

CIA Is Funding Government-Led Chemtrail Project: Spy Agency to Help Study “Security Impacts” of Geo-engineering

By [Steve Watson](#)

Global Research, July 20, 2013
infowars.com

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Environment](#), [Intelligence](#), [Science and Medicine](#)

The CIA is funding a scientific study to determine the feasibility of altering the planet’s climate in order to stave off climate change, according to documents released by The National Academy of Sciences.

[The papers](#) reveal that the project will run for 21 months at a cost of \$630,000, with a final report due in 2014. The CIA backed scientists will study how weather patterns could be influenced and altered, and assess the potential impacts of geo-engineering attempts.

The NAS [website](#) notes that the funding for the study is coming from “the US intelligence community”. William Kearney, a spokesman for NAS, told [Mother Jones](#) that the agency in question is the CIA.

The revelations mark the first time that an intelligence agency has publicly funded such a study.

A CIA spokesman would not confirm that the agency was involved, yet stated that “It’s natural that on a subject like climate change the Agency would work with scientists to better understand the phenomenon and its implications on national security.”

It seems that the CIA has outsourced its geo-engineering studies following the apparent closure of its own research center on climate change and national security in 2012. The move came following criticism from Republican members of Congress who said that the intelligence community should not be spending time researching weather modification.

The NAS website states that the study will encompass a “technical evaluation of a limited number of proposed geoengineering techniques.” A prominent technique that will be evaluated, according to the papers, is “solar radiation management”, which involves spraying aerosol particles into the stratosphere to reflect sunlight away from the planet - in other words chemtrailing.

The study will also look into “carbon dioxide removal (CDR)”, which involves sucking carbon out of the air via chemical reactions or porous nanosponges. Of course, Carbon Dioxide is fundamental to all life on Earth, so “sucking it out of the air” could come with dire consequences.

The study is also being backed by two other government agencies - NASA and the National

Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

Reporting on the project, [The New Scientist](#) stresses that CIA involvement in weather modification should not be seen as sinister.

“In fact, the CIA’s main interest in geoengineering does not lie in any offensive use. Rather, the US intelligence community sees climate change as a potential threat to global geopolitical stability, and so wants a thorough analysis of the mitigation options.” the report states.

Critics will balk at such a naive statement, given the history the CIA has for covertly subverting and overthrowing foreign governments that it does not approve of, and doing anything but securing geopolitical stability.

Weather weapons have existed for decades, with research on such offensive techniques dating back to the 1950s. In 1997, U.S. Defense Secretary William Cohen admitted that weather modification techniques had [been actively used by governments for over 15 years](#). The US military has been using weather modification techniques since the Vietnam war.

One need only look up at the sky to confirm that our governments, at the behest of think tanks, ‘research’ groups, and radical environmental organisations, are *already* engaging in these type of programs. Our skies are riddled with artificial clouds, that are patently not merely the contrails of standard air planes.

Indeed, as we reported last year, a Harvard University project experiment funded by Microsoft founder Bill Gates saw thousands of tonnes of sulphur particles sprayed over New Mexico as part of a geoengineering study, despite the fact that even staunch environmentalists have [warned the process could have catastrophic effects on the earth’s eco-system](#).

This is just one example of a practice that has now been in operation for years, if not decades.

Groups such as the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) [meet routinely](#) to discuss ongoing geoengineering programs, specifically the spraying of aerosols into the atmosphere.

Levels of aluminium, barium and strontium in our air, water and soil have exponentially increased, leading many to conclude that these are the after effects of radical geoengineering programs that are already in operation.

A further study last year revealed that the cost of a massive program to spray sun-dimming particles into the upper atmosphere would be around [\\$5 billion dollars a year](#). However, the study conducted by U.S. scientists writing in the journal *Environmental Research Letters* completely failed to analyze whether such a massive geoengineering program would be a good idea and what environmental consequences it would have.

A similar Carnegie Institution for Science proposal also recently advocated spraying the upper atmosphere with aerosols, a process that would “reduce by 20 per cent the amount of sunlight that takes a direct route to the ground” and make blue skies “fade to hazy white,” [the New Scientist reported](#).

Given the fact that most advancements in science and technology are already taking place years before they are disclosed to the public, it stands to reason that geoengineering programs based around spraying the upper atmosphere with particles are already underway.

Scientists now admit that vapor trails from airplanes are creating “artificial clouds” that block out the sun. This is no longer a matter of debate. The chemtrail “conspiracy theorists,” who were ridiculed for pointing out that from the mid-90’s onwards contrails from jet planes were lingering for hours and forming artificial clouds, have been proven correct.

