

5 Reasons We Should Not Ignore Chemtrails on Earth Day

By Robert O'Leary J.D., BARA



In this article, I will be discussing 5 reasons why Earth Day and chemtrails/geoengineering *go together* and that each Earth Day should include education and development of strategies around this issue.

The fact that the date for the **International March Against Chemtrails** [See <https://globalmarchagainstchemtrailsandgeoengineering.com/events.html>] this year occurs the weekend after Earth Day seems to me to be very appropriate. If geoengineering/chemtrail activists are right, that a toxic chemical cocktail is being allowed to rain down upon us, then this phenomenon not only affects our air, but also our land and seas.

1. Earth Day is about protecting our Air, Land & Sea:

Since geoengineering/chemtrails are in the air, land and sea, it follows that it would then become part of the ecosystem and the circle of life – running through and potentially affecting all the creatures on Earth. Each of the alleged chemicals inside, among them reportedly aluminum, barium and strontium, each have their toxic levels.

In Europe, they have something called the “Precautionary Principle” which goes as follows: “The Precautionary Principle is a guiding framework for decision-making that anticipates how our actions will affect the environment and health of future generations. The Principle emphasizes public participation and stakeholder collaboration in long-term environmental health and ecological policies and programs.” It is said to be “a paradigm shift in decision-making [and aims to] prevent irreversible damage to people and nature. See <https://www.environmentalcommons.org/precaution.html> There are said to be Five Key Elements within the Precautionary Principle, as follows:

1. Anticipatory Action: There is a duty to take anticipatory action to prevent harm. Government, business, and community groups, as well as the general public, share this responsibility.

2. Right to Know: The community has a right to know complete and accurate information on potential human health and environmental impacts associated with the selection of products, services, operations, or plans. The burden to supply this information lies with the proponent, not with the general public.

3. Alternatives Assessment: An obligation exists to examine a full range of alternatives and select the alternative with the least potential impact on human health and the environment, including the alternative of doing nothing.

4. Full Cost Accounting: When evaluating potential alternatives, there is a duty to consider all the reasonably foreseeable costs, including raw materials, manufacturing, transportation, use, cleanup, eventual disposal, and health costs even if such costs are not reflected in the initial price. Short and long-term benefits and time thresholds should be considered when making decisions.

5. Participatory Decision Process: Decisions applying the Precautionary Principle must be transparent, participatory, and informed by the best available science and other relevant information. This principle is why GMOs are not allowed in many EU countries. So, they are not taking any chances while the science figures out and verifies how GMOs are really affecting us. See <https://www.environmentalcommons.org/precaution.html>

While our authorities, like the FDA & CDC, seem to prefer to patent, license, and then approve new chemicals and medicines – sometimes over their own scientists' objections – just to have $\frac{1}{2}$ of them recalled within 5 years, we would do well to do the prudent thing and actually exercise this principle around GMOs...and chemtrails.

On Earth Day, we talk about the health of the environment. So anything that potentially affects the environment must perforce be discussed and shared with others. Earth Day also encourages us to motivate others, including our leaders, to do proactive things for the environment.

So, if we are to be precautionary, prudent and honor Earth Day's full educational and advocacy potential, we need to bring chemtrails and geoengineering into the discussion each Earth Day.

If you are interested in taking part in the International March Against Chemtrails, on April 25, 2015, you can check out the [link](https://globalmarchagainstchemtrailsandgeoengineering.com/events.html) at <https://globalmarchagainstchemtrailsandgeoengineering.com/events.html> for a march taking place near you.

2. Aluminum Hurts Our Plants & Trees:

According to the website, www.spectrumanalytic.com, "[e]xcess soluble/available aluminum (Al⁺⁺⁺) is toxic to plants and causes multiple other problems. Some of the more important problems include...

- Direct toxicity, primarily seen as stunted roots
- Reduces the availability of phosphorus (P), through the formation of Al-P compounds
- Reduces the availability of sulfur (S), through the formation of Al-S compounds
- Reduces the availability of other nutrient cations through competitive interaction

The primary damage caused by excess Al^{+++} is in damage to plant roots, as seen in these wheat seedlings. Diagnosing this type of damage requires that growers inspect the root systems of their crops or other plants. Of course, when plants have damaged root systems, many other above-ground symptoms are likely. One of the most common will be P-deficiency. However, since Al-toxicity occurs in strongly acid soils, plants may also exhibit deficiency symptoms of calcium (Ca), magnesium (Mg), or other nutrients. They might also show symptoms of manganese (Mn) toxicity, which is common when the soil pH is too low. Finally, poor root development reduces the plants ability to absorb water. Plant problems that damage the roots are difficult to diagnose with leaf analysis. This is because the uptake of these toxins is somewhat self-limiting, due to the root damage that they cause. This is most common with Al and copper (Cu) toxicities.

