

Refuse to Grow Old

[click here](#)



[Additional Titles](#)

EXPERIMENTAL WEATHER MODIFICATION COMING TO YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD, SOON

Other Rosalind Articles:

[Fluorescent
Light Bulb
Warning](#)

[Experimental
Weather
Modification
Bill on Fast](#)

By Rosalind Peterson
November 2, 2007
NewsWithViews.com

Prepare yourself for more water shortages, floods, droughts, and a sharp decline in food supplies in the United States when U.S. Senate Bill 1807 & U.S. House Bill 3445, that were introduced on July 17, 2007, are voted into law. These identical bills, titled: "Weather Mitigation Research and Development Policy Authorization Act of 2007", are moving


Prepare
yourself
for more
water
shortages,
floods,
droughts,
and a sharp
decline in
food
supplies
in the
United
States
when U.S.
Senate
Bill 1807 &

[Track](#)


[More Rosalind Articles](#)

forward at a rapid rate in Committees on Commerce, Science and Transportation. Please note that these bills were not referred to Committees on Agriculture, Natural Resources, the Environmental Protection Agency, or Forestry, and that you were not invited to debate the merits of these bills by your elected representatives.

House 3445, introduced July 17 are void law.




“It is the purpose of this act to develop and implement a comprehensive and coordinated national weather mitigation policy and a national cooperative Federal and State program of weather mitigation and research.” The Board of Directors will be comprised of eleven members and only one member shall be a representative of the Department of Agriculture. There are no members of the public to be appointed to this Board, no EPA representatives, no Natural Resources or Forestry representatives, and there are no provisions for county, state, public, or agricultural oversight of these programs prior to implementation.




Experimental Weather Modification (or “mitigation” which is not defined in these bills), can affect all of us by reducing water supplies and changing agricultural crop production cycles (micro-climates), while reducing crop production and water availability. Since most experimental weather modification programs use chemicals released into the atmosphere the public could be subjected to increasingly toxic or unknown substances that could have negative effects on agricultural, drinking water supplies, crops, and trees. If the weather is changed in one location it may have severe adverse consequences in another region, county or






state. And who is going to decide the type of weather modification experimentation, who it will benefit, and who will suffer the negative consequences of these actions? And will one state or region “steals” the rain or snow that would normally go to another state by using these “weather modification schemes” as is happening from current weather modification programs?



Many current and ongoing weather modification programs (50+ listed by NOAA each year-note the ones listed in this bill), are already changing the climate in many regions of the United States. Since most Americans have not been made aware of these programs it is easy to blame severe climate disturbances on “global warming theories” or climate change. These events are causing an overwhelming urge to “mitigate” current weather problems with increased weather modification experimentation, instead of examining local micro-climate changes that are caused by current and ongoing programs. It would be easier to stop these experimental programs than to add new programs without a clear understanding of current and future synergistic effects.

Senate Bill 1807 does not address these issues but intends to implement more experimental weather modification programs without a national debate or public oversight. Terry Krauss, Project Manager for North Dakota based Weather Modification, Inc., owns a large fleet of aircraft and conducts cloud seeding projects in more than a dozen countries around the world. Many private companies, universities, and government agencies modify the weather in the United States, and in other



countries. These programs could clearly be negatively affecting the weather in the United States and exacerbating global climate change.

The December 2005 Popular Science Magazine discussed a plan to use an oil slick to stop hurricanes without noting the adverse environmental impacts of the oil used to cover the ocean. Popular Science also noted that a private company, Dyn-O-Mat had been conducting "...early trials. In July 2001, Dyn-O-Mat engineers dumped 8,000 pounds of their Dyn-O-Mat Gel (capable of absorbing 4,000 tons of water), over a small thunderstorm near the Florida coast. Within minutes the storm disappeared from Doppler weather radar..." When this toxic secret chemical drops into the ocean or over land what are the environmental effects? Who is studying what happens to marine life, crops, soils, and drinking water supplies when this chemical mixes with rainfall on the ground?

