

Search

Go!

BUILD A FREE WEBSITE
OF YOUR OWN ON

CACTUS (Citizens Against Chemtrails U.S.) presents ...

[CLICK HERE to visit Clifford Carnicom's website](#)

CLIFFORD CARNICOM
Live on Coast-to-Coast AM radio
with Barbara Simpson
May 17, 2003

Barbara Simpson (BS): Good evening, good morning. We are going to take a close look at contrails. . . or chemtrails, as many people call them. We're going to visit with a man who has spent a good portion of his work efforts studying these big mysterious streaks in the sky. If you wonder what they are and why they are there, stay with us, Clifford Carnicom is with us on Coast to Coast AM. I'm Barbara Simpson. . . Let me tell you about our guest. His name is Clifford Carnicom. He does not have a book to sell. He does have a website which I will tell you about. But the issue is: whether you call them contrails or chemtrails, that's what we're going to be talking about. He has been a self-employed professional computer consultant for the past three years. He provides unique on-site personal services to small businesses and individuals, including system analysis, networking, software development, website consultation design and implementation services. He originated, developed, and maintains a high-traffic environmental and socially conscious website, and public discussion forum. He was previously a research scientist, and a federal employee for 15 years with three different agencies, including the United States Department of Defense, the Bureau of Land Management, and the U.S. Forest Service. His technical background is extensive in the fields of geodetic science, advanced mathematics, computer science, and the physical sciences. He is with us right now on Coast to Coast AM. Clifford, thanks for being with us.

Clifford Carnicom (CC): Thank you very much, Barbara, for the opportunity to be here tonight. And I appreciate it very much.

BS: Is it Mister or Doctor?

CC: Mister. Just Clifford Carnicom.

BS: Mister Clifford Carnicom. That's quite all right. With that background I wasn't sure, so I thought we should know. How did you get from sort of mainstream science into looking at what some people say are an exaggeration and sort of a scare tactic of the weirdos on the fringe?

CC: Well, I decided to leave federal employment in 1998. Actually, I need to update that biography because it's exactly five years now that I've been self-employed. But I left the federal government to seek self-employment. And in terms of how I became involved, I guess that I would certainly regard myself as first and foremost a citizen of this nation. Secondly, I would view myself as an independent researcher. And regardless of where I'm working or what my circumstances are, I do pay attention to the world around me. And the observation of a natural world has always been important in my life, either through work as well as pleasure. And in the end I have a very deep concern about the welfare of this planet, even though, historically, I certainly would not be regarded as an environmental activist by any means. But the severity and the level of the operations that has taken place has crossed a new threshold, I think, for this planet as a whole. And I am deeply and personally in

volved as a result of it.

BS: Just out of curiosity, when you worked for, for example, the Bureau of Land Management and/or the Forest Service - you worked for both - what was the nature of your work?

CC: That work at that time with those two agencies was involved in what is called cadastral surveying, which is federal land surveying, which has to do with the determination and establishment of federal land boundaries in primarily more remote portions of the country in the national forests. I spent quite a bit of time up in Montana, but as a federal land surveyor during that work. My work with the Defense Department as a geodesist is a fairly limited and unique profession, which is very deeply entrenched in the geophysical and mathematical sciences.

BS: What does that mean? What did you do?

CC: I primarily was involved with modeling the gravitational field of the Earth. Geodesy has three main branches. The first would be the geometric structure of the Earth. The simplest way to think of that would be surveying on a global scale as opposed to local. The second would be the study and evaluation of satellite systems in space. And the third would be the modelling of the gravitational field of the Earth. My work was primarily involved with the latter of those three.

BS: That's interesting.

CC: It's very involved and fascinating work on a geophysical sense and has many, many applications - certainly, in my case, on the defense side at that time.

BS: In terms of - do you call them contrails or do you call them chemtrails? Or is there a difference?

CC: Actually, I suppose, it's a good time to bring up a distinction which I think is necessary. You will, Barbara, seldom hear me use the word chemtrails. I'm somewhat averse to that term, since it has no real formal definition. . .

BS: Yeah.

CC: . . . and it makes the subject more difficult to discuss - certainly in a professional environment. What I think is necessary at the onset of the discussion is to distinguish between four separate entities, because they are all separate and they need to be treated separately in order to analyze the problem correctly. These four entities would be: number one, a contrail, a conventional contrail. The second would be the use of the term aerosol. You will find that I will use the term aerosol trails, since I believe it is a more accurate representation and assessment of what it is we are dealing with. The third would be the formation and existence of clouds. Again, this is a separate phenomenon, and one of the problems that has emerged over time is the merging and mixing of these.

BS: Yeah.

CC: And the last of these four would be, really, the existence of a new phenomenon which I would have to label as aerosol banks. I can no longer really call them clouds. These are banks or collections of aerosols which, in a generic sense, may be interpreted as a cloud but, in fact, the physical and visual characteristics of these are so different that they need to be distinguished between. Now, I'm hoping that we don't actually spend the majority of the evening distinguishing between these. I realize that it is important, and I will try to make that distinction to the necessary level. However, for now over four and a half years, there is a segment of the population which continues to debate the existence of this phenomenon. That is fair for certain people to do. What I want to make known is that the research has progressed far beyond that question at this point, and considerable more territory is available for us to discuss this evening

beyond the formal definitions of contrail vs. aerosol.

But, in brief, a contrail is nothing new, it's been around since aircraft were flying at high elevations - roughly at the close of World War II in 1947. It does, by all definitions - including the EPA as well as a Vincent Schaefer - consist primarily of water vapor or ice crystals. The essential point is: The primary constituent is water. An aerosol is a particle in suspension in a gas, and it could be a solid or a liquid, actually. But it is a particle in suspension. Third: a cloud. I'm hoping we don't need to mention the obvious, but basically we are talking about a collection of water vapor that's visible in the sky.

BS: Right.

CC: And these aerosol banks would be the aggregation of aerosol particles that have accumulated water over time, and have different physical and visual characteristics from a traditional cloud. There is an element of common sense and observation that does need to be factored into this discussion. We can speak technicalities if we need to, but there are clear physical and visual differences which can be documented between each of these I'm speaking of. And the process of either existence or formation is entirely different. One of the big problems that has emerged is: Someone says "Well, a contrail forms clouds." Not the case. Not the case. These are separate phenomena. A contrail forms and dissipates according to certain physical laws. A cloud forms under a different set of physical laws. Aerosols exist by being introduced, and aerosol banks (or modified clouds) exist as a result of the combination of aerosols as well as their interaction with water vapor. So, we could debate these further but these are the four distinctions that I would make. And when we speak of these we need to address each one separately rather than just assume they are one single entity and that there's a continuum between them, because it simply is not the case.

BS: They're totally distinct?

CC: They absolutely are.

BS: Why is it when I talk to mainstream - I'm not sure that's the right word - but I guess traditional or mainstream scientists and physicists, they debunk everything you said except the fact that contrails come from airplanes and that's what we see in the sky?

CC: I cannot speak for other people. I can only speak for myself. In terms of what the motive of an individual is to not fully disclose and discuss a subject to the level of thoroughness and detail that it deserves, one can speculate for some time as to what that motivation is.

BS: What do you think it might be? I mean, you clearly have been involved in this for a long time, you clearly have heard the debunking of the whole concept of aerosols being introduced into the sky, and the banks that you're talking about. I'm not arguing it one way or the other, because I've seen things in the sky that don't look "normal," quote unquote, to me. I don't know exactly what they are. I've heard lots of theories. But you've heard the arguments against it. Why do you think they're not open to the possibility that there might be something more than just the traditional chemtrail [sic] from an airplane at a high elevation?

CC: There are those who do not seek full disclosure of events and phenomena that affect our lives. There are those individuals. Many of those individuals have whatever motives. There's often elements of security, of acceptance, of fear. These are often motivating factors as to why human beings are not willing to confront the world around them. These would be some of the human factors involved. Like I say, I can't speak for them. But there are motivations which affect human behavior that have caused many, many times where information has been hidden from the public and not fully disclosed. It may be that there is the opinion that it's better that you don't know certain things. Unfortunately, I do not subscribe to that philosophy unless it is clearly presented as an issue of national security for which there may be valid reasons for not discussing a subject. One of the central issues here is that of informed consent. It's been one of the primary issues from the

beginning.

BS: Well, when you say 'informed consent,' the implication is that something is being done to us.

CC: That is correct. Something is being done to our planet, and we are a part of that planet. And something very definitely is being done to this planet and to us. My essential and primary claim is that since the beginning of 1999 there has been across this nation as well as much of the globe the systematic injection of massive amounts of particulate matter into our atmosphere using aircraft as the medium. The consequences of these operations are now to the point where I do think it is fair to say that the atmosphere of this planet is at a level of threat and jeopardy, as well as the biology and general ecology of this planet. This is not a trivial issue, and this is accompanied by literally thousands, if not hundreds of thousands, of observations from concerned citizens, thousands of reasonable requests by citizens for investigations, as well as contributions by other independent researchers.

BS: Who's doing it?

CC: I cannot give you an answer as to who. Unfortunately, I do not have an inside track. I'm a citizen who conducts research from my vantage point to the best that I am able to. I do not know who. I can record what I see, I can analyze what I see, and I can interpret what I see, and I can make that information available to the public. And there will be times when I will accept the limitations upon what I am able to discover from my vantage point. But what can be said is that the level of this operation is at a global level. This is not something that originates or stems, or at least is confined, to any single national interest. With few exceptions, and primarily from those countries which would be regarded as part of the historical communist bloc where information is not necessarily forthcoming, the reports encompass the globe. The atmosphere of this planet has been modified. It is directly visible and we can go through that information as we have time tonight.

BS: Wait. Let me ask you this: Did I understand you to say that there are no reports of it from the former Soviet Union, any of the Iron Curtain countries?

CC: You'll always watch it. I will try to guard my language because there are few absolutes in life. What I can say is I do not have any direct reports from those countries -- with one exception: I will mention that there was one fellow from one of the Russian countries that did state that they have certain environmental modification programs in place in their country which have characteristics similar to the operations that I'm describing. So, that would be the one exception to that that I can think of. But in general, information has not been especially forthcoming from those portions of the world, as it has not been historically in many areas.

BS: Well, are you saying or do you know or have you found out that the effect of these things is weather modification? Or is that just a part of it?

CC: Oh, I would say that is very much just a part. As we discuss this through tonight, unfortunately the more that one learns the more that one has to consider as being a potential application of these operations. Environmental modification or weather modification is certainly a very strong component which has a strong argument that can be justified with it. But I would not by any means try to exclude it to that. And we could certainly discuss the weather aspect of it. But one will find that if you pursue one subject it will begin to tie in to other areas. What I can say, at least as a starting point tonight to give you some sense of the directions that we could go, there are now five areas that I would say are consistent with the data, with applications. By applications, I mean doing something, being able to do something with these introduced particulates. The first would be environmental modification and control. The second would be biological operations. The third would be electromagnetic applications. The fourth would be military applications. And the fifth is a more recent addition to my list, and it simply has resulted from the scale and the level of the problem as it has emerged. And that is

planetary modification and control. Unfortunately, I must include that now because of the level of what we are dealing with. The atmosphere has been altered. So, you know, as we talk tonight, we could easily go through those in more detail. And environmental modification and control might be one of the simplest and easiest to start with, and also possibly least distressing and disturbing, and most comfortable.

BS: It would depend on who's got the control, wouldn't it?

CC: Absolutely.

BS: (laughs) That's the part that would worry me!

CC: That's right. But at least in terms of our experience, and I think history is showing that people at least can accept that there. . . You know, there is a natural tendency of human beings to, I think, want to accept these programs as being of a benevolent nature.

BS: Umm.

CC: Unfortunately, the evidence does not support that conclusion.

BS: Okay, hold your thought right there because we are at the bottom of the hour, and we will come back to find out why that evidence does not support that benevolent conclusion. Our guest is Clifford Carnicom. We're talking about contrails, chemtrails - what are they? We'll find out right here on Coast. I'm Barbara Simpson.

BS: Contrails. That's the subject we're talking about with our guest, Clifford Carnicom. Clifford, you mentioned the four things in the sky: the contrails, clouds, aerosols, and aerosol banks. The contrails that we're used to are from airplanes. Is that right?

CC: That would be correct. By definition, they consist of condensed water vapor or ice particles.

BS: Does every airplane leave contrails? Because we don't always see them. What causes some to do it and some not?

CC: Not every airplane would, by any means. And while I won't claim to be an absolute expert, I will mention the primary variables that are involved. Certainly, the temperature of the atmosphere is important. The humidity is important. And the relative humidity - it would be both, actually. Whatever particles in the air could be a factor. The type of engine could be a factor. The stability of the air could be a factor. These would all be things that could be factors in contrail formation.

