

Wahrheit's

In this issue, we will be discussing the H.A.A.R.P. project. Not enough research has been done on the effects of this machine on the human race. People need to see for themselves what this is capable of doing.

tech brief

issue #2 fall 2010

We explore subjects related to improving the human condition and expose projects which we believe are risky and unnecessary. This essay is about some of the science being developed and contemplated by military planners and others which could profoundly effect our

lives. The intent of this essay is to focus discussion on these new systems by bringing them into the light of day.

Is it possible to trigger earthquakes, volcanic eruptions or weather changes by man-made activities? Is it possible to create and direct balls

of energy at lightning speeds, to destroy an enemy? Is it possible to manipulate the behavior, and even the memories, of people using specialized technologies? The United States military and others believe that this is the case. Many of these systems are well

on their way to being



used in the battlefield.

There are many new technologies being explored that will cause

people to experience artificial memories, delusions and physical problems. These new technologies are being designed to minimize death (although death is possible) and to be virtually undetectable.

Many of these new weapons are being called "non-lethal" in terms of their effect on people.



Zapping the Adversary

A report on non-lethal technologies, issued by the Council on Foreign Relations points out that, "The Nairobi Convention, to which the United States is a signatory, prohibits the broadcast of electronic signals into a sovereign state without its consent in peacetime.

This report opens discussion of the use of these weapons against terrorists and drug traffickers. The CFR report recommends that this be done secretly so that the victims do not know where the attack is from, or if there even is an attack. There is a problem with this approach. The use of these weapons, even against these kinds of individuals, may be in violation of United States law in that it presumes guilt rather than innocence. In other words the police, CIA, DEA or other enforcement organization

becomes the judge, jury and executioner.

A document by a Captain Paul Tyler looks at the debate between classical theories and recent research. There is a gulf of conflict between these two schools of thought. The debate centers on the classical idea that only ionizing radiation (that which generates heat in tissue) can cause reactions in the body, while new research indicates that subtle, small, amounts of energy can cause reactions as well. What Tyler wrote in 1984, as an officer in the Air Force, puts the debate simply. He said,

"Even though the body is basically an electrochemical system, modern science has almost exclusively studied the chemical aspects of the body and to date has largely neglected the electrical aspects. However, over the past decade, researchers have devised many mathematical models to approximate the internal fields in animals and humans. Some of the later models have shown general agreement with experimental measurements made with the phantom models and animals. Presently most scientists in the field use the concept of specific absorption rate for determining the Dosimetry (dosages) of electromagnetic radiation. Specific absorption rate is the intensity of the internal electric field or quantity of energy absorbed... However, the use of these classical concepts of electrodynamics does not explain some

experimental results and clinical findings. For example, according to classical physics, the frequency of visible light would indicate that it is reflected or totally absorbed within the first few millimeters of tissue and thus no light should pass through significant amounts of tissue. But it does. Also, classical theory indicates that the body should be completely invisible to extremely low frequencies of light where a single wavelength is thousands of miles long. However, visible light has been used in clinical medicine to transilluminate various body tissues."

In other words, the classical theories are partially wrong in that they do not fully explain all of the reactions which are observed in the body. The Navy has abstracted over a thousand international professional papers by private and government scientists which explore these issues.

Tyler continues,

"A second area where classical theory fails to provide an adequate explanation for observed effects is in the clinical use of extremely low frequency (ELF) electromagnetic fields. Researchers have found that pulsed external magnetic fields at frequencies below 100 Hertz (pulses/cycles per second) will stimulate the healing of nonunion



fractures, congenital pseudarthroses, and failed - arthroses. The effects of these pulsed magnetic fields have been extremely impressive, and their use in orthopedic conditions has been approved by the Food and Drug Administration."

Even the FDA, one of the most vigorous regulatory authorities in the country, accepts these non-thermal effects. Tyler adds,

"Recently, pulsed electromagnetic fields have been reported to induce cellular transcription (this has to do with the duplication or copying of information from DNA, a process important to life). At the other end of the non ionizing spectrum, research reports are also showing biological effects that are not predicted in classical theories. For example, Kremer and others have published several papers showing that low intensity millimeter waves produce biological effects. They have also shown that not only are the effects seen at very low power, but they are also frequency-specific."

Tyler goes on to discuss the results of this new thinking and the possible effects of these low energy radiations in terms of information transfer and storage, and their effects on the nervous system. Research has shown that very specific frequencies cause very specific reactions, and, once a critical threshold is passed, negative reactions occur.

Manipulating the Environment:

There has been a good deal of speculation about the possibilities of creating artificial weather and of controlling the weather. This is not new and has been the subject of on-going military research for decades. Moreover, in 1976 the United States signed international treaties calling for a ban on "geophysical warfare".

The use of new weapons is not limited to governments and sophisticated science laboratories. In April, 1997, the United States Secretary of Defense, William Cohen made the following comment:

"Others are engaging even in an eco-type of terrorism whereby they can alter climate, set off earthquakes, volcanoes remotely through the use of electromagnetic waves."

This is not new either but has its roots in 1960-70's era research by American scientists and continues to appear in numerous articles and reports. The idea of creating artificial weather including cyclones is being explored. In a recent article in the Wall Street Journal it was reported that "a Malaysian company, BioCure Sdn. Bhd., will sign a memorandum of understanding soon with a government-owned Russian party to produce the Cyclone. The deal with the Russians was set up so that if the technology did not work the Malaysians did not have to pay for the attempt. There have been other reports of Russian research into this area.

As technology advances, the ability to control populations and manipulate outcomes also advances. Because we know how to control the weather, create earthquakes, force behavioral changes and manipulate the physiology of people does not mean that we should do it. The age we are in requires even greater safeguards of personal freedoms, not further constraints upon it. If freedom is what is being defended than freedom is what must be inherent in the actions our governments take in creating aspects of our reality.



The transparency of government - the idea that we should be able to look into our government and see clearly the values of the population reflected there is an absolute expectation. Are there risks in transparent government? Yes, an open society necessitates that certain risks be taken.