https://www.spectrumanalytic.com/support/library/ff/Soil_Aluminum_and_test_interpretation.htm

In addition, the website, www.compleatpatriop.blogspot.com, tells us that:

Artificial weather modification through the use of chemicals can impact us by reducing water supplies, causing dry snows, less rainfall, changing agricultural crop production cycles, reducing crop production, and water availability. Since most experimental weather modification programs use chemicals released into the atmosphere the public could be subjected increasingly toxic or unknown substances that could adversely impact agricultural crops and trees, not to

mention our personal health. Global dimming and persistent contrails and chemtrails that produce man-made clouds, may have serious impacts on crop production, trees in our forests, and our trees on our private property, and Idaho's Whitebark Pine. The dead and dying trees all around us are being attacked by beetles, and we have a tinder box sitting waiting for the lightning strike to ignite and off she burns. I wonder at the governments answer all the time, well huh, it's the beetles, and lack of moisture. Well did any of you brilliant government stooges do any soil testing for chemicals, like barium and or other chemical man made agents, gather some ring samples maybe, how about a water sample in these area's. Never mind, I think I will get some samples myself for my own documentation, never needed you guys any way. See "The chemtrails are killing the trees", October 31, 2009. <https://compleatpatriot.blogspot.com/2009/10/chemtrails-are-killing-trees.html>

Not only have whistleblowers, like Kristen Meghan, testified to the fact that aluminum, barium, and strontium are in the chemtrails (based on ingredients she saw in military documentation and based upon testing of soil samples), certain weathermen have stated that what they called "chaff" was coming out of commercial airlines with had aluminum in them [See <https://www.geoengineeringwatch.org/tv-weatherman-exposes-covert-aerosol-chaff-program-covert-geoengineering/> and <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ev1Z67pXCxA#t=56> and <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bvPZ4Ed5LrE>].

Too much aluminum in soil, as you might suspect, changes the chemical properties of soil. In fact, some experts tell us that it makes it very hard to grow things. Interestingly and one might say suspiciously, Monsanto reportedly has had (for years) GMO seed varieties that can grow despite the high presence of aluminum in soil.

For those of us who wish to plant seeds as God/Source/Our Creator intended, aluminum coming down from planes on to our farmland and gardens is harmful to our future as it would be likely to affect our food supply – which is already being affected by neonicotinoids (affecting bees and butterflies – our pollinators); leaving us to pay Monsanto exorbitant prices every year for the only seeds that work – seeds that may have the same glyphosate treatment that the WHO [not the cool rock group celebrating 50 years this year (rock on, guys, I love ya!) but the World Health Organization] just declared is “probably carcinogenic”.

So, this issue could be one of the most important of our time and Earth Day is a great time to begin the discussion.

3. Reducing Our Carbon Footprint:

Another issue at the heart of Earth Day is reducing our so-called carbon footprint. The day is used to educate and advocate for cleaner burning fuels and alternative energy methods. This is a great opportunity for people try out new and neat scientific ideas to bring us the energy we need more consciously, effectively and safely.

And certainly there is a lot of debate over whether there is global warming or not. There are most certainly vested interests on either side. There are companies that wish to save money and the politicians they pay to say that there is no problem. Then there are people (and their advocates) on the other side that have money invested in the carbon tax or cap-and-trade initiatives; and hope that they will make big profits from them.

The rest of us, who are not getting paid now or in the future, would probably agree that there should be adequate safety emissions safeguards on all factories and that we should explore alternatives so that we do not put all our eggs in one basket. Investment of this sort also allows us to reduce our

reliance on foreign oil companies who, we all can probably agree, seem to set gas prices on a whim and do not care about us, but just about our money.

Factories are in our towns and cities. They could be near our homes, our children's' school or playgrounds so we would be fools not to want to keep our air as clean as possible for our generation and future generations.

If we can all agree that too many toxic emissions are bad, then it is not so hard to appreciate the concerns of advocates in the chemtrail/geoengineering effort. Imagine having the perfect balance of laws and regulations to get the perfect compromise of business need **and** public safety in our factories, but still having other toxic chemicals raining down from us every day or every other day before a rain storm?

4. It's happening in your neighborhood without your permission

Aside from chemtrails potentially causing potential harm to our health, the notion of having things enter our property without our permission or a law permitting it can give rise to what is called a "nuisance" (and no we are not talking about an annoying neighbor). Wikipedia.org has this to say about the *Law of Nuisance*:

Nuisance in English law is an area of tort law broadly divided into two torts; private nuisance, where the actions of the defendant are "causing a substantial and unreasonable interference with a [claimant]'s land or his use or enjoyment of that land",[1] and public nuisance, where the defendant's actions "materially affects the reasonable comfort and convenience of life of a class of Her Majesty's subjects";[2] public nuisance is also a crime. Both torts have been present from the time of Henry III, being affected by a variety of philosophical shifts through the years which saw them become first looser and then far more stringent and

less protecting of an individual's rights. Each tort requires the claimant to prove that the defendant's actions caused interference, which was unreasonable, and in some situations the intention of the defendant may also be taken into account. A significant difference is that private nuisance does not allow a claimant to claim for any personal injury suffered, while public nuisance does.

Private nuisance has received a range of criticism, with academics arguing that its concepts are poorly defined and open to judicial manipulation; Conor Gearty has written that "Private nuisance has, if anything, become even more confused and confusing. Its chapter lies neglected in the standard works, little changed over the years, its modest message overwhelmed by the excitements to be found elsewhere in tort. Any sense of direction which may have existed in the old days is long gone".[3] In addition, it has been claimed that the tort of private nuisance has "lost its separate identity as a strict liability tort and been assimilated in all but name into the fault-based tort of negligence",[4] and that private and public nuisance "have little in common except the accident of sharing the same name".[3] See "Nuisance", [_https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nuisance_in_English_law](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nuisance_in_English_law)

This generally means that if you constructed a catapult in your backyard, put trash bags in it and ejected the family's trash into a neighbor's yard, they could sue you for you having caused a nuisance. Because of this we have zoning laws and ordinances to ensure that there is some public oversight over where our government and companies put a toxic dump or factory. Quite often there will be public meetings, with mandatory postings of date and time, providing you with opportunities to make your voice heard.

A rather shocking recent video, dated January 25, 2015 by Joe Wayne, shows that, apparently, geoengineering companies such as Geoengineers, Inc. and Parametrics have been hired at least

as far back as 1997 (in one community) and as recently as 2007 (in another community), to do some sort of geoengineering work. While we cannot be sure of the specifics of what type of work was being commissioned, it was obvious that geoengineering contracts were being made with these companies. It seemed that these were not meetings in which the county leaders made sure the public could participate.

Check out the video, entitled "Huge Breaking News...DEATH FROM ABOVE County Commissioners Ordering & Paying For Geoengineering", by Joe Wayne, at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sxPxlzTi9ts>

The investigator makes the valuable point that this work is being done by our public servants with our tax money. If these contractors are doing work having to do with dropping toxic chemicals upon us, then we are actually paying public servants to wage a biochemical and biological warfare upon us. For more about this, see my article "How Do We Erase Chemtrails from Our Sacred Skies" at <https://consciouslifeneeds.com/better-job-erasing-chemtrails-sacred-skies/1178827/>

At the very least, we should all delve into this more, call our county (or if you do not have a county government, then a state) government councils and check out meeting minutes to see about references to geoengineers. Then, ask what these contracts regarded and if you can see those them and judge for yourself. Then share it with other so that we can further the public discussion about this important issue.

If we grab onto this suspicious thread and pull it enough, who knows what kind of information we will find.

Kristen Meghan has stated in a January 18, 2014 video, entitled "Geoengineering Whistleblower ~ Ex-Military ~ Kristen Meghan, Hauppauge, NY, January 18th, 2014", at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jHm0XhtDyZA> that she saw

orders for aluminum, barium and strontium without naming the manufacturer and with other information missing or suspect. She was curious as to the fact that these items were in the form of aerosol sprays. Then she saw certain containers being loaded into planes. Finally, she saw soil samples with very high amounts of these and other chemicals.

When she inquired about these things, she was threatened and as she mentioned "demonized" by those around her in the U.S. Air Force. See Kristen Meghan, "Geoengineering Whistleblower ~ Ex-Military ~ Kristen Meghan, Hauppauge, NY, January 18th, 2014", January 18, 2014, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jHm0XhtDyZA>

Add to this that there was a Department of Defense handbook, released in the Fall, 1990 entitled "Chemtrails" and said to be the "Chemistry 131 Manual, Fall 1990, Department of Chemistry, U.S. Air Force Academy". Another manual was said to have been published for the 1991 school year, as well. This seems to suggest that new air force pilots were being trained about aerosol spraying. See Howard Saive, "Breaking: Air Force 'Chemtrails' Manual Available For Download" , March 31, 2013, <https://www.veteranstoday.com/2013/03/31/breaking-air-force-chemtrails-manual-available-for-download/> It seems therefore that the DOD actually coined one of the very terms that we are using to characterize this phenomenon. It also makes us see how ironic it is that Ms. Meghan would be "demonized," for asking questions about geoengineering, when a handbook had been written and an instruction program had been held about 2 decades before she began asking questions.

A document from November, 1966, entitled "A Recommended National Program In Weather Modification A Report to the Interdepartmental Committee for Atmospheric Sciences", shows that geoengineering research and applications were underway, undergoing further research and being funded by the U.S. Government nearly 50 years ago. See Homer E. Newell, Associate Administrator for Space Science and Application, National

Aeronautics & Space Administration, Washington, DC, "A Recommended National Program In Weather Modification A Report to the Interdepartmental Committee for Atmospheric Sciences", November, 1966

https://saive.com/WXMOD/NASA_National_and_Interdepartmental_Program_for_Weather_Modification_1966.pdf The document talks about well-meaning applications of geoengineering, but one can certainly see what types of damage might be wrought by the "weather modification" spoken of in the document.

Another document, just eight (8) years later has the following weighty title:

"WEATHER MODIFICATION HEARINGS BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON OCEANS AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS UNITED STATES SENATE[;] NINETY-THIRD CONGRESS[,] SECOND SESSION ON THE NEED FOR AN INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT PROHIBITING THE USE OF ENVIRONMENTAL AND GEOPHYSIOAL MODIFICATION AS WEAPONS OF WAR AND BRIEFING ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE WEATHER MODIFICATION ACTIVITY JANUARY 25 AND MARCH 20, 1974 [Top Secret hearing held on March 20, 1974; made public on May 19, 1974]" See <https://www.virtual.vietnam.ttu.edu/cgi-bin/starfetch.exe?v4Y8f9vXJS1.hj.fF.KBBey7exnjbmsbVEn398MLWXPiyU1m.RJxqzkk7dfVayB1ArT70CZulszN5148G9gNxwTQwFHBu09AAHBCFrVmtwL05b3QyaTeR0/2390601002A.pdf>

The following is a quote from this document:

The objective of S. Res. 71 has been endorsed by several national

and international organizations. on: the international level, the North

Atlantic Assembly at its 18th meeting in November, 1972, recommended

a treaty to ban environmental or geophysical modification.

except for peaceful purposes. Domestically, in 1971, the National.

Academy of Sciences Committee on Atmospheric Sciences urged the

U.S. Government 'to present for adoption by the United Nations

General Assembly a resolution, dedicating all weather-modification

efforts to peaceful purposes.' 'The President's National Advisory

Committee on Oceans and Atmosphere in its first annual report in

1972, strongly recommended that the United' States seek international

arrangements to renounce hostile uses of weather modification. Again,

in 1972, the Sierra Club joined the Federation of American Scientists

in urging that, 'The United States should henceforth dedicate all

geophysical and environmental research to peaceful purposes and

should actively seek the cooperation of other nations in programs of

joint research on geophysical phenomena, their control, and their

peaceful use.'

However, despite the wide support for this concept, the Administration

has failed to articulate a national policy on weather modification.

This is due primarily to the intransigence of the U.S. military

establishment. The military branches of our Government havestead-

fastly opposed the .development of any policy in order to keep all

their option open in the 'field of environmental' modification. This

response is, in my opinion, a shortsighted reflexive reaction. It does

not represent a carefully considered, well-developed national policy.

However, until such a policy surfaces, the military will have the

freedom to indiscriminately experiment and operationally use this

technology.

This situation which I find extremely distressing. If we do not

restrict the military use of current environmental modification

techniques, we risk the danger of the development of vastly more

dangerous techniques, whose consequences may be unknown or may

cause irreparable damage to our global environment.

Military use of such techniques will affect the very important

peaceful international scientific efforts now underway under the

auspices of the World Meteorological Organization and the International

Council of Scientific Unions-such programs as the Global

Atmospheric Research Program [GARP] and "Earthwatch."