BS: What about altitude?

CC: I'm sorry. What I have done is look at some of the models for this as well as my own observations. And in general, my work as well as the papers that I have found, would indicate that a very cold dry air is very conducive to contrail formation. And this is, again, why people need to distinguish between these things. It's very confusing when they mix them up. . .

BS: Exactly.

CC: . . .and start talking about cloud formation. Actually, if one thinks about it: As a kid when you were watching the airplane, if you were in a desert environment, that's a classic environment for contrail formation - cold, dry desert air. So, there isn't really a lower limit on humidity, in a practical sense, in terms of that formation in combination with these other factors, if everything is suitable.

BS: Now, when you mentioned contrails and clouds, those are both natural things - the contrails naturally from airplanes, the clouds natural in the sky, depending on all of these other factors. Now, you mentioned the aerosol. Is that what most people are referring to when they call them the chemtrails?

CC: Yes, they do. By popular terminology they do. I've already expressed my reluctance to use that term because of the difficulty, in terms of the discussion of the subject in a professional and an objective sense. One has to have a common understanding of language. And when one uses the term 'chemtrail,' it implies some knowledge of a chemical composition. . .

BS: That's right.

CC: . . . of the emissions. And that's not accurate. What is accurate is to assess them as aerosols, because it's exactly what they are: particles that are being emitted. And one can go through the physics and chemistry to show that that is the case. You know, clouds form because of what are called condensation nuclei. You actually need a particle in the sky to form around with water. So, clouds are not forming in pure air. They are forming around particles. In general, primary cloud structures will exist at mid-elevations -- you know, 10,000, 20,000 feet. And 30,000 would be considered very high clouds of a very thin nature. It's not a classic environment for cloud formation. That's because those particles do not normally exist up there in great numbers. And the humidity is actually very low. This is another issue that comes up in terms of cloud formation. Clouds form primarily at relative humidity levels of 70% or greater. That comes from at least six sources. They all say the same thing. And when you find many of these discussions that talk about these so-called 'persistent contrails' you will repeatedly find this general statement: 'that under conditions of high humidity.' But you will never yet, that I have seen, see a number attached to that. It is always a generic, vague statement which does not apply in a practical sense in most cases, because that upper environment is actually most of the time quite dry. Under the congressional investigations for the supersonic aircraft flying at high altitudes - 60,000 feet - that was one of their questions, whether or not that thing was going to radically alter the atmosphere. And their conclusion was exactly the same as I have reached through my observations: that the higher you go, the drier that environment goes. And they're talking about 5% humidity up there. It's just physically an unrealistic scenario except in the most unusual circumstances.

BS: Wait a minute. What's an unrealistic scenario?

CC: To expect what is called cloud formation - high levels of cloud formation - to be forming at extreme elevations: 30, 40, and in the case of the supersonic transport, up to 60 thousand feet.

BS: So, was the speculation that if we had planes flying at that altitude that the contrails would cause cloud formation?

CC: That's right, that they might persist. Exactly.

BS: Why would that be a problem if it did? I mean, why would it be a problem?

CC: Well, it's a problem, I suppose, for several reasons. Number one: It demonstrates the introduction of particulate or pollution into the atmosphere, because it means that particles are being emitted. It's the only way the clouds could form to begin with. It causes a visibility issue. It causes a temperature issue, solar radiation. You know, anytime you go disturbing the planet it has consequences. And those folks were concerned about whether those consequences would be significant. The same as if you had a volcano, Krakatoa, a nuclear bomb. Something that affects the solar radiation into this planet is something to be considered at all times.

BS: Okay. Now, going back to the basic level where the contrails are, and we are talking about normal clouds. How do you know that what people call the chemtrails are, in fact, aerosols?

CC: Primarily because of the physics of cloud formation and what would be called cloud nucleation. As I was saying, there'd be a few factors involved. One would be the statement I made about clouds forming around a particle. You need something in order for that cloud to form. It just doesn't form in

pure air. So, if you have some haze or quote "cloud" forming at high elevations immediately after the appearance of massive striations of aircraft - literally, sometimes a couple hundred passes within two hours when they hit the area hard enough - you have the formation of a very unnatural meteorological event. The primary way that such a modification could occur is, number one, by the introduction of particulate matter, and, number two, by that particulate matter being of what's called a hygroscopic nature. In other words, it loves water. If you put those two things together you have a satisfactory explanation for an artificial creation of what some people might call clouds but which I cannot, because they do not satisfy any classical meteorological definition of cloud formation. You also have a visual behavior which is entirely different from classical clouds. It's a haze, diffuse. Take a look at your cumulus clouds and take a look at how diffuse the edges are now. Go dig out your meteorological books on photography of cumulus clouds and try to find those on a regular basis now. You have a physical alteration which is evident in many, many ways. But those two mechanisms, the introduction of particulate matter -- of an extremely fine size, by the way; it has to be extremely small.

Here's another conflict you run into: If you dig up the research from the Max Planck Institute -- one of the most esteemed atmospheric agencies in the entire world -- you see what they say about the emissions of aircraft and what the particle size of exhaust is, here's what they'll tell you. They'll tell you it's roughly 30 to 100 microns in size. Now, to give you a sense of scale, a human hair is roughly 60 to 100 microns thick. So, they are talking about the normal, expected particles of exhaust of aircraft is ranging between 30 and 100 microns. If you look at the size of cloud condensation nuclei, what is required for the formation of clouds, in general you are speaking at the sub-micron level, at less than a micron. The physical separation in size alone between the ingredients that cause various effects is enough to create a serious contradiction in any claim that this is some normal process. It could not happen if you accept that information from Max Planck.

BS: When we're talking about the aerosols and you're talking about these particles, do you know what they are?

CC: We have a good sense of what is in these. Unfortunately, those in claimed positions of authority have not provided their services to the public of this country in the way that is both required and deserved by the citizens. However, with considerable research by myself as well as many others across the country, we have a very good sense as to the primary constituents of these emissions. The simplest way to describe this would be: A primary constituent would be regarded as a metallic salt. Metals form roughly half of the periodic table, so they are not uncommon. Metallic salts are even more common in life. So, this is not an unusual physical existence. But it is unusual in the sense of you're not expecting to have it in massive amounts in the atmosphere, that's for sure. So, this would be a generalized statement, that one of the primary constituents would be that of metallic salts. In specific terms, there are five metals that are of elevated concern because of repeated testing that shows the same results. These five elements are: barium, magnesium, calcium, titanium, and aluminum. These five metals are what I would call candidate metals that in the end need to be thoroughly investigated by the environmental agencies of this country and tests run under the proper protocols. And this is a starting point. Another statement here is that the citizens of this country have no responsibility to be performing these tests. These tests should be done by public service, tax-supported, agencies. It is not the responsibility of the citizen to be conducting these tests. These tests are being conducted, to the best of the ability, by citizens, with their own limited resources. It is completely and totally inappropriate that these agencies have not responded adequately to these repeated requests for proper testing.

BS: Let me ask you this: Where do you get, or how do you get, the samples that indicate that it's any of those five metals? Or, actually, you were talking about the metallic salts involving those five metals, is that right?

CC: That's correct.

BS: Okay. Where do the samples come from? And what kind of testing did you do?

CC: Barbara, I have 20 methods that I have exercised, myself alone, in terms of these physical test procedures that I have conducted. Again, I not making any claims of being a certified lab providing certified results. I am stating as a concerned citizen: I have applied my background, my skills, the best that I am able to, through a variety of sampling means, to present and provide results that I find. Here's the 20 methods, until we get tired of hearing them. First would be examination of rainfall, both crystal examination as well as distillation processes. Second would be the use of what's called electrostatic precipitation to basically collect particulate matter using high-voltage mechanisms, a Van de Graaf generator. Third would be repeated analysis of HEPA filters, a filter which carries material down to three-tenths of a micron in size. Fourth would be the use of electrolysis for examination of ions in solution. [Fifth] would be pH tests. Actually, these pH tests were conducted by numerous citizens across the country. This is another extremely significant issue. [Sixth] would be the examination of an aircraft filter -- actually done by covert means, unfortunately, and that could not be publicized in detail. [Seventh] would a private environmental engineer firm. [Eighth] would be extensive time under the microscope myself. [Ninth] would be examination of fiber samples that have been received.

BS: Wait now. Fiber samples from where? Where are these things coming from?

CC: This is another component. When I indicated primary constituents. . .

BS: Yeah.

CC: . . . There's three primary classes. One of them is metallic salt particulates.

BS: Yeah.

CC: A second is fibrous material of a most unusual nature, which we could also discuss in detail. And a third is a gel-like material. Of these three, the metallic particulates would appear to be the dominant component. The fibers of a most unusual nature -- which the Environmental Protection Agency has been involved in, by the way, and which they refuse to identify - have been repeatedly reported also. And I would regard them as being the second most significant. The last, the gel, is more isolated in terms of the actual reports. However, in terms of actual commercial and public disclosure there's actually a known source for that type of material, where they are introducing gel materials -- to absorb massive amounts of water -- into the atmosphere.

BS: It's part of weather modification tests, right?

CC: That's right. So, I made it through eight or nine out of my list. I can keep going, if you like. But I have roughly 20 methods of examining materials through means and resources which are available to me or which I have developed, or which other citizens have contributed to. Again, I do not believe it is a responsibility of any citizen to have to be performing these tests. But the fact is these tests have been performed over and over and over. When I put my work up there, there's not a single time that that is not repeated but I even begin to think about putting it up there.

BS: When you say that the EPA has refused to do the testing on the fibrous material, or at least refused to release any information on their findings, do you actually mean that they specifically said "We refuse to do this," or "We won't do it," or "We can't do it"? Or that just that they haven't done it?

CC: The former, unfortunately. Here's the history of involvement with the EPA: We had certain fibrous material received. It was sent to me from two separate locations by two different parties at two different times. That material was sent to me at the beginning of 2000. Actually, it would be at the close of 1999. I spent some time under the microscope with that material and it struck me as being of a very unusual nature. Why was it unusual? Number

one, it was an extremely small size. I spent quite a bit of time educating myself on fibers and comparison to other fibers - basic forensics, actually, of fiber analysis. This material was and is unique. Most fibers will be in the order of several microns to maybe a dozen, fifteen microns in thickness, up to a human hair being 60 to 100. This material was, again, at the sub-micron level. This is extremely unusual. Asbestos materials are in the order of two microns thick. You have to start asking: What is this stuff and where is it coming from? The material had a synthetic appearance, extremely spiral or kinky in structure. It was extremely elastic and extremely adhesive. It did not satisfy the chemical and physical and measurement properties of spider webs.

BS: This has been described as, I've heard people say that they find what looks like spider webs on plants and things outside after they've had these contrails in the sky, or these 'whatevers' in the sky.

CC: That is correct. There are those that describe the material as having properties similar to that.

BS: Right.

CC: Unfortunately, in my analysis, it did not satisfy that. You also have some very physical impossibilities occurring. I really even had a chance to present this because some of my information is on the video side. But I had one fellow --this is before the issue even really had any momentum at all - we had a fellow out in Oklahoma that sent me a video. His whole barren hayfield was just covered with this stuff.

BS: Really?

CC: He took the video directly in conjunction with the appearance of the aircraft. The field was just covered with it. And you have a very hard time with your arguments about the spiders and the ballooning spiders -- it doesn't work. And so, this material was of a very unique nature, and I spent quite a bit of time under the microscope. I will say that I had a professional helper; that person will remain anonymous. This person invited me to look at that material under a high-quality microscope. That person stated "Clifford, there's something here that you can't see with your equipment. I think you should see this." I made a visit with that individual, I made a videorecording of that session. And the fact is, whether or not we wish to deal with the issue or not, that in addition to the unusual fiber nature, there were biological elements that were repeatedly discovered within that sample.

BS: Okay, hold your thought there because we'll pick up right there when we come back. My guest is Clifford Carnicom. We're talking about contrails. You might call them chemtrails. He doesn't. But you're talking about the same thing. I'm Barbara Simpson on Coast to Coast AM.

[Second hour]

BS: Good morning. Have you ever looked at the sky and seen what you first thought was an ordinary contrail from a plane, and then you realize that there were a lot of them? And sometimes they formed patterns in the sky. And then the blue sky suddenly became a cloudy, hazy sky. What's going on? I've seen it. I've wondered. Well, it appears to be a mystery but our guest, Clifford Carnicom, has done more than just wonder what's going on. He has investigated it. And he's with us on Coast to tell us what he's found. As we continue. I'm Barbara Simpson. . . . Clifford Carnicom is my guest, and Clifford, before the bottom of the last hour you were talking about the three primary things that are found in - or residue, if you will - of these contrails: the metallic salts. And then you were talking about the fibrous material which you said you had gotten samples of and, in fact, had done some testing on, looking at under a microscope. And you said there were also, you used the term 'biological differences.' What do you mean by that?