According to Popular Science "...Dyn-O-Mat's founder and CEO, has already arranged to lease a specially rigged 747 "supertanker" to conduct trials on actual hurricanes. Meanwhile, he has assembled an all-star team of scientists and labs at Florida State University, the National Center for Atmospheric Research, NOAA, and elsewhere to begin running computer models that analyze the gel's effect on larger storms...'We already know the gel works', says Cordani...'Now we need to figure out how much to use and where to put it'..." Could hurricane and other experiments be causing drought in Georgia and other states in 2007? Since the public is not informed, and Congress has no oversight powers, the public is being kept in the dark about dates and results

of these experiments leaving many unanswered questions.

Alaska and other areas across the United States are beginning to feel the impacts of climate change. Enormous changes are being seen in the declining health of native plant and tree communities in many areas across. Climate shifts are being recorded everywhere. In the last few years abnormal rainfall and droughts have been occurring on a more dramatic basis and few are asking questions about current and ongoing experimental weather modification programs that may be exacerbating these problems.

The answer seems to be that these bills will just be passed to “mitigate” (no definition of this word in the bill), current problems. If we are creating these problems with current weather modification endeavors then how can we correct this problem by adding more programs? Wouldn't it be better to account for all of the experimental weather modification programs, and atmospheric heating and testing programs, and study their synergistic effects, affects on trees, micro-climates, and agriculture before deciding to implement more experimental weather modification programs? If these programs change growing seasons, disrupt photosynthesis, and interrupt the pollination process, crop losses could be substantial, exacerbating economic agriculture instability.

A Weather Damage Modification Program conducted by the Bureau of Reclamation, according to this bill, does not evaluate the negative impacts to agriculture, water supplies, or micro-climates in counties or states

surrounding experimental weather modification programs. Thus, their models are flawed. U.S. Senate Bill 1807, Section 4 – Definition (3) declares that “...investigative findings and theories of a scientific or technical nature...” will be turned into “...practical applications for experimental and demonstration purposes, including the experimental production and testing of models, devices, equipment, material and processes”. Does this include toxic chemicals or atmospheric heating and testing experiment chemicals?”

NASA noted in an October 2005 newsletter that increasingly persistent contrails forming man-made clouds and haze are “...trapping warmth in the atmosphere and exacerbating global warming...” NASA goes on to note that: “...Any increase in global cloud cover will contribute to long-term changes in Earth’s climate. Likewise, any change in Earth’s climate may have effects on natural resources...” U.S. Senate Bill 1807 does not address this issue or issues regarding Global Dimming (NOVA PBS 2006), or consider them in any models. Thus, the bill has built-in flaws.

Weather modification companies, private corporations, scientists, and universities are lobbying hard for this bill to pass because they see our tax dollars going to them for these projects until at least the year 2017, prescribed in this bill. No doubt amendments will be submitted by private corporations to elected officials as part of their Congressional lobbying efforts. The public is not invited to attend or be represented in any manner.

Priorities in the bill are funding, training and

support for scientists, participation in international efforts, and research and development. Note that research related to potential adverse affects of weather mitigation is also in this bill but the bill does not specify agriculture, micro-climate damage, crop losses, drought or flood inducement, or chemical toxicity from these types of experimental weather modification programs. Our micro-climates and food production (the livelihoods of thousands of people who are in the agriculture business) are to be used as guinea pigs without warning, prior notification, public oversight or input. And if crops our damaged, our grasslands in drought or floods, who is responsible for these disasters when they are man-made by experimental weather modification (mitigation), programs? The agriculture industry will suffer staggering losses and food prices will skyrocket due to these losses, food shortages will increase... while we import more and more contaminated food from countries like China. This bill does not protect the public.

The bill will require a description of “...any potential adverse consequences on life, property, or water resource availability form weather mitigation efforts, and any suggested means of mitigation or reducing such consequences if such efforts are undertaken...” However, we have over sixty-six current and ongoing programs, why won’t they be assessed first to address environmental and agriculture problems well in advance of any additional experiments? The bill does not state that any public hearings will be held in advance of any experiments or that the public will be notified when these programs are to take place or what

means of mitigation for adverse consequences will be in place. In addition, this bill does not address compensation for losses due to this experimentation.

Since the first report on this bill is not due until January 31st, in the second calendar year following the date of the enactment of this Act, but if passed, this plan will be implemented not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act. This means a huge gap where no public oversight, congressional oversight, public debate and hearings, or any other method of oversight will be required. And with the public excluded from any participation to protect water, agriculture, forest, natural resources, and other public interests from questionable experiments, the programs will be implemented without proper protection for these interests.

