Murphy in his superlative documentary *Why in the world are they spraying?*, Freeland theorises, realistically, that GM companies have a big interest in geoengineering because the nanoparticles (many say aluminium, barium, and others²²) present in chemtrails will increasingly poison soils, as floods and droughts resulting from the 'owning the weather' programme make genetically-modified food sources a necessity. Freeland writes that Harvard geoengineer Professor David Keith is president of a company called Carbon Engineering and has received money from Bill Gates, who has invested in genetic modification research. Her sources check out.

Some of her research is questionable, however, such as the reference to purported holographic cities appearing in China. It is true that for decades the US military has planned to use holograms for psychological warfare purposes²³ but whether these 'ghost cities' are true or not is difficult to substantiate. The book dismisses the UN's ENMOD Treaty, which prohibits weather warfare, as 'having no teeth'. However, the treaty is sound, particularly the annex, which makes just about every weather modification activity unlawful. As she points out, however, it has no enforcement mechanism; but the same is true of *all* UN treaties (think of Israel's decades-long violation of the Geneva Conventions in occupied Palestine, or Britain and America's illegal invasion of Iraq in violation of the UN Charter, or the social security cuts across Europe in flagrant violation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, *ad infinitum*).

Sadly, Freeland repeats the unsubstantiated claim that passengers on *commercial* planes are asked to 'lower the

²² See, for example, <www.bariumblues.com>.

²³ Robert J. Bunker (ed.), *Nonlethal Weapons: Terms and References*, INSS Occasional Paper 15, US Air Force Institute for National Security Studies, Colorado: US Air Force Academy, <www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA365328>.

blinds' by staff as not to witness spray operations. This does not pass the common sense test. Chemically-modified contrails can only be sprayed from specially-designed jets. Papers dating back to the 1970s discuss using afterburners to vaporize carbon,²⁴ as does a NASA patent for barium vapour releases,²⁵ and a more recent proposal by a scientist to the UK government.²⁶ Also, when you see the amount of chemicals sprayed in the skies, it would be difficult to imagine how such quantities could be fitted to commercial craft. Added to which, the spray operations are conducted in ways impossible for commercial jets, such as planes ascending almost totally vertically, as this author has videotaped and discusses in the Appendix below.²⁷

Freeland also lists a number of US bases from which chemtrail planes are supposedly taking off. This is substantiated to some extent by former, late FBI agent Ted Gunderson, who 'personally ha[s] observed' unmarked spray jets taking off from air force bases in the US.²⁸ Which raises the question: why aren't US chemtrail activists going *en masse* to these bases in protest?

24 Gray, W. M., W. M. Frank, M. L. Corrin, and C. A. Stokes, 1974, *Weather modification by carbon dust absorption of solar energy*, Department of Atmospheric Science Paper 225, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO, <<http://typhoon.atmos.colostate.edu/Includes/Documents/Publications.html>>.

25 NASA and Paine *et al.*, 'Barium Release System', US Patent, 3,751,913, 14 August 1973, <<http://tinyurl.com/k7t7ddh>>.

26 British Parliament, *Innovation, Universities and Skills Committee: Geoengineering Inquiry (Geoengineering Case Study): Memoranda of Evidence*, 'Memorandum 16 [also listed as 115]: Submission from John Gorman, Chartered Engineer', September, 2008, p. 87. States: 'it would be nice to investigate the possibilities of injecting the fuel/additive mixture into an afterburner', referring to silica. And: 'Memorandum 13 [also 152] Submission from John C.D. Nissen' (p. 68), which says, quoting two of three proposals: 'main candidates [for geoengineering] include: 1) creating stratospheric clouds - using precursor injection to generate aerosols; 2) creating contrails - using an additive to aircraft fuel', <<http://tinyurl.com/k9drs9x>>.

If scientists propose it, why wouldn't the military already be doing it?

27 See also *Clouds Roll By: A Short Film About Chemtrails*, <<https://archive.org/details/CloudsRollByAShortFilmAboutChemtrails>> Vertical trails are at 1 minute 20.

28 Ted Gunderson <<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Gk0DrAf6wUc>>

Apart from a few trifles like the ones above, the book is a well-researched and frightening read. Myself and others are of the opinion that along with the ever-present threat of nuclear accident/war, geoengineering is the most serious threat we face and it is shameful that well-known critics of modern power systems are reluctant to discuss chemtrails for fear of looking like fools, even though the evidence is there.

Geoengineers themselves say that their plans (read: actions) will deplete ozone, exacerbate drought, and cause flash-flooding. This will mean the destruction of food supplies, the growth of disease as temperatures rise, the militarisation of increasingly scarce water supplies, the dominance of GM companies over agriculture, and, to 'protect' against such chaos, the realisation of the Pentagon's quest: Full Spectrum Dominance.

Appendix

The image below is from a video I took of four, possibly five



jets, whose manoeuvres I recorded on 11 August 2012 between 6am and 7am in Plymouth, UK, near the abandoned airport. I filed a FOIA request with the MoD in order to identify them. This still shows a plane with the transponder signal 3770 ascending from 17,000 to 21,000 ft in less than 30

seconds making a long, persistent trail, even though the CAA's own documents say vapour cannot form, let alone persist, at those altitudes.²⁹

Below is a section of the radar reply analysis of the National Air Traffic Service, Britain's privatised air traffic control company. Part of the organisation is under Ministry of Defence control; that part is subject to the Freedom of Information Act. To protect MoD employees, the contact details were redacted when the report was sent to me.