CC: Well, my job here is to observe and report, and analyze and interpret to the best of my ability. Sometimes in this process, one encounters information that can certainly be considered disturbing or distressing, at the least. But I, and not to avoid that issue, and it is a necessary aspect of these

operations that is to be discussed at some point if the issue is given a fair hearing. And that is the repeated finding of biological components within samples. I am not a doctor. I don't claim to be a doctor. But I do claim to make an honest observation of what I find and to report it. And if someone else finds that reporting, or finds something of a similar nature and I consider that person credible, I will also present it. And that is what happened in this case when we're speaking of an episode that occurred with the Environmental Protection Agency over an extended period of time. This particular health practitioner. . .

BS: A doctor?

CC: Yes. This person identified these materials to the best of his ability. Again, I'm not speaking for myself as to what they are. I'm speaking for what he did to the best of his ability. He identified them as erythrocytes -- or red blood cells. Now, what was unusual about these cells was that, by his analysis, these appear to be of a -- what you would call a - freeze-dried nature. They were extremely small, and actually his process of discovery was unique in itself. But it was only under certain solution conditions that a reconstitution of these cells took place to where they were visible. But by his analysis, that's what he reported. With my analysis as well as his, the public health was of sufficient concern to me that I thought and believed, along with David Peterson, a fellow investigator out of Colorado, that it was appropriate to send this material to the administrator of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency - at that time, Caroline Browner. This material was sent by certified mail with a request for identification on behalf of the public welfare. This letter was sent on January 12, 2000. All of the correspondence and certified mail receipts are all on the website, if a person cares to research the history of what I am describing. February 25th, a letter was received from the EPA. No acknowledgment of receipt of that physical sample by word existed in that reply letter. In other words, we know that it was received by the certified mail receipt. But in the letter of reply there was no reference to any physical material being received.

BS: What did the letter say?

CC: What the letter stated was that the EPA is unaware of any unusual aircraft operations. They made a specific choice of using the word 'unaware.' On January 9th of 2001 another letter was received, and the same word was used again.

BS: Another letter to you from the EPA?

CC: Yes, that's correct - received from the EPA. Again, with repetition of the phrase that the Environmental Protection Agency is 'unaware of any such aircraft operations.' Again, no reference within the letter to any receipt of physical material.

BS: You sent another sample to them, in other words?

CC: No. No. We'd have to dig up the correspondence. I probably asked for a second response, since none. . .

BS: Oh, I see what you mean. I was curious as to why they sent another letter that long after the first one.

CC: That's right. Another letter was received on January 9th. I'm not sure if I got to that one or not; I don't think so.

BS: Yes, you did. You said February 25th and then you said January 9th, 2001.

CC: Okay. And then a third one was received on February 1st, 2001. You're now one year later. Again, the phrase is used that the EPA is 'unaware of any aircraft operations.' Mind, one, that the primary purpose of this letter was to make the United States Environmental Protection Agency aware of such operations. That is a primary purpose of the letter.

BS: I thought the primary purpose of the letter was asking them to test the material.

CC: Both. But the use of the term 'unaware' is certainly an inappropriate response, when one reads the letter. On July 5th of 2001, one and a half years after the initial sample was sent with a request for identification on behalf of the public interest, a letter was received. I won't read the whole letter, but it's on the site. But I will read a choice sentence that the EPA chose to mention. It is this: "We would like to take this opportunity to inform you that it is not the policy of this office of EPA to test or otherwise analyze any unsolicited samples of material or matter. Accordingly, we are returning the sample to you under separate cover." So, after one and a half years, with never an acknowledgment of physical receipt of the material (and actually, through involvement of a Freedom of Information Act by a third party, which is another story in itself) a letter at that time was sent with the use of such words as 'policy' and 'unsolicited,' which I find most interesting because policy has no basis in law. Policy is an act of the whim of whoever happens to be in charge. And 'unsolicited' means: If we don't ask for it, we don't have to do anything. I believe that both of those claims are entirely flawed and do not serve the public welfare or the public interest, which was requested in a reasonable manner.

BS: Did you ever check with an attorney who deals in issues like this against government agencies to see whether you do have a legal leg to stand on?

CC: Negative. Unfortunately, I do not have the resources to afford attorneys. My resources are quite limited. And one of the outstanding points of our discussion as it ensues is the failure - the outright failure - of most professionals, across the board, to conduct their profession on behalf of the public interest. There should be attorneys stepping forward. There hasn't been but there should be. There should be a doctor stepping forward. There should be a chemist stepping forward. There should be a microbiologist stepping forward. And with few exceptions, the professions of this country have not represented themselves in the public interest as the ethics of their profession does demand.

BS: Do you think, just out of curiosity. . . I'm playing a little bit of devil's advocate as we go along here, though. . .

CC: That's fine.

BS: Do you think that they are aware enough that this is --in your view, at least, and those who are working with you -- that this is more than just a fringe group of people who are seeing ghosts when there is nothing to worry about?

CC: I think that they know that there is a serious issue that has to be reckoned with, and they refuse to perform their duties - for whatever reason. You have asked: Why do people not do things? Well, I mentioned some reasons. I don't know what's behind the EPA motivation. All I know is that they didn't do their job, as I see it. I was a federal servant. The job of the government is to serve the people. It's not the other way around.

BS: What is the reaction, just out of curiosity, from environmental groups? I mean, they seem to jump on every bandwagon that comes along of anything that can be interpreted as being harmful to the environment. I mean, they are there suing right and left for everything. It would seem to me that something of the magnitude you're talking about would have roused the ire of some of these groups which are, quite honestly, very well funded, and sue at the drop of a hat.

CC: It would seem to me that would be the case also. Unfortunately, as one becomes engaged in this research and these events, there's a reality that has to be accepted. And that reality is an across-the-board refusal and denial by all agencies of authority as well as environmental groups to respond to the public welfare and interest. There have been letters sent to the environmental organizations. It's probably appropriate to mention that a part of my work includes a record of official responses on this issue. There are citizens

across the country that have sent their letters to the appropriate official asking for an evaluation and investigation of what is occurring in our atmosphere, in our skies. The letters are submitted in good faith and seek an honest addressing of the issue. Here is a listing of typical replies. Now understand, and I will fully admit that these titles are colored by my own interpretation of these letters. However, anything that I cite to you either exists

in those letters or must be accepted as my characterization of what I think the letter said. And I will admit that. But here they go. The first one is probably one of the strongest, and I don't use this word lightly. But it is "The Air Force Lies to America." Go look at the letter that the Air Force has sent to the citizens of this country, and you tell me that that letter represents truth. What the Air Force states is that this issue has been fully investigated by all media and academic institutions, and it's a hoax.

BS: (laughs) Yeah, that's kind of a stretch.

CC: I do not use the word 'lie' lightly. But that is a direct falsehood. And anyone that claims that needs to present the full list of all media and all academic institutions which have fully assessed all of the evidence in an open public forum. It does not exist. Second, Air Force: "All is ordinary." Secretary of Defense: "No cause for alarm." U.S. EPA: "Not aware." EPA continues to profess to be unaware. EPA "perpetually unaware." EPA Region Four is "also unaware." Greenpeace - this is in answer to your question, Barbara, Greenpeace: quote "can't help" unquote. Greenpeace: "Unable to comment." Senator Bingamon "offers assurance." Senator Lugar replies. Congressman refuses certified letter. Rep. Udall refuses to respond, then calls for hearings, then recants. Rep. Mike Thompson: "All is normal." New Mexico Environmental Department "denies illegal activity." New Mexico Attorney General office substantiates "all is normal." Ohio EPA declares "unable to investigate." ABC News 20/20 says "Unfortunately, it was not chosen." WorldNet Daily "passes for now." University of Michigan classifies inquiry as "harrassment." This is a representative sample. This is not the entire sample. I have stopped logging these, to tell you the truth. I have no faith, unfortunately - I have to confess it - I have no faith in the media of this country or the officials of authority to respond based upon their historic record thus far. They have failed miserably.

BS: It certainly sounds that way. These responses from these organizations across the board - I mean, whether you're talking about the media or you're talking about the various states and individuals as well as government agencies. . .

CC: One can go through each of these letters by themself and determine whether or not you think that a reasonable request was made, and whether an appropriate response was granted. I say no.

BS: In terms of. . . By the way, are these on your website?

CC: Absolutely. Anything that I speak of -- hopefully, I'll try to draw exception to it if not the case. This particular page is called Official Responses, I believe. On the left side are probably two or three hundred items. And this one is actually down on the lower part of that list. But anything that I speak of - all of these letters are on the website. I would suspect that there is roughly a thousand pages or so of material that are available to the public now.

BS: What period of time does your website cover? From roughly when to when, historically?

CC: February 1999 to the current date. We're now getting to four and a half years.

BS: Wow. In terms of the. . . When I first was on the radio and starting hearing about these things, I initially said on my San Francisco program that I wasn't sure what people were referring to, because I knew what contrails were. And a man, one of my listeners from a neighboring community, sent me some color photographs of a blue sky and the, I described as sort of the

tic-tac-toe pattern, you know, the right-angle pattern of the lines. And I looked at it and I thought, well, I have seen them. And I started becoming more aware. And I've seen them here where I live in the San Francisco area. But I've also seen them in Arizona. I've seen them in New Mexico. I've seen them in Nevada. They follow pretty much the same pattern. And as you said earlier where you've got this design in the sky, if you will, of what initially look like conventional contrails, and then they kind of spread out and blend and merge and then that blue sky isn't blue anymore. Is that a fairly consistent description of what happens everywhere? Or are the anomalies, do they vary with location?

CC: I would say that's a generally accurate assessment. I mean, there are some folks that have reported flights at low elevations. I cannot duplicate that record why I'm at. I'm in Santa Fe, New Mexico, a high desert region. All the aircraft that go over here are at high altitude. But, in general, yes, that's an accurate description because what you have are those two ingredients that I spoke of earlier, and that is the introduction of particulates. And then you have an issue of humidity that's involved. Santa Fe, New Mexico is a desert environment. The average humidity up there is roughly, you know, 30%, somewhere in there. I have records down to 12% humidity. It is physically impossible by conventional meteorology for such a haze to develop. And the only way it makes sense is by having, number one, the introduction of a nuclei; and second is its hydrate form, or seeking of water. There are salts that accept water at relative humidities of 30%. This is exactly in the area that we're talking about that you'll start to see that haze perform, that haze develop.

BS: Right. When you did the testing to determine the metallic salts, and you said there were five, right? - barium, magnesium, calcium, titanium, and aluminum.

CC: There are five as what I call a 'candidate list.' In other words, I'm very careful with my work and I do not extend my claims beyond that which is appropriate. The fact is I have no personal test for the existence of titanium; when I submit that candidate list it's because either I or sufficient credible reports have been received that it is worthy of examination. I can speak to two of those metals, in particular, for my tests. The others can be regarded with an environmental engineer test that was done, and also that commercial aircraft filter. The two metals that I speak for with direct experience are those of barium and magnesium. These are the two of the five that I have direct test results that justify the existence of those two metals.

BS: Now, were they from rain samples? Or where did you get your samples for the test that you did?

CC: This would be through a combination of those 20 - well, really, not all 20 do apply. Probably about six methods apply towards the atmospheric testing. We can start with the rainfall and then, you know, the electrolysis is certainly an important one. That's an interesting one, which is the first one on my side that presented a strong and justifiable case for the existence of barium.

BS: Okay, hold your thought there and we will come back as we continue talking about the mysterious contrails that so many of us see and we really don't know what they are. And it sounds like the authorities don't want to know. I'm Barbara Simpson.

BS: Barbara Simpson here, talking with Clifford Carnicom. Clifford, before we continue with our conversation about the contrails, I mentioned earlier your website and I want to put that out and give it to people. It's www.carnicom.com. Is that sufficient for people to get to what they need?

CC: That's fine, Barbara. There is a prominent link on the front page to the aerosol operation issue, and easily visible, and people can find that research of four and a half years easily from there.

BS: Okay. So, again, it's www.carnicom.com. And Clifford mentioned earlier

the list of various things that you can look into. I can vouch for that because I have checked it out, and you've got hours and hours of reading there if people want to do it, on lots of different aspects of all of this, backing up what we're talking about. Just before the break we were talking about the fact that you were looking into the testing. What would be the purpose of putting barium or magnesium or any of the other metals that you mentioned - the metallic salts - into the atmosphere? What would it do to the atmosphere?

