

MILITARY PSYOPS AGAINST CIVILIANS

In a phone call to the USAF Special Operations Command Public Affairs Office, I questioned the legitimacy of using these subliminal broadcasts against civilian populations. I was told that it was all perfectly legal, having been approved by the US Congress (!). It may be okay by Congress, but I sincerely doubt that it would be approved by the recipient populations.

That conversation also elicited more information concerning the Commando Solo units. For instance, the Air National Guard of individual states in the US can also operate Commando Solo aircraft, should the Governor of a State request assistance. That means the PsyOps mind-control technology can be directed against US citizens.

The Commando Solo aircraft have participated in the following missions - possibly more, as the early missions of Volant Solo 1 were not known to the spokesperson:

- **• Operation Urgent Fury (Grenada, October-November 1983, Jan-June 1985)**
- **• Operation Just Cause (Panama, late December 1989)**
- **• Operation Desert Shield (Kuwait, Iraq, from August 1990)**
- **• Operation Desert Storm (Saudi Arabia, Turkey, Iraq, 1991)**
- **• Operation Uphold Democracy (Haiti, 1994-1995)**
- **• Operation Joint Guard (part of a UN operation in Bosnia-Herzegovina, 1995)**
- **• Operation Desert Thunder (part of a UN operation in Iraq)**
- **• Operation Desert Fox (Iraq, 2 to 3 days in December 1998)**

Other countries are known to have a similar aircraft, but the PR officer declined to identify them, suggesting instead that I check out Jane's Defence Weekly for such information. Not having access to that particular publication, I searched through my copy of Jane's Radar and Electronic Warfare Systems 1993-94. The Commando Solo unit was not listed, but a browse through the book was informative as to the numerous types of electronic offence and defence systems available. These include stationary and mobile land units (many housed in large trucks), shipboard and airborne models as well as space-based technology. If the military is spending US\$100 million per airborne unit (times eight, we're talking US\$800 million here), I think it is safe to assume that they have tried out mind-control equipment with less expensive, roving land units (trucks), but use the airplanes to cover wider areas and hard-to-reach locations of the world.

And I might add, we can assume that they have tried out the efficacy of this mind-control technology. Even the US military would not waste \$800 million on something unless it has been proven to work, and work effectively, even under the adverse situation of military combat. This is an important point.

The initial research into mind control in the USA was conducted under the auspices of the CIA. The flagrant abuse of human rights in experimenting on unsuspecting persons was based on the supposition that the veracity of the experiments would be compromised if a subject knew that he was participating in an experiment. In the case of mind-control technology, this supposition may very well be true. But that does not justify its use - or so said the Nürnberg Code, the tenets of which were used as a legal basis to prosecute Nazi scientists for war crimes. However, the US seems to have excused its own military and scientific community from adhering to that Code.