Atmospheric experiments, the Alaska H.A.A.R.P. program, military experiments on weather modification, like those being undertaken at Elgin Air Force Base, and elsewhere, are not listed as being part of this bill. In 2004, The Science Channel, for a special television program titled "Owing the Weather", conducted an interview with J. Gregory Glenn, a Research Scientist at Elgin Air Force Base in Florida, where "...Air Force weapons researchers and nano particles specialists are conducting weather control experiments..." Thus, the public will be subject to these experiments with no Congressional or public oversight. And your local insurance company and other private corporations will continue "mitigating" for private profit at your expense.

We know today, and most weather

modification companies, will tell you, that weather modification works. They can't always control the results but we do know they work or may have unintended consequences or have been used in other ways. In the 2004, Science Channel Program "Owning the Weather", are the following statements on "Project Popeye": "...Though they had denied it for more than seven years (until Seymour Hersh of the New York Times broke the story), the U.S. Military had been using weather modification as a weapon in Vietnam and Laos. Starting in 1966, the United States Air Force had made over 2,600 top-secret cloud seeding flights. Codenamed "Project Popeye", this clandestine operation attempted to turn key enemy transport roads to mud, rendering them impassable...As a result of the uproar over Project Popeye, on the 10th of December 1976, the United Nations passed General Assembly Resolution 3172. It explicitly banned the use of weather modification in warfare..." Other U.S. hurricane clouds seeding projects have also been classified, until years later, due to the devastating results of these experiments and fear of lawsuits.

Now, Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison (Texas), and Congressman Mark Udall (Colorado), have reintroduced similar bills for passage this year. Once again it is time to act to protect our natural resources, our soil, water, agricultural micro-climates, and crops from unknown types weather modification experimentation. In addition, they have ignored addressing issues raised in a December 13, 2005, letter to Senator Hutchison from John H. Marburger III, Director, Office of Science and Technology Policy, Washington, D.C. which states in part:

“...there is a host of issues—including liability, foreign policy, and national security concerns--that arose in the past and should be adequately considered before the U.S. government undertakes the coordinated national research program this legislation would require...” These include but are not limited to “...Department of Justice on legal issues, with the Department of State on foreign policy implications, with the Department of Defense and State on national security implications, and with pertinent research agencies to consider the reasons the U.S. Government previously halted its work in this area...”

Mr. Marburger’s letter went on to define some local, political and legal ramifications, national Security Implications, and Research issues which included: 1) Weather modification may promote rain in one area to the detriment of another; 2) These legal and liability issues pertaining to weather modification (now mitigation), and the potential adverse consequences on life, property, and water resource availability resulting from weather modification activities, must be considered fully before the U.S. government could take responsibility for this new research program: 3) Given Global weather patterns, whether one country “owns” its weather so as to assert intra-border control with extra-border consequences, must be considered under present international conventions...”



Senator Hutchison and Congressman Udall did not address any to these issues in the text of their legislation. Thus, it is believed that they both ignored the issues not only brought forward by the public but by the Office of Science and Technology. Also missing from this bill are references to various U.S. Patents that discuss weather modification methods through the use of atmospheric chemicals, ionospheric modification and testing, how satellites can be used to change the weather, and space based weather modification satellites. The range of patents and geoengineering schemes to modify the weather are staggering in number and scope. And this bill does not address any of these issues or the myriad of geoengineering schemes now in use or proposed for the future that will modify our weather.

***Never Miss
Another BIG
Story***

Please contact all of your elected local, state and federal officials to stop this bill in its present form. This bill needs to have appropriate agriculture and public oversight, with public hearings included, prior to any more experimental projects. We need a national dialogue on this subject before more experimentation takes place. Concerned grassroots citizens are involved in this educational protest movement to protect agriculture from unwise experimental weather

modification programs. "We, the people, simply will not accept this reckless experimenting on our weather and are fighting the passage of this bill in order to protect agricultural crop production and our water supplies."