CC: Well, Barbara, this actually starts to open up a broader area of discussion. If we can, if you can grant me the opportunity, it might be helpful to follow through on a question that you asked earlier that we didn't get a chance to really finish.

BS: What's that?

CC: Which eventually will tie into what you're asking now, and that is the purported claims of benevolence that these operations have, and how the evidence doesn't necessarily support that. And this would be one of the questions of why someone would do such a thing.

BS: Wait. When you said 'purported claims of benevolence' it sounded to me as though nobody was claiming they even existed. So, how could they be benevolent if they don't exist?

CC: Well, that would be one case. However, it is fair to say that there have been several occasions where: when media attention has been given to this subject -- a certain argument claiming that these operations are beneficial or benevolent to us for the purpose of mitigating global warming, in particular, and ozone reduction - this is a common theme.

BS: Who said that?

CC: Who said that? You have a certain journalist that has repeated that claim numerous times.

BS: Who?

CC: Who?

BS: Yeah.

CC: His name is William Thomas. You have many anonymous sources that just come out with, you know, unsigned, uncited statements making this claim. And it has received. . .

BS: Yeah, but an anonymous claim has virtually no weight at all.

CC: That's correct, unless - unless -- it receives wide distribution. That's an unfortunate consequence of the role of the media. In other words, you know, when one looks at the issue of propaganda, misinformation, and disinformation, it certainly can have an effect, to circulate that type of information, regardless of whether it has any validity or credibility whatsoever.

BS: Right.

CC: Unfortunately, there is a reality that there is an effect. I think it is a very appropriate question because I think it's necessary to examine the evidence and ask whether or not that is a reasonable argument. I find serious problems with that argument as it has been presented. The argument goes something to the effect of this: You put particulate matter into the air and it reflects heat, so it's cooling off the Earth, so it's helping us out with global warming. I will say that this argument has received a, let's say, substantial amount of attention when press is given on this subject. It specifically draws reference upon a paper by Teller - Edward Teller - written in 1996, which puts forth this argument. And this has been used as a rationale as to why someone would do such a thing. There's some problems. . .

BS: Wait a minute. You're saying Dr. Edward Teller, from Lawrence Livermore Laboratory, put out a paper in 1996 saying that these contrails are in fact intentional and that they are putting metal salts in the atmosphere to help global warming? Is that what you're saying?

CC: No. What I'm saying is this is a paper which presents a proposal for the introduction of particulate matter into the atmosphere in significant amounts for the purpose of curtailing global warming. It is a proposal. And what I'm saying is: This proposal is often used as an argument as to why it is actually occurring. And I'm furthermore saying that this argument, when examined, does not hold up to scrutiny. And here's the reason why: If you look at this paper, it says, okay, we're going to try to introduce these particulates. But a very important piece of information that has not been discussed in that presentation is where that material is introduced. And guess where Mr. Teller and his associates want that material introduced into the atmosphere. They suggest three locations. First, is the stratosphere. The stratosphere is roughly 40 miles above us. The troposphere is the lower level. Planes fly roughly seven miles high. The stratosphere is 40 miles high, roughly. That's the first, that's the lowest. The second one is 8,000 miles away from Earth. That's his second location. And the third location is 400,000 miles away from Earth. Never does he say that it is desirable to introduce these materials into the lower atmosphere. And there is a very sensible, physical reason why you would never do such a thing. And that is that these particulates absorb heat. It is exactly the opposite of what is being claimed by those that use this as an argument, that it is somehow benevolent, that it is somehow helping us. Usually, if something is benevolent for you, you tell people about it. You don't hide it. And the fact is that these metals, as investigated, absorb heat. And if you put them in the lower atmosphere they make it hotter. And therefore the actual physical effect of these particulates is exactly as hundreds of thousands of people are observing, and that is: It's getting hotter. It's not getting colder. And the more you put this stuff in the air, the hotter it's going to get. And not only that, it absorbs water at tremendous levels, and you are setting yourself up for a drought or the aggravation of drought conditions. Which is exactly what we are experiencing. And I do not accept any argument that is presented that this is a benevolent operation with a fundamental premise of mitigating global warming. It does not hold up to scrutiny. Observation and all analysis directly contradicts that. And we do find ourselves in a most serious drought situation, and that is a part of the monitoring that is presented on this site. And I can only say it is reasonable to predict that the situation will only intensify, as long as the operations continue. Last year, you had roughly two-thirds of the United States in severe drought conditions. And as it stands right now you have roughly one-half of the United States under extreme or severe drought conditions - primarily the whole Rocky Mountain area, that whole central high area, which, by the way, is your watershed system. And to me it's quite predictable that you are going to have a significant consequence related to drought as long as you introduce water-loving, heat-raising particulates into the atmosphere.

BS: Let me ask you this: I've seen a lot of these things in the sky. Personally, I have never seen the airplanes that I know a lot of people have called me on Coast and talked about it. I know they've talked with George about it. When Art was doing the show they talked with him about it. If you can't see the planes, how high does that mean they have to be so that you really can't see where these trails are coming from?

CC: Well, from my side, Barbara, you know, that is simply, it's not something that I could experience here where I'm at, because it's very easy for me to see the planes in almost all cases. Commercial aircraft generally flies roughly at 35 to 40 thousand feet. That's seven miles away. And I'm at 6,500 [feet], so it's down to about six miles. But, nevertheless, quite visible here, no problem for me. And a part of my work - roughly, the first year of all of my work --- was focused on the photography and video of aircraft. So, I spent a significant amount of time specifically for that purpose of collecting information related to the visual characteristics of the aircraft that were conducting these operations. So, I can't speak, unfortunately, in your case. I can only say that in my case a part of my effort was devoted towards the collection of photographic evidence as to the nature of the aircraft and the

types of emissions that are visually occurring and the anomalous nature of those.

BS: Right. What kinds of aircraft did you take pictures of? Was there any type of consistency among them?

CC: Well, in my case, you know, this is somewhat of a point of contention with some folks, because you know there's folks that say these things are flying down at 10,000 feet. They're saying they're all military aircraft. The fact is, I just photograph it and I put the evidence up here. And what I find -- one can look at the photographs for themselves -- in my case, with my photographs, every one of those aircraft that I have would be of a commercial type. And I will have to use the phrase 'commercial type.' I cannot say whether it's commercial or not. But I can say that these aircraft that I have, especially Boeing 757s, 737s (MD-80 or DC-9, I think is the most current nomenclature) -- these are commercial-type aircraft that exhibit most unusual behavior, to say the least.

BS: Like what?

CC: Well, let's take these for example. I understand some folks may not have the benefit of the Net, but nevertheless I will try to describe it visually.

BS: Okay.

CC: I have at least four to five photographs --these were all done with telephoto lens. At one point I had up to a 1200-millimeter lens on my camera before it was stolen. And these aircraft have the most unusual property of emitting a what I would call laminar flow, a continuous flow, laminar flow, which emanates from the entire wingspan of the aircraft. Now, there are some problems that develop here. And that is: These aircraft have usually two engines, maybe three in some cases, but engines in specific locations on that wing or along the fuselage. You run into some physical problems when you start seeing a laminar flow across the entire wingspan. I'm quite familiar with those that offer a counter argument of wing vortices. I'm sorry, I've looked into that; it doesn't hold up. The distribution of a flow does not follow that claim. And you have a physical impossibility that arises. The DC-9 or MD-80 is a classic case. What you have there is an airplane with two engines along the

fuselage of the aircraft. Not even on the wings, in this case. Two engines, which one can see along the fuselage, the rear portion of the fuselage of this plane. You have emissions which encompass the entire span, literally a continuous flow from wingtip to wingtip. And these emissions were continuous as far as the visibility is, which is roughly close to 200 miles in a horizon at that altitude in a clear desert environment -- under conditions of extreme low humidity, we can add - for a total span of roughly 400 miles of continuous emissions that does not physically make sense as being produced by the engines.

BS: So, it sounds as though this would be a physically modified plane that would allow for the release of something from the wingspan?

CC: It most certainly does. It most certainly does. Now, I am not claiming that this is typical. As a matter of fact, when these photographs were taken it's fair to say that these were not seen anymore after that. These are rather unusual photographs but they certainly provide a compelling argument. These are not conventional aircraft by any means, nor are their emissions. You have 757s that are showing the same thing. You have color and spectroscopic variation within those emissions which would suggest strongly that it's not water vapor, besides the whole behavior of it after that. You have one photograph up in Colorado that has the discrete 'on-off.' What you have going is this continuous trail that I'm talking about coming across the full wingspan. And then, just like turning off a switch, it's just blank as could be. And then down whatever it is, a quarter mile, half mile, whatever the distance is, it's turned right back on. It literally looks like a switch. This photograph is so unusual that I had several folks that claim that there was no way this was possible; it had to be a fake photograph. Sorry, it's true. You've had a person that has looked into the pixel structure of this photograph.

There's no manipulation whatsoever. And it is a fact that it has a discrete nature that is atypical. It does not satisfy your meteorological arguments of variation in the atmosphere. The atmosphere is a fluid environment. It doesn't go in sharp lines, on and off, and you've got a problem.

BS: Yeah.

CC: There's other photographs that are a little dark but it's a little interesting in that it looks like there's. . . It's hard, it's a hard thing to do, technically, to get these. But you see some protuberances along the wing that just don't look like the engines, but I just can't do any more with it. One has to judge for themselves.

BS: Were there any markings on the plane at all? I mean, most planes have. . .

CC: Not that I could capture at that level with my equipment. This is a difficult problem, again, with limited resources. My 1200-millimeter lens was a jerry-rigged affair with two teleconverters in there -- and you knock down the light, so you run into technical problems with the amount of light you're getting. I simply did the best I could with these. They certainly are unusual and quite remarkable and would cause one to, hopefully, take a second look and examine the evidence.

BS: Has anybody else taken any photographs that get a shot of the same kind of thing you're talking about?

CC: There are some. However, I can't say that I've seen any that are any more dramatic than this. I think when one presents this evidence they need to make the case convincing. And there are a lot of photographs that I would regard as somewhat ambiguous. So, I'm not saying there aren't any. There's a few folks that have done some remarkable work with a telescope -- and that's really difficult to do. But in terms of presenting the basic conflict that I'm speaking of, I can't say that I know of any right offhand that are necessarily better. But certainly photographs now are in the order of, probably, hundreds of thousands that exist. But close-up photography at this level of a 1200 lens is a pretty rare thing to come by.

BS: Right. You mentioned various metals. It would seem to me that some if not all of them would have a negative impact on, certainly, human health. I don't know about plants. But certainly on mammals. Am I right on that or not?

CC: I would agree with you, Barbara. I would agree with you. Let's address this from the simplest point of view, to begin with. And that is the ingestion of metallic particulate matter.

BS: Yeah.

CC: There's three sources that I can quote you right now. The first one will be the American Lung Association themselves. They've got that directly on their website. You have a study in the New England Journal of Medicine. You have a study by Johns Hopkins University. And you have a textbook that I own which is called The Mechanics of Aerosols. And all four of these sources will convincingly state to you that there is a direct relationship between mortality and the ingestion of particulate matter.

BS: We will continue with that train of thought, the effect of that stuff in the sky on the rest of us right down here on terra firma. My guest is Clifford Carnicom. His website, www.carnicom.com. Coast to Coast continues. I'm Barbara Simpson.

BS: My guest this morning is Clifford Carnicom. Clifford, before the end of the last hour we were talking about, you were saying that there were metallic salts of possibly five different metals. And I had asked you the effect on health, on mammals, of ingestion of things like that. And you quoted the New England Journal of Medicine, Johns Hopkins, American Lung Association, and one other -- and I missed that one -- that say that there is a

negative effect. Did they say any more about that?

CC: Well, what the literature demonstrates, I guess, at the most rudimentary level is that there is a direct link - the one source quotes it as being linear - between the increase in mortality in association with the ingestion of increased concentrations of particulates. Now, the size of the particulates is also a significant factor in that.

BS: Right.

CC: And we are speaking of, by the best analysis available, extremely small particulates. The best evidence indicates these are at the seven micron level. The smaller it is, the more likely these are to settle into the deeper recesses of the respiratory tract, and the harder they would be to get rid of. So, again, I make no claims to be a doctor but in the research that I have done it is extremely disturbing at the most rudimentary level of physical mechanics and their effect upon the body. And these are aerosols I'm speaking of, not contrails. There is a distinct difference. I am speaking of the ingestion of suspended particles in the air that go into the respiratory tract.

BS: What about ingesting them through, if it lands on, food crops, for example? We would eat them rather than breathe them in. Is that also a possibility or a probability?

CC: I think very much so, Barbara. I have equal concern for the welfare of the biology, the flora, the fauna, the water table. I have equal concern for the health of this planet beyond our own species. The findings with respect to pH are disturbing, also.

BS: Like what? We haven't talked about that. What did you find?

CC: No, we have not. What started this was: I ran some pH tests, pH being a measure of the acidity or the alkalinity of a solution. I ran pH tests on rainfall that I collected. This test showed a bias towards the alkaline side relative to where it is expected to be. That concerned me enough that I extended a call for other citizens to conduct tests in their locations. And I appreciate the efforts that many individuals have made as well as many other citizens across the country that have helped me in this work also. But we had roughly about 20 states that were involved by the time it was done. The results were consistent across the board that there was a shift or a bias in the pH test towards the alkaline side. Now, one reason this is important, a starting point, is again another reference by a fellow named Crutzen. Crutzen was the winner of the Nobel prize for chemistry in 1995. He wrote a book called *Atmosphere, Climate, and Change*, which is a Scientific American publication. In this book this fellow makes a statement that to me is rather important, and that is: He says that if there was one thing, one physical quantity that characterized the state of the atmosphere, it would be the pH. He says it very clearly. So, if you were to take one single thing and try to characterize the general state of the atmosphere, it is the pH.

BS: What range is the healthy range?

CC: Normal water is actually slightly acidic. That was part of my learning process also. Initially, I assumed it was neutral, as some others may. And in the learning process, I realized that's not the case. You actually have a mixing of carbonic acid because of CO₂ there, so it drives it a little bit toward the acidic side. The expected level for normal rainwater would be at 5.6 -- understanding that the scale runs from 0 to 14, with 7 being neutral. Now, you also have - particularly the eastern part of this country -- that has a tendency toward the acidic side, the whole acid rain picture that we spent billions of dollars studying and researching, which will drive it down even a little bit further. The findings from citizens, as well as myself, is that you have an increase of roughly 20 to 25 times. This information is now two years old, so I don't know what the current tests will show. But you have an increase roughly in order of 20 to 25 times on the alkaline side from that which is expected.

BS: But when you're testing rain it's certainly influenced by everything that's

in the air. How do you do a test to show the effect of the contrails vs. smog vs. dust storms vs. factory output vs. fireplace fires and, you know, all the myriad things that introduce particulate matter into the air? How do you separate all that out?

CC: I don't intend to claim to separate them all out. What I can claim to do is run a fair and legitimate test with the resources that are available to me, and report those findings to the public.

BS: Yeah, but if you can't distinguish among all of those things, then your findings are not valid.

CC: I would not accept that position whatsoever.

BS: How would you defend it, then?

CC: What I would say is that if one makes any environmental test and those tests indicate a cause for concern, then it is appropriate to make that information available to the public as well as public officials so that it can be investigated properly with those that do have the resources available to separate out the influence of various components. That is the obligation and duty of a citizen. It does not negate the validity of a test in any way. It is simply the presentation of information for those that do have the resources.

BS: So, in other words, you're saying that just the fact that you see an increase in the alkalinity, that is sort of a red flag that needs to be investigated. Right?

CC: Exactly.

BS: But not necessarily that it's from contrails.

CC: I make no claim of that in my writings. You read my writings, I make the claims as I think is appropriate under the circumstances.

BS: What does that mean?

CC: That is an atmospheric test, at least resulting from rainfall, repeated over numerous locations and numerous times that provides a consistent result that is justifiable cause for concern.

BS: And what is the concern? What is the negative effect of that increase in alkalinity on us, either as humans or other mammals or Nature in general?

CC: Well, one would infer that if this country spent billions of dollars in a decade investigating the issue of acid rain -- where you had an imbalance toward the acidic side of rainfall and those effects upon the biology and health of this planet -- I think it's reasonable to, let's say, infer or conclude that there may be justifiable equal cause for concern if the balance shifts the other way. Again, I don't claim to be a medical person or a botanist in this side, but in general, a common sense reply is: If you go disturbing Nature, you'd better know what you're doing and you'd better investigate it.

BS: Well, I would agree on that. But I'm thinking in terms of the acid rain. We had the specific effects of acid rain, whether it be on death of trees, whether it be on the disintegration of public memorials and the marble being affected, the facades of buildings, etc. What are the effects of the increase in alkalinity?

CC: Well, I think we're going to need to get the agricultural folks in here at some point of this discussion, but I think that we would find that the flora of this planet has certain ranges or limits of acidity and alkalinity that it can grow best under or flourish. And that if you start upsetting that balance or that range, that you can expect corresponding disturbances in the production levels of that flora, whether it be crops or native plants. That's as far as I can go, you know, with my analysis. Again, if someone finds information of concern, their duty is to present that information for public examination and investigation. In other words, Clifford Carnicom cannot

account and compensate for the billions of dollars that was spent investigating the acid rain. I don't have those type of resources.

BS: Right. When we're talking about the doing of all this, you were saying. . . Am I right to conclude that you believe it's intentional?

CC: These are deliberate acts, yes.

BS: Okay. Do you have your own suspicions as to who is doing it?

CC: I really can't pin down a 'who.' You know, I try to be fair in my analysis, and I don't have a 'who.' There's nobody stepping forward. There's no accountability and there's no disclosure. What I can infer, based on the evidence, is that you are dealing with -- at a minimum, and this may be at least worth considering, at a minimum -- dealing with a global operation and/or power structure associated with it. And that is at a minimum.

BS: What would be the maximum?

CC: Maximum would be external to that environment.

BS: Meaning?

CC: External. It means one must consider all possibilities.

BS: Well, give us an example. What do you mean by external? You're the one who reached that conclusion.

CC: External to this planet would consider external forms of life and/or influence.

BS: In other words, you're talking about extraterrestrial life?

CC: Anything is to be considered when you start to deal with the ecology of a planet as a whole. It can be mentioned that one of the many visitors to my website that has expressed an interest -- being high-level military defense contractors as well as pharmaceuticals -- is the Ames Research Center. One of the primary objectives of the Ames Research Center from NASA is to study astrobiology. One must at least consider all possible influences when you're dealing with a problem that's not anything that. . . You know, I'll say at this point: I have nothing that cannot be explained in terms of Earthly origin. I'll say that. But what I will say is that we are now at the point where this planet has been modified. Not a nation, not a country -- the planet has been modified. And therefore, that should concern the global community as a minimum.

BS: How has the planet been modified? In what way? What do we know about the way it is today that it wasn't 25 years ago?

CC: There's some mountains that are maybe 15 or 20 miles from me. In the desert environment -- you can dig in the math, you can go through the books -- but in a desert environment, good air, you can see 120 miles without a problem.

BS: Especially in Santa Fe.

CC: I have mountains that are 15 miles away from me that are frequently and regularly obscured from view. That's a physical change which is of more than concern to me, as well as, I hope, many others. So, there's something there. There's something there between you and the mountain. And I'm saying to a certain extent we have a very good idea of what's there. And that represents a change. And if one can demonstrate that that change exists on a global scale, then that would be cause for concern, I would believe.

In terms of the fragility of the atmosphere, let me try to give one real-life example in terms of what we're dealing with. If a human being -- say roughly six feet - were the size of the Earth, if the Earth diameter corresponded to the height of a human being, and you were to take a stack of index cards and

you would stack up those cards so that they were roughly a sixteenth of an inch thick, and you'd stick those index cards on top of your head, roughly three quarters of the mass of our atmosphere is contained within those index cards. This is a fragile environment that this planet depends upon.

BS: Right.

CC: You do not go disturbing that atmosphere without consequences. Those consequences are in place now.

BS: What do you mean?

CC: The atmosphere is no longer the same as it was. We have toyed with Nature here. We have other applications, you know, that we may get to or not get to, depending on time, but: Life is your breath.

BS: Of course it is, but we already know, don't we, that human beings on this planet have modified the atmosphere? If nothing else, but our use of fossil fuels has created a contamination of the atmosphere, to say nothing of all the other things we've done.

CC: Life is full of relatives. There are no absolutes here. What I am saying is that there is a body of evidence collected over four and a half years that presents a compelling case of a significant alteration, both physically and chemically, of our fragile atmosphere that surrounds this Earth. And that there is a point, there is a threshold, where one would hope that human beings have a concern for the welfare of their home. And I am saying that I believe that that threshold has been crossed some time ago.

BS: I guess, bottom line, the issue is, then, what can be done about it? If, as you say -- and I'm not questioning you at all -- you've tried reaching these people, you've written the letters, you've gotten the answers, you've gotten the snubs and the ridicule, I'm certain, from different sectors of our society and others -- how do you deal with it? How do you fight city hall? -- I guess is what I'm saying.

CC: Yeah, that's a great question. I wish I had an easy answer. I've been working on it for four and a half years. I do see different levels of it. And I have to express my disappointment as well as my optimism for human faith and nature, and hopefully eventually it will triumph. But, you know, I do see this on different levels and, unfortunately, the first level on this is a selfish point of view: me. And I have to say I'm disappointed in the environmental organizations and their lack of willingness to engage themselves in the protection. Like I said, I'm not a radical environmentalist by any means, if you look at my history. I was a pretty quiet federal employee. But I am upset, there's no way around it. And these folks that claim to be acting on behalf of the welfare of our planet under an environmental cause or guise -- and not perform their service -- is a travesty. And, unfortunately, the first level of this is one of selfishness. And this is the one that seems to emerge first. I hope that we can get past this. But that's me, how I protect me and my health. What do I do? How's it going to affect me?

BS: But we have no recourse, do we? I mean, how do we protect ourselves?

CC: There's always recourse. It's a matter of whether or not we exercise it.

BS: Well, what would the recourse be?

CC: Well, the first level is that: Go ahead and satisfy the selfish interests and needs, and learn to protect your health. Because we have, apparently, a very serious problem that can affect your health. We have a lot of reason to think that your health is in, let's say, some state of jeopardy or threat. And so you need to take the actions to educate yourself and to defend and protect your health and your environment that you live in, your home. So, this is the selfish interest. But there's no problem, go ahead and satisfy that. That's your first recourse. My contention is that that's not good enough.

BS: Well, it certainly doesn't solve the problem. I mean, obviously.

CC: It does not. It does not.

BS: Yeah. Okay. I hear the music, which means we're at the bottom of the hour. We will continue and find out some of the ways we can protect ourselves. And also I want to ask Clifford about something we've talked about on Coast a lot before: HAARP. I wonder if it has anything to do with that and the military. Lots more to talk about. We'll be back. I'm Barbara.

BS: Talking with my guest, Clifford Carnicom. And his website, by the way, is www.carnicom.com. Clifford, we were talking about how we can, or you suggest that we can protect ourselves from the negative effects of what might be in the contrails.

CC: We were, Barbara, and I guess what I was trying to express is that I see different levels of going after this, and my hope is that matures to a higher level than it has. We talked about individual improvement of your own environment. Certainly, there are some very important things that need to be done there because our immune systems are under assault. It appears to be the end health effect here, as far as individuals go. And so a great deal of attention needs to be placed into the boosting of our immune systems. I wear a mask outside. I have for about a year and a half. I believe it's beneficial to minimize the ingestion of these particles. I think that one should consider high-quality air filtration in their home.

BS: Wait. I was going to ask you a question on the masks. If the size of these particles is so small, what kind of mask would you get? I mean, they're even saying -- with SARS, for example, with so many people using the mask for that -- that they're really not sufficient to protect them. Where would you get masks that would have openings that tiny?

CC: Sure. One has to do the best they can under circumstances, and life is full of compromises. I guess my answer to that would be: On a practical sense, I actually have three masks, but in terms of one I use on a daily basis, it would be called an N-95 mask. I have what is called a P-100, which would be the equivalent of a HEPA mask. These things both have their inconveniences, no matter how you go about it. There's an issue of self-consciousness that arises there, I think, with most people.

BS: Uh-huh. You wear one all the time when you go out?

CC: I do now, yes.

BS: Really?

CC: Yes, I do.

BS: Okay.

CC: That's the result of my own experiences. In terms of size, I can only go by my experience. I believe, actually, from the physical side it makes sense, that this material takes some time to accumulate in your body. It also takes some time to be released from your body. I do notice an improvement, as far as that goes, over time, but it has taken quite a bit of time to affect that.

BS: Improvement over what?

CC: Previous health experiences. Especially respiratory conditions and that type of thing. Three main health symptoms that I think people should look for would be: chronic respiratory conditions, second would be unusual allergic responses, and the third would be short term memory loss. I do want to mention that there are some good folks over at a place called Chemtrail Tracking USA -- Lorie Kramer and Kim Weber. They are conducting a health survey now. And folks may want to contribute their information to that, so that some sort of a handle on the chronic symptoms that are reported can be collected.

BS: But, you know, my only problem with that is: How do you separate out

those symptoms which can be attributed to a whole variety of sources? I mean, how do you know it's from this and not that? - I guess is what I'm asking.

CC: No one is claiming to separate those out in an absolute sense. I think what you have is that human beings have a need to protect their health and protect their welfare and their dignity as a species. And they have a right to act to collect the best information that they can, since there apparently is a complete failure of our public health organizations to provide that service for them, to have the proper investigations. And if the folks that you pay to do your job won't do it, then sometimes you have to do the best you can under your own control.

BS: I got you. It makes sense.

CC: So, I think a certain level of that is finally accumulating. In terms of size, you know, there's an interesting question on that that I've worked through myself. And that is, the source -- the size at the source does appear to be at the sub-micron level. However, in the descent of materials -- which, by the way, does occur. People say it never reaches the ground. It's not true. It's just a matter of time. There's plenty of charts that show the descent rates. That material, by the analyses that have been under way, hygroscopic quality, it's absorbing water, and actually one would expect an increase in size. So, by the time it's down to the lower atmosphere, one would expect it to be of a slightly larger size. And actually the light characteristics of that material can give one a fairly good idea of the size range. It would appear to me, both by that analysis as well as practical experience, that the mask does have a level and degree of effectiveness in reducing that intake.

BS: Uh-huh. What else could people do?

CC: The next level is really where I would go from there. You know, the immune system is really a lifelong enterprise, actually.

BS: You bet.

CC: But the next level of that would be to extend your concern beyond your own immediate health and body to that of another human being or another creature or a plant of this Earth. And that is to help someone else beside yourself. The next level would be to engage yourself at your national level and become an active citizen in your country, and take part in it. Look into the history of your country and the foundation of it, and protect it and defend it.

BS: I'm not sure I understand what that means in relation to contrails. That sounds like good basic patriotism to me.

CC: What it means is that we have public officials and agencies in authority that are not performing their duty. Therefore, it is the call of citizens to seek that performance of duty by those officials and those authorities. Engage yourself.

BS: In other words, put the pressure on.

CC: That's right.

BS: I would assume that if enough people did they would respond differently to letters such as the ones you mentioned earlier. And it's because they're not getting huge numbers of letters, phone calls, e-mails, faxes, etc., that they can slough it off.

CC: Yeah. I'm not sure if that's actually true or not.

BS: Really?

CC: Yeah, unfortunately I can't, because I think we have an issue in this country that has developed of media control of information. And that is an

extremely powerful force in terms of what has representation within this country as a legitimate topic of discussion or news. And that is an extremely powerful source. Just as you see right now in a current war in a foreign country where one of your first objectives is to overtake that source of information, that media, to present a certain agenda to those people. So, I don't know that I could accept that argument because we actually have no count other than: I would say from my own personal experience that I do believe you have an awareness of this issue that is now in the millions. I do believe you have millions of folks that are aware of this issue, to some degree.

BS: Yeah.

CC: I think you have activism on the level of scores of thousands. And so I do not think that the numbers are necessarily inadequate. And I think that with a responsible performance by the media, as a start, in this country, that we would be much further along than we are. And I do appreciate the effort that you are making tonight to help present this information to the public in a broader form. But there is a serious, serious issue with the control of information by the media in this country.

BS: Oh, there's no question about it. Not necessarily even control of the information, but certainly a rigid ability to decide what becomes 'news.'

CC: Sure. What's important.

BS: Exactly. I have loads of questions, and I want to touch on HAARP a little bit later, but we've got a lot of callers, too. So, let's get a few of the callers in, Clifford. We have a caller on the east of the Rockies line. Caller, what's your name and where are you calling from?

Caller: My name is Kevin. I'm calling from Albany, New York.

BS: Okay, go ahead, Kevin.

Kevin: Hi, Barbara. Hi, Clifford. I'm curious - and I'm not a big fan of censorship myself, about what goes over the airwaves. But working on mass hysteria, which was talked about on Coast to Coast, I'm curious if Clifford isn't contributing to the spread of negativity. I would like him to sum up what he knows definitively, without disclaimers, what he can say definitively about the effects of these chemtrails or contrails, as he will call them. And what he can say definitively instead of summing it up with disclaimers and stuff like that. I'd like to know what he can tell the public and your listeners -- all of us - - definitively what is known about these things that people are talking about constantly. And I'll listen to what you have to say on the radio.

BS: Okay. Thanks for the question. What do you know for a fact?

CC: I think what I have done, Barbara, is spend roughly, whatever it is -- two and a half, three hours? -- presenting information from this standpoint to the best ability that I can. I will not be boxed into a corner to satisfy this particular individual's agenda.

BS: That's not putting. . . Wait now, come on. You're being unfair, Clifford. I don't know whether he has an agenda or not. He's asking you a question. What do you know for a fact about what you have spent more than the last four years collecting evidence on? That's a legitimate question.

CC: All of the evidence, all of the information -- you can designate whether you regard something as a fact or not.

BS: Uh-huh.

CC: What I say is that you have a body of evidence, a body of information, that you are free to evaluate if you wish. You can determine the veracity or unbelievability of the information as you see fit. And, you know, at what point does something become a fact? Right?

BS: When it's been proven to exist.

CC: Yes. And how is that proof to take place? At what level? You open up a complete Pandora's box in terms of trying to assign an absolute to an issue.

BS: No, I think he was asking you: What do you believe is the fact about it? Would it be safe to say you believe that there is something being done to create these contrails?

CC: I stated. . . And first of all, I do not accept the use of the term 'contrails' for what we're speaking of. And second, what I did at the very early part of our interview is that I stated what my primary claim was, to the most assertive level that I could.

BS: Uh-huh. Well, do it again, because maybe he just tuned in. I mean, let's face it, we've been on the air for three hours now. We probably have had a whole shift and change and mixing and melding of audiences. Tell us again.

CC: That may be.

BS: It is true.

CC: What I stated was that since the beginning of 1999 there has been the systematic injection of massive amounts of particulate matter into the atmosphere using aircraft. That's what I've stated.

BS: Okay, fair enough. Let's go to the west of the Rockies line. Caller, what's your name and where are you calling from?

Caller: Yeah, I'm Robert and I'm calling from Lake County. It's in Northern California.

BS: Okay, Robert. Go ahead, please.

Robert: Yeah. My dad was in the military, air force, Army Air Force, for 20-something years. I used to tell my friends about what makes up a contrail. And ever since this aerosol trails thing started, you know, I've been pretty concerned about it because it absolutely doesn't follow the rules of science or anything else. You know, I've called in a few times, actually, asking for someone to talk about it on the air, William Thomas or somebody. And I just want to say, God bless you, Clifford - amen - for having the balls to. . . It's okay to say 'balls' on the air, isn't it?

BS: I think you did.

Robert: Yeah!

BS: It's even okay to say 'God.' Go ahead.

Robert: Yeah. Oh, that's right: God. We're starting to almost run out of that, it seems like. So, I really appreciate what you're doing and I was thinking we should make like a poster, you know. Maybe somebody could get it together and set up a website and send in some photographs. I've got a tic-tac-toe times ten pictures from quite a nice vantage point that I've seen frequently. And I think it's a mess, you know. It's a big controversial thing. I'll tell you what's definitive about it. For one thing, everybody's ignoring it, it seems like. I've talked to people who should have their heads screwed on straight and they can't seem to even try and think about it. I think the people that have the aptitude and the facilities to do anything about it are too busy with the distractions of life, from their luxuries and everything else to their problems and just dealing with reality, in general.

BS: Well, you know what really bothers me, Robert. You live in Northern California, as do I, so we've probably seen some of the same things. And what I find astonishing is: really intelligent people who will deny that it even happens!

Robert: Yeah, I'm amazed that someone told me that it was jet exhaust. And

I'm like, no, there's no . . . It's amazing.

BS: Yeah.

Robert: So, maybe a poster's a good idea. Listen, I collected some fiber one time. And I'm just curious if you had any. This might happen with other fibers, but when I put light on it, it actually started to float. And I've noticed that sometimes certain, you know, maybe they're polymer chemtrails or whatever -- aerosol trails, rather -- that do that. As soon as the sun goes down they disappear. And also I had this and I was going to look at it with one of my either 100x or 30x portable microscope I have. And when I finally opened it up after quite a few months it had disappeared. And believe it or not I got sick, and I swear I breathed some of it in when I opened it. That was pretty stupid, the way I did it. At any rate, God bless you. Amen, amen, both of you.

BS: Thank you, Robert.

CC: Thank you very much, Robert. I appreciate your concern and your involvement.

BS: Yep. No question about it. Let's go to the wild card line. Caller, what's your name and where are you calling from?

Caller: Yes, my name is Jamie and I'm calling here in the Coachella Valley area of, I guess, the Palm Springs area, but we call it the Coachella Valley.

BS: Southern California.

Jamie: Yes. In California, yes. My question would be. . . We get 'em here all the time, too. There would be a beautiful blue sky morning. And next, you know, you see those planes coming out from the horizon or way back and just leaving that contrail, I guess. But my question is: Once in a while, you'll get a black one going through there, along with the contrails. And I want to know if he knows anything about that. And I'll listen to my answer off the air.

BS: Okay, thank you. I must admit I haven't seen black ones. Have you, Clifford?

CC: That's actually a good observation. It's sort of an interesting one. I don't have a definitive answer, okay? I can acknowledge a lack of definitiveness at certain occasions; there's plenty of them with this issue. By the way, another one to add on to that topic of 'what is absolute' is: being done without informed consent. But this business of black lines is rather interesting. I don't have a direct answer other than there are numerous reports. These are coming from, really, many places. I have seen them myself. I think one has to . . . You know, when you do a study on this, you have to do it completely and legitimately. And there is a question of shadow effects that does have to be eliminated. I know that many of the observations do not support a shadow effect as being capable of creating the full effect. But that has to be eliminated from an analytical point of view before I think we go further. From that standpoint on, it is speculation at this point. There are beam systems and such that are being considered. I don't operate in a speculative mode very much. And the starting point to this is to start collecting the photographs, make the analysis of sunlight, eliminate the shadow question, and then go from there. But I think it's a good question, and the observation is a very legitimate one, and is reported on a continuous fashion, actually.

BS: You mentioned again, as you did earlier, about informed consent. Obviously, you're referring to your belief that this is some kind of subjecting us to something outside the ordinary, and therefore we should be told about it first. In other words, experimenting on us. Isn't that essentially what you're saying?

CC: Absolutely. Absolutely. The power of government derives from consent of the governed.

BS: Uh-huh.

CC: The Declaration of the United States.

BS: It's happened before, we know that.

CC: It has happened before. And, yes, informed consent is a central issue here.

BS: Okay. We have another wild card line caller, and by golly, I hear music. So, caller, hang on. We'll get to you. We're at the top of the hour. We're talking with Clifford Carnicom. His website -- if you want lots and lots of information backing up what we've been talking about tonight, he has been dutifully collecting all of this and putting it up there for you, and it is impressive indeed: www.carnicom.com. We'll continue on Coast. I'm Barbara Simpson.

[end of third hour]

BS: Talking with Clifford Carnicom about what's in the sky. Clifford, just before the end of the last hour I called up the wild card line and then it was the end of the hour. So, let's go right to that caller. Caller, what is your name and where are you calling from?

Caller: This is William in Miami.

BS: Okay, William, go ahead.

William: Okay. I picked up on the contrails when I talked to Art probably about three years ago. I started noticing them. And on a good calm weekend when the beaches are crowded from Miami to Ft. Lauderdale there's always contrails going up and down right off the ocean, back and forth. Only on the weekends. You don't see them during the week or anything like that.

BS: Hmm!

William: And you don't know if they're doing experiments or whatever. But what was really curious to me, and when the shuttle -- God bless them -- exploded, that afternoon there were criss-crosses, tic-tac-toes in the sky. And I was wondering if you think there was maybe like they were putting something out in the air that would calm the hysteria so they wouldn't think it was another terrorist attack or something like that. I just wanted your opinion on that.

BS: Okay. Clifford, do you have an opinion on that?

CC: Yes. Hi, William, thanks for the question. I guess, in general, I would state that I have nothing definitive to state that that particular operation for that purpose was in place. I think the question opens up a more interesting question, and that is: Why and where are they when they're doing what they're doing? And that's been a very difficult problem. I don't think it's been satisfactorily answered entirely. However, one of the themes which continually appears is that these aerosols -- again, I do not accept the term 'contrails' for these because it does not satisfy behavior as well as physical and chemical behavior, the whole bit -- but nevertheless there is a strong pattern of the prevalence of the operations with respect to advancing moisture systems. It appears to be fairly conclusive -- again, I'm sorry if someone doesn't like my particular language -- but it's fairly conclusive that these have a direct association with advancing moisture fronts. Anybody that's tried to pin down any particular calendar or events of people being in a certain place, I think generally has been very unsuccessful because I don't think that that's really the simple answer for what's going on.