The report acknowledges that 'the gentleman [i.e., me,] specifies he saw jets', yet the Primary Tracks on the radar were not registered as jets until one — with the transponder signal 3770 — contacted air traffic control to register a manoeuvre, i.e. climbing from FL170 (or flight level 17,000ft.) to FL210 (or flight level 21,000ft.) which I videoed. Squawk 3770 appears to be a non-commercial jet, as I can never find it via commercial plane-spotting software.³⁰

The radar analysis concludes that nothing but 'normal airways traffic' had occurred. But this cannot be the case as the jets are not registered on the radar cell — though the report acknowledges that I saw jets — until one, i.e., squawk 3770, performs an unusual manoeuvre, and that squawk 3770 is making a 'contrail' at an altitude impossible for contrail formation, let alone persistence, as I videoed.

The consensus is that contrails cannot form below 24,000ft. (The UK Civil Aviation Authority puts it higher at 50,000ft.)

In an e-mail, the UK Civil Aviation Authority told me that the trail is black because it is a 'shadow' of a contrail. A more likely explanation is that it is a climate-modification operation involving carbon black dust.³¹

29 Civil Aviation Authority (UK), 'Contrails, Wingtip Trails and Fuel Dumping', <www.caa.co.uk/docs/7/EIS%2011.pdf>.

30 <<http://uk.flightaware.com/live/flight/UCA3770>>

31 See <<http://www.pipr.co.uk/archive/>> and <<http://digitool.library.colostate.edu/webclient/DeliveryManager?pid=2726>>.

From Andrew Tranter



MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

CIO-CI Information Access Review

CIO/S/18/1/683 -29-08-2012-123156-004

Mr T Coles
9 California Gardens
Little America
PLYMOUTH
Devon

(via email to: tim.cole@plymouth.ac.uk)

SIC: tim.coles@plymouth.ac.uk

Ministry of Defence
Main Building (Level 1 Zone N)
Whitehall
London SW1A 2HB
United Kingdom

Telephone (MOC): +44 (0)20 780 70000
Facsimile (MOC): +44 (0)20 721 84619
E-mail: CIO-FOI-IR@mod.uk

27 November 2012

Dear Mr Coles,

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 2000 - INTERNAL REVIEW

1. I am writing in response to your email to HQ Air Command Secretariat of 14 November 2012 in which you expressed dissatisfaction with the response you received to an earlier request for information (RFI). It is therefore necessary for MOD to conduct an internal review under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (the Act) of the processing of your RFI relating to an alleged incident of unmarked aircraft flying in Plymouth area airspace in August 2012.

2. I have now completed an internal review looking at both the handling of your request and the substance of the response provided. The purpose of the internal review is to consider whether the requirements of the Act have been fulfilled. The scope of the review is defined by Part VI of the Code of Practice under s.45 of the Act, which can be found: <http://www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/information-access-rights/foi/foi-section45-code-of-practice.pdf>.

Handling

3. In conducting my review of the handling of your request, I have focussed on the following requirements of the Act:

- a. Section 1(1)(a) which, subject to certain exclusions, gives any person making a request for information to a public authority the entitlement to be informed in writing by the public authority whether it holds information of the description specified in the request;
- b. Section 1(1)(b) which, subject to certain exemptions, creates an entitlement to receive the information held by the public authority;

1

SYNOPSIS OF REQUESTED RADAR REPLAY

Radar Analysis Cell
LATCC(MI)
NATS Swanwick
Sepwith Way
Swanwick
Southampton
SO31 7AY

Business Support
HQ 2 Group
RAF High Wycombe
Naphill
Buckinghamshire
HP14 4UE

Tel: [REDACTED] Fax: [REDACTED]

Southampton
SO31 7AY

HP14 4UE

Tel: [REDACTED] Fax: [REDACTED]
M: [REDACTED] Fax: [REDACTED]
e-mail: [REDACTED]

CD No(s) 194/12

ALL TIMES ARE ZULU

All positions listed in the Synopsis of Events are taken from the radar screen, and are annotated as Degrees, Minutes and Seconds (not decimal).

Incident 194/12

DTG: 11 0500 - 0700Z AUG 12 - SATURDAY

Position: IVO PLYMOUTH

AC Type - 4 JETS Callsign - N/K SSR Code N/K Mode C N/K

Radar Head **BURRINGTON PRIMARY & SECONDARY, JERSEY, PEASE POTTAGGE and BOVINGTON**

Recording starts **110500Z AUG 12** Recording ends **110700Z AUG 12**

Orientation: *The Reference Point (RP) used is Plymouth City Airport (N5025.20 W0406.17) and is shown by the white cross located in the centre of the screen.*

Synopsis of Events Based on Radar Replay: Burrington Primary radar

The identifiable tracks seen on this recording are airways traffic with the lowest shown at 0625:45. This squawk 3770 is seen tracking WSW to ENE 5.0nm from the RP at FL170 in the climb to FL210. Other, higher tracks are seen criss-crossing, in straight lines, the location throughout the period.

Aside from the above there are a number of Primary Tracks (PTs) that are picked up on radar. These are not necessarily aircraft and some could be spurious returns due to the general atmospheric conditions, birds, windfarms etc. We often pick up microlights and gliders as PT, but these can be discounted as the gentleman specifies he saw jets.

0503:20 PTs are seen beyond 5nm to the ENE and N intermittently until approx 0515 with no regular pattern seen.

0627:04 PT is seen beyond 5nm to the E for one sweep of the radar.

0632:20 PT is seen at 5nm to the ENE for one sweep of the radar.

T.J. Coles is a PhD student at the University of Plymouth, UK.