Associated Reference Articles:

- 1, "Weather Mitigation Research and Development Policy Authorization Act," [U.S. House Bill 3345 Full Text](#): [U.S. Senate Bill 1807 Full Text](#):
- 2, [Other Related Articles](#):
- 3, [NOAA Project StormFury 20-Year History](#):
- 4, www.asp.bnl.gov/
- 5, [Scientists Excited for Wyoming Cloud-Seeding](#)
- 6, [Contrail ID Chart](#), pdf
- 7, Weather Modification, Inc. Home page, [Atmospheric Research, Aircraft Modification, and Cloud Seeding Website](#): (WMI February 2007 Discovery Channel Program: Krauss: "... The demands for fresh water are increasing. People think nothing of drilling wells and extracting ground water. Well, now we are trying to use modern technology to extract water that goes unused in this river of water vapor that is passing over us each second of the day. A lot of people don't realize that California has been conducting wintertime cloud seeding for almost fifty years to supply the increasing demand for water (and power) in California..." Krauss speaks WMI just using unused water vapor. However, that water vapor would have a final destination as rain or snow somewhere else, in another county or state, if not artificially interfered with by chemicals. When you deliberately put more snow in the Wyoming mountains (December 2005-

February 2006), you deprive another area of the rain or moisture that would normally fall in other areas. Thus, more snow in the Wyoming mountains may cause drought in surrounding counties or states. What legal right do we have to modify the weather and deprive other areas of that so-called "unused water vapor" that could alleviate droughts or keep our agriculture micro-climates intact? (Also note that weather modification companies have a financial investment in promoting experimental weather modification programs and would see nothing wrong with implementing those programs.)

8, NOVA "[Dimming the Sun](#)" April 2006, and [[Read](#)]

9, [Global Dimming](#):

10, November 20, 2006: "[NASA plans to block out the Sun](#)"

11, May 3, 2006: "[Blocking Out the Sun](#)"

Peterson - Could the H.A.A.R.P. Project in Alaska, NOAA, DOE, NASA, Air Force, Department of Defense, etc., be the reason for climate changes that have been escalating since the late 1980s, when the funds and technology allowed for the escalation of atmospheric heating and testing programs like NASA's TMA Night Cloud tests using trimethylaluminum or the advanced testing of military weapons systems like star wars?

12, [Night Clouds Atmospheric Testing Program](#):

13, [U.S. Weather Modification Patents & Weather Modification Method](#):

14, [Use of artificial satellites in earth orbits adaptively to modify the effect that solar radiation would otherwise have on earth's weather-1998](#):

15, [Weather modification by artificial satellites 1999](#)

16, [Combustible compositions for generating aerosols, particularly suitable for cloud modification and weather control and aerosolization process](#) 1977

17, [Method and composition for precipitation of atmospheric water](#) 1994

18, [Method and apparatus for altering a region in the earth's atmosphere, ionosphere, and/or magnetosphere](#) 1987, * Bridget Conroy, from Arizona, and Rosalind Peterson, from California, are co-founders of the Agriculture Defense Coalition. They joined together in October 2005, to fight a similar experimental weather modification bill that was introduced in 2005. Thanks to their dedication and hard work in bringing this to the public's attention, organizing rallies, with lots of help from local individuals and groups in several states, many people across the United States contacted their elected representatives, and these bills were not passed in 2006. They have mobilized again to fight this new threat to agriculture and natural resources. [Contacts](#). [[Read](#)] [[Read](#)]

© 2007 Rosalind Peterson - All Rights Reserved

[Sign Up For Free E-Mail Alerts](#)

E-Mails are used strictly for NWVs alerts, not for sale

In 1995, Rosalind, now retired, became a certified California United State Department of Agriculture (USDA) Farm Service Agency Agriculture Crop Loss Adjustor working in more than ten counties throughout California. Rosalind has a BA degree from Sonoma State University in Environmental Studies &

Planning (ENSP), with emphasis on using solar power, photosynthesis, agriculture, and crop production.

Between 1989 and 1993 Rosalind worked as an Agricultural Technologist for the Mendocino County Department of Agriculture. After leaving Mendocino County she took a position with the USDA Farm Service Agency as a Program Assistant in Mendocino, Sonoma, and the Salinas County Offices, where she worked until becoming certified as a crop loss adjustor for the State.

E-Mail: info@californiaskywatch.com

Home