BS: So, you used the terms 'advancing moisture fronts.' In other words, increasing rainfall?

CC: Increasing moisture, yes. As a matter of fact. . .

BS: Does that increase rainfall?

CC: Pardon me?

BS: Does that then increase rainfall?

CC: Actually, quite to the contrary. This material absorbs moisture and decreases rainfall.

BS: So, that would lead to the drought you were talking about earlier. Okay.

CC: That's correct. So, that's one of the strongest patterns that I would say has shown up in terms of why and where. I won't say that's exclusive by any means. There's interesting questions on solar activity and this type of thing, but in terms of a repeatable pattern, moisture shows up real strong.

BS: Okay. Let's go to another wild card line. Caller, what's your name and where are you calling from?

Caller: Hello.

BS: Hi there. What's your name and where are you calling from?

Caller: Bill, Cleveland.

BS: Okay, Bill, go ahead.

Bill: Yes, Barbara Simpson. Your maturation as a Coast to Coast talk show host is obvious. I thank you for being perfective [sic] and continuing to be open-minded.

BS: Thank you.

Bill: Clifford Carnicom, you are courageous and I . . . Like many others. You're not alone. Thank you for what you're doing and saying. I have two questions. I'll make them brief. And then a comment. Do you feel an extraterrestrial objective might be to kill or control Earth's population or to benefit their lifeform or a hybrid lifeform? Number two, how can those who want to support you financially do so? And three, you might want to still contact William Thomas. He started off as you do. I think he got scared. I think they got to him. But he still had a lot of things he stated on his webpage that I think you might find interesting. And I thank you so much for being a guest.

BS: Thank you. Okay, go ahead. What about the theory of extraterrestrials trying to perhaps kill us or modify us or use us in some way?

CC: Thank you very much, Bill, for the questions as well as the support. Good questions. As I said, I cannot have any really basis based on analysis or any physical basis that there's anything outside of this Earth at this time. All I'm saying is I do not dismiss the possibility. How I would answer the population reduction question is this, and that is that there are many people who claim or think that an agenda within these operations is the killing of people or reduction of population. How I answer this is that I cannot make the claim that that's an agenda of this operation. But what I can say is that people are dying in increased numbers. And this mortality rate has increased specifically related to respiratory illness. Respiratory illness is now one of the five leading causes of death. So, the fact is the mortality rate is increasing. Whether or not that's . . .

BS: Wait. The overall mortality rate? Or the mortality rate for respiratory?

CC: The mortality rate from respiratory disease is now one of the five leading causes of death.

BS: Okay.

CC: Matter of fact, recently on an ABC presentation apparently it's jumped up to number four and projected to go up to number three by that same individual. So, certainly cause for legitimate concern there. In terms of

financial, I truly appreciate the offer. Let it be known that I have no financial interest in the research of this issue. I'm acting solely out of what I believe are my obligations as a citizen. Those that wish to contact me can certainly do so with my mailing address, which is PO Box 4653, Santa Fe, NM 87502. But I do want to make it clear that I have no financial interest driving my research. And lastly, understood and agreed that William Thomas has been a significant force of exposing this issue to the public, including both America as well as Canada, and that significant contributions have been made by him and they are to be recognized. It is simply my objective to make the most accurate and best information available that I can on this subject so that we can proceed accordingly.

BS: Okay. Very good. Let's go to another wild card. What's your name, caller? Where are you calling from?

Caller: Yes. My name is Andy. I'm calling from Los Angeles.

BS: Go ahead, Andy.

Andy: You have a great show, Barbara. Clifford, did I understand you to say that there were blood particulates -- is that correct -- that were airborne?

CC: What I can say is that repeated atmospheric testing through a series of tests as well as means have repeatedly presented the existence of biological components. In the opinion of one medical professional they were determined to be, or assessed to be, erythrocytes or red blood cells of a unique and modified freeze-dried form. I have a series of tests myself that have been conducted. I have eight test results -- all listed on separate pages here: May 11, 2000; July 21, a whole series of eight dates -- where my work analyzing filters do detect the repeated presence of biological components. I am not a doctor but I will state by the best analysis that I am able to make from a visual as well as measurement as well as size and shape of these components, that one of them does appear to satisfy the visual characteristics of erythrocytes. I'm not going to overstep my grounds in terms of what I know. Actually, if one will notice: There is a continuous appeal on my site and in my work for the past two to three years calling for professionals in the various fields to perform their duties and offer their services for the public welfare where it's called for, and one of them is certainly an investigation of the biological components. In addition, there is the repeated presence of a granular structure that appears to have a biological origin as well as a bacterial form, a motile bacterial form that apparently seeks out and desires proximity to those cellular structures. And all of this work is presented on my site to the best of my ability.

BS: Can the bacteria form be identified as a certain bacteria?

CC: Oh, I'm sure it can if we get the right folk to doing it.

BS: So, in other words, because you don't have that type of scientific background you have not been able to specifically define it.

CC: That's correct. And/or resources.

BS: Okay. I mentioned earlier: Military, actually, was something that you mentioned as far as the applications for something like this. And also the issue of HAARP. What role, for example, do you see the possibility of military involvement? And does it have anything to do with HAARP? I mean, that's a subject that we've talked about a lot on Coast.

CC: We haven't even begun to broach that subject, and it's a very serious part of this discussion. If we did have adequate time to. . .

BS: Well, start it. Go ahead.

CC: Yes. What I will say, Barbara -- and I'll give you the short answer first and then, depending on your time or a future engagement we might be able to go to it in detail -- but the short answer is that these operations, these aerosol

operations, have HAARP and Tesla written all over them. That's the short answer.

BS: Give me a slightly longer answer.

CC: All right. Here's your longer answer. One needs to dig out the patent for HAARP and read it closely. It's quite an enlightening and educational exercise. Three years ago it was probably pretty much Greek to me. Not the case now, at this time. Examples: HAARP talks about the injection of barium into the atmosphere and the role of photoionisation upon that element. HAARP talks about using the magnetic field lines of the Earth as a conduit for energy transfer. HAARP talks about the role and use of cyclotron resonance for the increase of energy in certain locations. HAARP talks about the use of both extremely low frequency as well as VLF frequency for a broad array of applications. HAARP talks about the manipulation of the geomagnetic field of the Earth to the level and the point of what's called a 'heave weapon.' A heave weapon is an EMP (electromagnetic pulse) effect from a nuclear weapon that actually lifts up the magnetic field of the Earth. This will give you an idea of the amount of power and energy that is implicit in the HAARP design. HAARP talks about the precipitation of particulates, meaning: causing the descent of particulates over specific geographic regions and locations of interest. These are some of the generic designs inherent in the HAARP's project. And there are a multitude of specific applications involving weapon systems and communication and satellites, communication, nuclear submarines, that can be described in more detail. The transport of particulates of very small size, as we're speaking of; radar disruption; weather modification. So, there's really quite a discussion that could ensue on the topic of HAARP. I guess I would refer back to the opening statement that I made, that by my analysis -- which only keeps getting deeper and deeper - is that these operations appear to have HAARP and Tesla all over the face of them.

BS: If that's the case, and it certainly sounds like it could be, would what has been done so far simply be a test? Or is there, do you feel, an attempt to permanently change the atmosphere and what's in, if you will, the air around us so that whatever use HAARP would be put to would be functional?

CC: My claim would be that the atmosphere has changed, it has been changed. Now, if one ceases operations entirely, one could make a fairly reasonable estimate about how long it would take for that thing to clear. But you're talking about a significant period of time. So, the fact is that the condition of the atmosphere has been altered. At what point does something become operational, at what point is it a test, when you have operations that have now been conducted in the overt fashion, right out in the open?

BS: Yeah.

CC: You actually have a history, good evidence that indicates operations back to '94-'95 in more restricted locations of the country. When you have an overt operation that has a visible effect that can be readily determined, I would seriously question whether you are dealing with a test or a research program at that point. And I would have to consider strongly that you are much more deeply into operational aspects. The HAARP facility, in terms of power levels, my understanding is that that guy is running at a pretty high bore right now. They're speaking of three and a half gigawatts, I believe. And in their own literature they state one gigawatt. My work leads to the possibility of emissions of fields at the million-power level. And actually a million watts. If you look at the HAARP patent, one of the major advantages that they claim is that this is a system that can be kept in basically a test mode, but still operational -- in other words, developed -- but can be run at lower levels of power to continually check and monitor the status of the system. So, in other words, a legitimate answer might be: both. You could be in a testing mode as well as the capacity to be fully operational, depending on your desires and objectives.

BS: If they are using it for those military uses, do you see the weather modification as being sort of a side effect of it? Or do you think it's intentional? And for what purpose, to cause a drought which would, you

know, cause a great deal of harm to the economy, to say the least?

CC: There are a lot of good questions that arise here. I don't have the answer to all of them. But in terms of weather modification, it clearly shows up as one of the desired intents of the HAARP project. One can read a document called "Owning the Weather in 2025" which clearly states the objective of the United States Air Force (not the US Air Force but the US military, in general) to literally own the weather. That has tremendous military, strategic advantages if one has actual control of weather systems.

BS: You bet.

CC: If one were to look at military history you would find significant consequences resulting from the environmental conditions of those battles. So, obviously it is a tremendous player in terms of military activities and engagements.

BS: Who put together this "Owning the Weather in 2025"?

CC: I believe that's an Air Force document, actually, if I recall.

BS: You have it on your website?

CC: It's tied in here somewhere. We'd find it eventually. And out of curiosity I have run into another one which is found at the Eisenhower Institute that is at the level of space. And basically this thing is declaring -- overtly, again -- open and complete domination and control of space. I mean, in absolute terms. So, you have it expressed from a military doctrine at both the environmental control of weather as well as complete domination in the space arena. So, you know, there's no being shy about the declared objectives.

BS: Just out of curiosity, do you regard those objectives as intrinsically negative?

CC: I don't really cast a negative or a positive entirely. However, it would be true that I do not believe that any single nation, government, or body has the inherent right of dominion or control over the planet. That's a fair statement.

BS: Okay, fair enough. Let's go to wild card line. Caller, what's your name and where are you calling from?

Caller: This is Jim calling from Oak Grove, Missouri.

BS: Okay, Jim, go.

Jim: I have my main question and a real quick one. When I look at the contrails -- or chemtrails, I believe they are, as you do -- I pay attention to it because I'm interested in it. And as I see it, you only see them when they're all there. And when they're not around they're just plain not around. Now, does that have something to do with anything you know about? Or is that just coincidence? And I find it hard to believe coincidence because I've been paying attention to this, and they're just only around when there's a lot of them. You get the patterns and stuff. And then when that dissipates and you check an hour or two later, considering planes are taking off from airports everywhere every forty seconds, they should always be around but they're not.

BS: Okay. You know what? Clifford, remember that question and we will get to it as soon as we get back from the bottom of the hour break. I'm Barbara Simpson on Coast to Coast AM.

BS: We're talking with Clifford Carnicom. Clifford, just before the bottom of the hour we had a caller, Jim in Missouri who asked about the contrails, what he saw in the sky. Regardless of what you call them, he said: When they're there, they're there, and then all of a sudden they're not. He just wondered about the timing of these kinds of things. Do you have any thoughts on that that you might give him?

CC: Barbara -- and I wish to thank Jim for calling -- and Jim, I'm sure that my answer will be inadequate for you because our experience may not be the same. Unfortunately, I can't corroborate that same experience on this end. In other words, there is a tremendous variety that has appeared here over time in terms of number of aircraft, types of operations, this type of thing. There's a pretty broad spectrum. So, in my case in this particular location, it's not as simple, unfortunately, as either here or, you know, not there. As an extreme example, which sometimes is best to make the point with, May 12th of this month was an extraordinary day which captures attention of a lot of folks, because you had easily over a hundred passes within a couple of hours of time.

BS: This is in Santa Fe?

CC: Yes. And so sometimes it's easier to at least discuss the issue when you can come up with the best representation of what it is that you're talking about. But I've literally seen all combination of . . . Unfortunately, it's not that simple here. And in terms of timing, the best contribution that I can make is related to the statement I made earlier with respect to moisture.

BS: Yeah.

CC: And, actually, changes in moisture being as significant as actual moisture increases -- what's called the change of something, first derivative, seems to be even more significant in a lot of ways. In other words, it may actually look clear -- just to explain that a little bit further -- it may actually look quite clear in the sky and there's no evidence of anything happening. But if you look at and start monitoring the weather aloft at flight altitude you can determine that there is an increasing change in the moisture. And that does seem to bring them in. And yet it may look perfectly clear to you, and you may not tell, and it's not until the next day that you realize that that storm system has been affected and destroyed.