Reading University’s Professor Keith Shine [told the Daily Mail](#) that the clouds “formed by aircraft fumes could linger ‘for hours’, depriving those areas under busy flight paths, such as London and the Home Counties, of summer sunshine.”

The report also makes reference to a 2009 Met Office study which found that high-level winds did not disperse contrails that later formed into clouds which covered an astonishing 20,000 miles.

As we have documented, geoengineering programs based around the premise of artificial aerosols were already in operation years ago, including at the [U.S. Department of Energy’s \(DOE\) Savannah River National Laboratory](#) in Aiken, S.C, which in 2009 began conducting studies which involved shooting huge amounts of particulate matter, in this case “porous-walled glass microspheres,” into the stratosphere.

Another program under the [Department of Energy’s Atmospheric Science Program](#) is directed towards, “developing comprehensive understanding of the atmospheric processes that control the transport, transformation, and fate of energy related trace chemicals and particulate matter.”

The DOE website states that, “The current focus of the program is aerosol radiative forcing of climate: aerosol formation and evolution and aerosol properties that affect direct and indirect influences on climate and climate change.”

These programs are already having the effect of blocking out sunlight. The emergence of the chemtrails phenomenon coincided with an average [22% drop in sunlight](#) reaching the earth’s surface.

In 2008, [a KSLA news investigation](#) found that a substance that fell to earth from a high altitude chemtrail contained high levels of Barium (6.8 ppm) and Lead (8.2 ppm) as well as trace amounts of other chemicals including arsenic, chromium, cadmium, selenium and silver. Of these, all but one are metals, some are toxic while several are rarely or never found in nature.

The newscast focuses on Barium, which its research shows is a “hallmark of chemtrails.” KSLA found Barium levels in its samples at 6.8 ppm or “more than six times the toxic level set by the EPA.” The Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality confirmed that the high levels of Barium were “very unusual,” but commented that “proving the source was a whole other matter” in its discussion with KSLA.

KSLA also asked Mark Ryan, Director of the Poison Control Center, about the effects of Barium on the human body. Ryan commented that “short term exposure can lead to anything from stomach to chest pains and that long term exposure causes blood pressure

problems.” The Poison Control Center further reported that long-term exposure, as with any harmful substance, would contribute to weakening the immune system.

Spraying sulphur into the upper atmosphere is linked with both environmental catastrophes and human health problems.

The following health effects are linked with exposure to sulphur.

- Neurological effects and behavioral changes
- Disturbance of blood circulation
- Heart damage
- Effects on eyes and eyesight
- Reproductive failure
- Damage to immune systems
- Stomach and gastrointestinal disorder
- Damage to liver and kidney functions
- Hearing defects
- Disturbance of the hormonal metabolism
- Dermatological effects
- Suffocation and lung embolism

Even pro-geoengineering scientist Mark Watson, admits that injecting sulphur into the atmosphere could lead to “acid rain, ozone depletion or weather pattern disruption.”

Rutgers University meteorologist Alan Robock also, “created computer simulations indicating that sulfate clouds could potentially weaken the Asian and African summer monsoons, reducing rain that irrigates the food crops of billions of people.”

“Imagine if we triggered a drought and famine while trying to cool the planet,” Robock told a geoengineering conference in 2010.

The Canada-based Action Group on Erosion, Technology and Concentration (ETC) has called for such experiments to be shut down. “This experiment is only phase one of a much bigger plan that could have devastating consequences, including large changes in weather patterns such as deadly droughts,” the group said in a written statement.

Fred Singer, president of the Science Environmental Policy Project and a skeptic of man-made global warming theories, warns that the consequences of tinkering with the planet’s delicate eco-system could have far-reaching dangers.

“If you do this on a continuous basis, you would depress the ozone layer and cause all kinds of other problems that people would rather avoid,” said Singer.

Even Greenpeace’s chief UK scientist – a staunch advocate of the man-made global warming explanation – Doug Parr – has slammed attempts to geoengineer the planet as “outlandish” and “dangerous”.

Steve Watson is the London based writer and editor for Alex Jones’ Infowars.com, and Prisonplanet.com. He has a Masters Degree in International Relations from the School of Politics at The University of Nottingham, and a Bachelor Of Arts Degree in Literature and Creative Writing from Nottingham Trent University.

The original source of this article is Infowars.com
Copyright © Steve Watson, Infowars.com, 2013

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Steve Watson](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca