

## U.K. Green Party Acknowledges EM Weapons

This is an email written in response to an inquiry by Ruth Barnett on May 02, 2004 about resolution 27, passed by the European Parliament, which states:

27. Calls for an international convention introducing a global ban on all developments and deployments of weapons which might enable any form of manipulation of human beings.

The reply is packed with information about electromagnetic weapons which is "one of the newest and most serious military developments in the world today."

---

### Original message from Ruth Barnett to the Green Party U.K.:

From: ruth.b  
To: office@greenparty.org.uk  
Sent: Sunday, May 02, 2004 1:27 PM  
Subject: Environment, security and foreign affairs, A4-0005/99

Dear Sir/Madam

Could you please inform me of your policies on the following resolutions as passed by the European Parliament, especially relating to No. 27., particularly with regard to all the experiments on people that are occurring in the UK but everyone is too afraid to admit to.

Yours sincerely,  
Ruth Barnett

---

### Reply from Dr Caroline Lucas, Green Party MEP for South East England:

Dear Ruth Barnett,

Thank you for your email - please accept this as a reply from both Green Party MEPs, myself and Jean Lambert.

The subject came to the attention of the Green Group in 1996, and we have slowly developed a knowledge base and large archive in this highly specialized area. Although neither of us were MEPs at the time of the vote in January 1999, the Green Group was the strongest supporter of the report.

Electro-Magnetic (EM) weapons are one of the newest and most serious military developments in the world today. Enormous secrecy surrounds their development, which is helped by the fact that they rely on the complex physics of non-ionizing radiation and on bio-electromagnetics. They can be broadly broken down into two categories - those aimed at the environment and those aimed at living systems, or in reality the human central nervous system.

In the case of the environment, very large quantities of energy can be literally 'broadcast', like radio, to create certain special environmental effects - radical changes in the ionosphere to affect communications, and possibly even the weather, as well as reflection to earth to perform such feats as x-raying the earth to find underground installations, possibly large transfers of energy to power equipment, or to apply destructive forces anywhere on earth, including EMP effects (Electro-Magnetic Pulse, associated with nuclear explosions), and simpler tasks like submarine communication, using very long waves.

The more sinister aspect concerns the ability to use low energy density waves of particular frequencies and special waveforms to literally 'tune into' the human central nervous system (CNS), something that has been achieved in the laboratory, according to publicly available scientific literature. This might be done on an individual scale, to temporarily or perhaps permanently alter psychological states, so as to elicit certain behaviours from human beings. It is alleged that many victims have been tested involuntarily for decades now with this technology. It is also suggested that these weapons have been used in some actions, most especially the Gulf War and against the Greenham Common women in the UK. In this case they would have a mass effect, in that they are aimed at large groups. This use is sought not only by the military, but, alarmingly, by the police forces as well, clearly for the purpose of controlling unruly domestic populations. Once achieved, such a system might become irreversible, or unstoppable.

This subject also has very serious implications for standard setting for non-ionizing radiation, because the levels of exposure at which one can manipulate the human being are very low indeed, since it is the tuning and the waveform which matter, not the levels, which is the reason that Russian exposure standards are apparently 1000 times lower than the US standards.

It is worth comparing the standard setting processes for non-ionizing and for ionizing radiation, as they are remarkably similar. The military, via the International Commission on Radiological Protection (ICRP), played a major role in originally setting ionizing standards at ridiculously high levels by burying or ignoring the science, leading to the need for continuous reductions in the acceptable exposure levels. Something similar appears to be happening with non-ionizing radiation, in that a very similar unelected 'independent' advisory committee (ICNIRP - International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection) has offered advice in this area, which is accepted blindly by the European Commission, despite the fact that, once again, much of the science is being ignored, and the precautionary principle, for some odd reason, seems not to apply. The fact that two of the US representatives on ICNIRP have been associated with the military has echoes of the past, and is most suspicious.

The focus of public attention so far has been a project in Alaska called HAARP (High frequency Active Auroral Research Program), which is a massive 'array' transmitter designed to manipulate the ionosphere for military purposes - communications effects, earth x-rays, and possibly weather manipulation (despite conventions banning this). But the range of uses of this basic technology is very wide, much wider than its predecessor, ionizing radiation (nuclear). The primary difference is that electromagnetic waves can be 'tuned' so as to have certain effects on living systems, whereas the 'chaotic' nature of ionizing radiation does not facilitate this and the result of exposure to it is normally direct damage only. As stated above, scientists have been able to 'tune' EM to facilitate remote direct communication with the central nervous systems of living creatures, and they are of course especially interested in using this fact to manipulate human beings.

They were used in a crude form by the Soviets against the US Moscow embassy in the '60s with fatal consequences for the ambassador himself, and it is believed that they were used in what is called a 'superfence' against the Greenham Common women, and also to demotivate the Iraqi troops during the Gulf War. The Soviets tried in the 70s to prevent an arms race in this area by means of a Convention, but the US rejected these efforts, and has moved ahead very rapidly, also within NATO, into a dominant position.

Unless this development is stopped, we are entering an Orwellian '1984' type scenario, which could potentially permanently transfer enormous power to those in control of the technology. It must also be seen in the wider context of the one-sided arms race currently underway, where the US is re-arming, by continuing with 'Star Wars', and is aiming to be totally dominant in 'Space Power' by 2020. Electromagnetic weapons play a key role here, alongside ABMs, lasers and particle beam weapons.

We are of course totally opposed to the development and deployment of these weapons. We

regard the unsuccessful attempts in the 70s of the former Soviet Union to have these weapons controlled by a UN Convention as having been a major missed opportunity, which has now led to a new arms race in this field. We have sought to renew the attempt to have a Convention to outlaw these weapons and the research that leads to them, primarily that concerning external manipulation of the human central nervous system.

The Greens achieved the quite remarkable Parliament resolution on January 28th 199, damning the US for not being willing to even come to discuss the matter with the Parliament, and in particular attacking the HAARP project in Alaska, calling for a Parliament STOA study on it, while also calling in rather vague terms for a ban on the manipulation of human beings.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Caroline Lucas  
Green Party MEP for South East England

---

## **European Parliament Resolutions as Passed, January 28, 1999**

Below are the resolutions passed by the European Parliament relating to non-lethal weapons technology:

Resolution adopted by the European Parliament, 28.1.99 Environment, security and foreign affairs A4-0005/99

23. Calls on the European Union to seek to have the new 'non-lethal' weapons technology and the development of new arms strategies also covered and regulated by international conventions;

24. Considers HAARP (High Frequency Active Auroral Research Project) by virtue of its far-reaching impact on the environment to be a global concern and calls for its legal, ecological and ethical implications to be examined by an international independent body before any further research and testing; regrets the repeated refusal of the United States Administration to send anyone in person to give evidence to the public hearing or any subsequent meeting held by its competent committee into the environmental and public risks connected with the HAARP programme currently being funded in Alaska;

25. Requests the Scientific and Technological Options Assessment (STOA) Panel to agree to examine the scientific and technical evidence provided in all existing research findings on HAARP to assess the exact nature and degree of risk that HAARP poses both to the local and global environment and to public health generally;

26. Calls on the Commission to examine if there are environmental and PUBLIC HEALTH implications of the HAARP programme for Arctic Europe and to report back to Parliament with its findings;

27. CALLS FOR AN INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION INTRODUCING A GLOBAL BAN ON ALL DEVELOPMENTS AND DEPLOYMENTS OF WEAPONS WHICH MIGHT ENABLE ANY FORM OF MANIPULATION OF HUMAN BEINGS;

---