BS: I see what you mean. Okay, we're going to take a break. We'll be right back on Coast to Coast AM. I'm Barbara Simpson.

BS: We have a caller for you, Clifford, on the wild card line. Caller, what's your name and where are you calling from?

Caller: Yeah. The name's Dave.

BS: Hi, Dave. Where are you from?

Dave: Texas.

BS: All right, go ahead.

Dave: Okay. I was wondering: On September 11th, the day after, you know they stopped flying the airplanes. I wonder if there was a measured temperature difference on that day?

BS: That's an interesting question. What about that, Clifford? Did you see any differences on September 12th, 2001?

CC: I'm trying to recall. That was an interesting period, actually, because, see, you had all aircraft grounded.

BS: Right.

CC: Right. For that time. And my own recollection was that of perfectly clear skies, no air traffic.

BS: Uh-huh.

CC: There were some reports across the nation of air traffic but, again, I don't speak for that which I can't corroborate or substantiate. All I can say is: On my side there were perfectly clear skies in accordance with the grounding.

BS: Right.

CC: I'm trying to remember how many days that lasted, but I think I recall several days of clear skies here in my location. So, there was no conflict, let's say, from my position in terms of presence and absence of aircraft.

BS: Okay. Let's go to the east of the Rockies line. Caller, what's your name and where are you calling from?

Caller: This is Bob calling from Kansas City, Kansas.

BS: Okay, Bob, go ahead.

Bob: Okay. I have a theory and then I have a follow-up question. All right. This is a theory, not a statement. What the contrails are is a nice little mixture of neutral ion particles and a nice little, you know, the magnesium and the barium and the biological agents to keep it from dissipating, to make it float in the air. And what happens is our lovely little HAARP satellite flies over, beams the gridwork with the ion laser they have on it. And what that does is, you know, whether the polarity is negative or positive, it turns it into either a cloud magnet or retractor.

BS: Okay. And what's your question?

Bob: That was my theory. And the question is: I was wondering if you can do a follow-up on the twelve Mayan crystal skulls.

BS: Oh, as far as the program goes?

Bob: Yes, yes.

BS: We'll certainly put it in the mix, and I appreciate your asking. What do you think, Clifford, of his theory of what the contrails are?

CC: I appreciate Bob calling from Kansas. I guess I must say that from my position I cannot substantiate or corroborate that theory.

BS: Okay. And as he said, it was a theory. So, we're not sure.

CC: Yes. And I actually appreciate. . . You know, it's important for people to think. I just have to offer my opinion as best I can, based on my work.

BS: Sure. That's fair enough. Let's go to the first time caller line. Caller, what's your name and where are you calling from?

Caller: My name is Julie and I'm calling from Spokane, Washington.

BS: Hi, Julie. Go ahead, please.

Julie: About three years ago I came down with severe pneumonia. And I had been noticing the contrails for about a month before that. They had sprayed Spokane really heavy. And we hadn't seen much of that activity before. I didn't really think a lot of it, and I'd heard it mentioned before. About three weeks later I got pneumonia so bad I had to be in the hospital. But ever since then I've had so many different things plague me, basically. But mainly it's in my lungs. And I swear I inhaled these things. And I did the same thing he did: I isolated the different particles and looked at them under a microscope. And I saw exactly what he saw: that we have a metal type one, we have a worm type one -- or a very fine hair -- or we have a little white one -- a little crystal-like one. And we do inhale these into our lungs. And it seems like if I get around anyone who even has a slight cold, I -- within 48 hours -- I have a fever and I'm delirious.

BS: What kind of pneumonia did you have, do you know?

Julie: No. They couldn't figure out what was causing it because it would come out of nowhere. They would call it walking pneumonia until I couldn't

walk anymore, I guess.

BS: Uh-huh. Okay.

Julie: I was wondering if he had heard of other people having chronic lung disease along with it.

BS: Clifford?

CC: Yes. Thank you. And I'm sorry, I didn't catch her name.

BS: Julie.

CC: Julie, right. I'm going to answer this one simply as a 'yes' to start with. And if we recall, one of the things that I did was mention three symptoms that I think people should be on the alert for. Those were: Number one: chronic respiratory distress of some type; second being allergic response. (These are not meant to be all-inclusive, by the way, but three that should be on our list.) And the third is loss of short-term memory. There does appear, certainly on an anecdotal level -- like you have said, Barbara -- it's difficult to sort out all these things but . . .

BS: Yeah.

CC: . . . on the anecdotal level as well as analysis of the CDC data there does appear to be, let's say, a legitimate cause for concern as to the association and correlations between, really, epidemic levels of respiratory distress and the onset of these operations. I could go into more detail on the stats on that, on the CDC stats for '99, but there does appear to be a direct correlation, at least at the anecdotal level, if one will accept that. I would also recommend, suggest, that listeners investigate the organism that's called mycoplasma as it has a case for investigation that keeps reappearing over and over and over. And it does have exactly those symptoms because that's what it is, is leading to walking pneumonia. Mycoplasma is a fascinating organism in the sense that it is the smallest bacteria known, to my knowledge. And it's significant that it does not have a cell wall, and antibiotics require a cell wall in order to be effective. So, many folks that find themselves subjected to mycoplasma illness, classical treatment techniques are not going to be as effective.

BS: But antibiotics don't work with viruses.

CC: This is not a virus, from my understanding. This is a bacteria.

BS: Okay.

CC: It's the smallest bacteria known, at least by my recollection. We'd have to dig into it a little deeper, but that's my recollection: that this is a bacterial form which is unique in the sense of not having a cell wall.

BS: Isn't the mycoplasma also associated with Gulf War syndrome?

CC: Absolutely. I can't remember the fellow's name. Is it Nicholson?

BS: Yes. Garth Nicholson, I believe it is.

CC: Exactly. Garth Nicholson in one of his findings is that mycoplasma is found in the majority of the chronic illnesses -- a wide array of chronic illnesses, Gulf War syndrome being one of them.

BS: But now, that's interesting because the association there, presumably, was with the shots that the military got, in terms of Gulf War syndrome.

CC: That's right. And all I could say is I would open up to consideration and investigation by all listeners to at least learn about the symptoms associated with mycoplasma. We haven't really discussed some of the tests that were done involving mold recently, but I have two tests done and there is a case for concern of particulates being a mechanism for transport of biological

components, of which mold would be certainly one that seems to be showing up.

BS: You mean they're intentionally spreading molds by using this method?

CC: I can't say intentional. I can only report the results of atmospheric tests that are conducted which --I'm not trying to sidestep you -- but they represent legitimate cause for concern to me when I run an outdoor atmospheric test with a standard mold product and the number of mold colonies appears to exceed any expectation by the references that I can find as being healthy. The first one was done in March, I believe -- I can't remember -- March 11th. We'd have to dig up the date. But you had over a hundred colonies showing up within the hour period. I have a representative sample on an indoor test that states: If you have more than eleven colonies you should have a real concern about the amount of mold in your environment.

BS: Yeah.

CC: That first test showed a hundred colonies-plus. And the second one two months later has showed forty colonies-plus.

BS: Was this outside or inside?

CC: Outdoor. I attempted to pick the most quiet clear day that I could. I'm in a high desert environment. We've been under a drought for several months. The environment would not normally be considered suitable for mold propagation.

BS: Right.

CC: And yet this is what is found.

BS: It sounds like a real deception that is going on. Do you think this is . . . I mean, on the one hand you could assume that you're saying it's the US Government is doing it to its people. But on the other hand, maybe it's a worldwide collusion. I mean, is that what you're looking at, some type of conspiracy?

CC: Actually, I've taken in a new phrase, Barbara, because language is so overused. Not to be flippant but I've switched over to 'coincidence theory' now, versus 'conspiracy theory.'

BS: But wait a second. Two definite different meanings to the words.

CC: Oh, they are, they are. I'm being slightly facetious here, but I'm just saying sometimes language loses its value.

BS: Well, it does if you play with it.

CC: One of my points here is that there really is no need for speculation or conjecture at this point, because the need is to examine the evidence which is now available. And the evidence, to me, is so compelling and overwhelming that it deserves investigation, that I have to accept that I cannot make certain conclusions which are beyond my sphere of investigation.

BS: Oh. Well, that's very logical. Let's go to another caller west of the Rockies. Caller, what's your name and where are you calling from?

Caller: Hi, my name is Stephanie and I'm calling from Phoenix.

BS: Hi, Stephanie. Go ahead, please.

Stephanie: Yes. It struck me earlier when Clifford was talking about May 12th that some of this had occurred: I was actually at a resort here in Phoenix on May 12th in a swimming pool. And my mom was visiting from Texas and she said "Wow, look at all those contrails in the sky. I wonder what that's about."

And I said "Well, you know, Phoenix Sky Harbor Airport is the sixth busiest airport in the country. I'm sure it's just the airplanes." And so it just struck me as interesting when he just mentioned May 12th because that's exactly the day that she was here when she said that. I'm wondering if there's some correlation, if these things occur in similar cities on the same day, or if it's not related.

BS: That's a good question.

CC: I think that you almost certainly expect a connection there. You know, these planes are going at 500 miles an hour. It's no big deal to cross the whole Southwest. You know, you hit a fairly large region at one time. I get reports that commonly report a similar activity covering a range all the way from Texas through New Mexico as well as Colorado. So, not difficult at all to have the same conditions here in New Mexico as well as Phoenix on that day. I, of course, wasn't there but I do know it was a most unusual day here in Santa Fe.

BS: Did I understand you earlier to say that, at least in the photographs that you've taken or ones that you've seen of the planes, where you can determine what model plane it might be, but there are no markings at all to identify it as to who might own it or be operating it?

CC: You know, I can't say whether there are markings or not. What I can say is that the limit of my technical equipment is unable to discern any markings of character on these planes. I can't say there are no markings. You know, actually, I don't know how typical it is to have markings on the underside. We have to dig into the aviation folks for that. I can only say: The limits of my equipment that I'm using will not allow one to determine the markings on these aircraft. Other than possible color schemes. You know, this one from Colorado. It has a color scheme attached to it. There might be inferences made from that.

BS: Well, does the color scheme, for example, match any commercial airliner?

CC: Sometimes they do. Yeah, sometimes they do.

BS: I mean, you could say it belongs to this company or that company, as opposed to another company.

CC: Sometimes they do. Like I say, commercial-type aircraft have been recorded in some of these photographs.

BS: What about photographs that other people may have taken? I guess what I'm asking is: In any of the photographs that you've seen by anybody from anywhere, have there been any kinds of markings that you could determine whether it was a commercial airliner or private or military or totally unmarked? Because people have also seen. . . I've seen totally unmarked planes in Arizona.

CC: I don't know if I can answer that properly because, you know, the best evidence to me is that which you can see and you can touch. We have to look at those photographs. One of the things that I find is that high-quality telephoto images are hard to come by.

BS: Yeah.

CC: They're very hard to come by. I worked very hard during my sessions when I was doing this for about a year. There are markings in the terms of color schemes that are sometimes visible on these planes. And one can make an inference. In other words, I know specifically one time we're looking at the Southwest airline, their color scheme -- I know it well. There were emissions from that aircraft which were clearly aerosols. One must consider that the aviation industry is a part of the infrastructure of this country, and one cannot exclude it from association with military activities. So, like I say, I can't speculate further than I can go. And I'm not up there in the sky at seven miles. I'm down here on the ground with my camera.

BS: Just out of curiosity -- it just occurred to me -- have you ever had any testimony or at least comments from anybody who works in airplane maintenance at any airport anywhere that can attest to the fact that there is something different about some of the planes? You know, mechanics or maintenance people?

CC: I have two statements on my website. Let me say that I am rather selective and careful in terms of posting or presenting what I call hearsay, and I generally avoid it. That's a general rule. There is an exception that I have posted, two statements. Any time you post hearsay it will always be subject to controversy and ambiguity. So, I don't dwell on it. But there are two statements that are posted that represent statements by people claimed to be in the airline industry that acknowledge the existence of modifications to aircraft. In terms of weight of evidence, I would give it very little, in the end, but it was of significant interest to me that I thought at least it should be presented without passing a judgment.

BS: Very good. Listen, I can believe this whole program has gone by as quickly as it has, Clifford. You've done a huge job. www.carnicom.com. I know you will continue and it's a subject that we will continue to do here on Coast, and I hope you'll come back and join us again. I'm Barbara Simpson. Speaking about joining us again, I'll be back with you tonight right here on Coast to Coast AM. You can read my column on worldnetdaily.com on Mondays. And e-mail me at barbara@coasttocoastam.com. I'll see you tonight. Be careful what you pray for -- you might get it.

[end]