Instead of its official silence and actions condoning a gradual drift

into environmental warfare, the administration should actively explore

the advantages of a renunciation of such operations and the possible

benefits stemming from an initiative for a multilateral "no first use"

agreement. It is imperative that the United States enunciate a

national policy on this subject, in no way blocking their development

and in no way moving forward in the enlargement of human Knowledge,

but simply dedicating these efforts to peaceful purpose.

I hope that these hearings will spur the administration into

some form of action to develop such a policy, as well as enlarging the body of knowledge available to the American public as to what geophysical and weather modifications actually imply. [Emphasis added by bolding] See “WEATHER MODIFICATION HEARINGS BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON OCEANS AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS UNITED STATES SENATE[;] NINETY-THIRD CONGRESS[,] SECOND SESSION ON THE NEED FOR AN INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT PROHIBITING THE USE OF ENVIRONMENTAL AND GEOPHYSIOAL MODIFICATION AS WEAPONS OF WAR AND BRIEFING ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE WEATHER MODIFICATION ACTIVITY JANUARY 25 AND MARCH 20, 1974 [Top Secret hearing held on March 20, 1974; made public on May 19, 1974]” at <https://www.virtual.vietnam.ttu.edu/cgi-bin/starfetch.exe?v4Y8f9vXJS1.hj.fF.KBBey7exnjbmsbVEn398MLWXPiyU1m.RJxqzkk7dfVayB1ArT70CZulszN5148G9gNxwTQwFHBu09AAHBCFrVmtwL05b3QyaTeR0/2390601002A.pdf>, pp. 1-2

Against this backdrop, to say that geoengineering does not exist or that it is an issue that has no actual or potential effect on the Earth seems silly. The silence in mainstream media and dismissiveness of some of the legislators asked about this should make even the most trusting among us would probably agree that something fishy is going on here.

5. Earth Day means we all come together to make a difference:

Two of the best things about Earth Day is that (a) we come together to acknowledge the benefits and blessing of having been provided with such an amazing place as the Earth and (b) we join together to bring about meaningful change. By coming together we talk and create a synergy that, hopefully, will last throughout the year and make the world a better place by this time next year.

Some of the linkages we should be making are with organizations such as Greenpeace. You may be a member in this

organization or some of the countless other ones out there. This year you may consider broaching this subject with your organizations. You may encounter some resistance from those who are not aware of these issues or are growing in their awareness.

You may even find some people that are passionately opposed to including this in the discussion. Be aware that there is some credible evidence that world banks and other powerful interests actually started the so-called "green movement." This may be why we still see mercury being used in light bulbs and still see petroleum products being used in even green products even as we try to move away from using gasoline. Some also link these interests with the so-called Agenda 21 and suggest that sustainability is a code word for these interests to take more control over land, resources, and you. See The Watchman, "The Green Agenda," <https://www.green-agenda.com/agenda21.html>

If all of this is true, do not be surprised if some of those challenging your interest in this subject are actually "plants or "trolls" to reinforce the interests of these companies in your organizations.

In any case, I urge you to keep bringing this subject up. Every effort has to start somewhere, but it is worth it in the end when we have the world at stake.

Other articles that you may find of interest:

"Groundbreaking Geoengineering Video Exposes Scientific Truth Regarding Chemtrail Chemical Composition", <https://consciouslifeneeds.com/groundbreaking-geoengineering-video-exposes-scientific-truth-regarding-chemtrail-chemical-composition/1182370/>

"Chemtrails Exposed: A History of the <https://consciouslifeneeds.com/chemtrails-exposed-history-new-manchattan-project/1181692/>New Manhattan Project,

"<https://consciouslifeneeds.com/chemtrails-exposed-history-new-manhattan-project/1181692/>

"How Do We Erase Chemtrails from Our Sacred Skies" at <https://consciouslifeneeds.com/better-job-erasing-chemtrails-sacred-skies/1178827/>



Robert O'Leary, JD BARA, has had an abiding interest in alternative health products & modalities since the early 1970's & he has seen how they have made people go from lacking health to vibrant health. He became an attorney, singer-songwriter, martial artist & father along the way and brings that experience to his practice as a BioAcoustic Soundhealth Practitioner, under the tutelage of the award-winning founder of BioAcoustic Biology, Sharry Edwards, whose Institute of BioAcoustic Biology has now been serving clients for 30 years with a non-invasive & safe integrative modality that supports the body's ability to self-heal using the power of the human voice. Robert brings this modality to serve clients in Greater Springfield (MA), New England & "virtually" the world, with his website, www.romayasoundhealthandbeauty.com. He can also be reached at romayasoundhealthandbeauty@gmail.com