charge from the plant, by using excess heat as its energy source.

Mr. Austin also noted that experiments on geothermal energy at the University of California, Berkeley, could be used to help defuse mines. However, the United States is not currently using geothermal energy on a commercial scale.

The Army Corps of Engineers has been conducting experiments on geothermal energy since the 1970s. In 1977, the Corps began a program to develop geothermal power plants in the United States. The program has since been scaled back, but it continues to receive funding.

Mr. Austin noted that the United States is not currently using geothermal energy on a commercial scale. However, the United States has been conducting experiments on geothermal energy since the 1970s. In 1977, the Corps began a program to develop geothermal power plants in the United States. The program has since been scaled back, but it continues to receive funding.

The Army Corps of Engineers has been conducting experiments on geothermal energy since the 1970s. In 1977, the Corps began a program to develop geothermal power plants in the United States. The program has since been scaled back, but it continues to receive funding.

The Army Corps of Engineers has been conducting experiments on geothermal energy since the 1970s. In 1977, the Corps began a program to develop geothermal power plants in the United States. The program has since been scaled back, but it continues to receive funding.
takes. Once we dumped seven inches of rain on two hours on one of our Special Forces camps.

Despite the probed skepticism on the part of some members of the Johnson Administration, military men apparently took the weather modification program much more seriously. According to a document contained in the Pentagon papers, the Defense Department's secret history of its weather program was one of seven basic options for stepping up the war that were presented on request by the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the White House in February, 1967.

The document described the weather program over Laos—officially known as Operation Pop-Eye—as an attempt "to reduce trafficability along infiltration routes."

**AUTHORIZATION NEEDED**

It said that Presidential authorization was "required to test operational phase of weather modification process previously successfully tested and evaluated in same area."

The environmental and military considerations were given at least three times as much weight as the section of the base. Each plane was capable of carrying out more than one mission on one flight.

One former high-ranking official said in an interview that the by end of 1971 the program, which has been constantly at least thirty different planes since the middle nineteen-sixties, was under the direct control of the White House.

Interviewed, one usually well-informed members of the Nixon Administration said that the project had been in the dark. In the last year, though, there have been repeated inquiries and publicly posed questions by members of Congress about the weather modification activities and what was going on in Southeast Asia, but no accurate information has been provided to them by the Department of Defense.

This, "the bomb, and restricted information about it to those who had to know," said one well-placed Government official, referring to the South Vietnamese how seriously the President's advisor on national security.

Nevertheless, the official said, "I understand it to be a policy action—that this was declassified on north of the DMZ with the roads and the SAM sites."

Another sources said that most of the weather modification activities were conducted with the aid and support of the South Vietnamese. "I think we were trying to teach the South Vietnamese how to do the cloud-seeding missions," the source said.

It was impossible to learn where the staffing and research for the secret weather operation were located. Sources at the Air Force Cambridge Research Laboratories at Bedford, Mass., and at the Air Weather Service headquarters, while acknowledging that they had heard of the project, said they had no information about its research center.

One Government source did say that a group was being used to help him see how much additional rain was caused. He would not elaborate.

**SCIENTISTS ARE CRITICAL OF RAINMAKING IN WAR**

(John Noble Willford)

After years of rainmaking experimentation, scientists say they do not understand the short-term effects of cloud-seeding, much less the possible long-term impact on the earth for the entire world.

This uncertainty has led to increasing concern among scientists about the use of weather modification as a weapon of warfare.

Dr. Matthew Me点钟, professor of biology at Harvard University, was quoted in the June 16 issue of the magazine Science as saying:

"It is obvious that weather modification used as a weapon of war has the potential of uncontrolled and possibly unpreventable damage to human life and property more than on combatants. This would be especially true in areas where subsistence agriculture is practiced, in food-deficit areas, and in areas subject to flooding."

**ISSUE RAISED RECENTLY**

The issue raised recently by the National Academy of Sciences, on the floor of the United States Senate and at the international environmental meeting at Vienna last month.

Recognizing the many potential problems, the national academy issued a statement last week asking the Department of State to sponsor a National Academy resolution dedicating all weather modification efforts to peaceful purposes and establishing, preferably within the framework of international nongovernmental scientific organizations, an advisory mechanism for consideration of potential International concern.

Senator Claiborne Pell, Democrat of Rhode Island, and 10 other Senators recently filed a resolution calling on the United States to join in a treaty outlawing "any use of any environmental or geophysical modification activity as a weapon of war, or the carrying out of any research or experimentation with respect thereto."

But, during the Stockholm conference, the United States delegation was instrumental in blocking a weakening of a recommendation calling for all governments to "carefully evaluate the likelihood and magnitude of climatic modification and to disseminate their findings."

**In sponsors story**

The weakening clause included the words, "to the maximum extent feasible." Officials later acknowledged that possible military use of weather modification was the basis for the language.

However, the Department of Defense's Advanced Research Projects Agency, which had proposed, toned down much and what kind of tinkering with the atmosphere is required to disturb the climate on a global scale, an indication that the Pentagon is not sure of the ecological impact of weather warfare.

The Defense Department acknowledges that the conducted "precipitation augmentation projects" in the Philippines in 1969, in India in 1967, over Ohio in the 1971 and Texas last summer— all at the request of the governments involved.

**Million results were mixed—successes in the Philippines and Texas, but not elsewhere. Other tests over the years have failed to increase rainfall, or have failed.**

Federal scientists to conclude that clouds seeded with silver iodide crystals rained more than three times as much as unseeded clouds. The results were confirmed by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, producing "explosive" growth of rain clouds.®

While conceding that "there's still quite a bit of controversy over whether your seeding caused rain or not," Ferguson said yesterday in a telephone interview from his Rockville, Md., office: "We seem to be on the verge of getting ourselves to work in certain cases."

**Raining research primarily involves experiments in the field, with silver iodide crystals used in clouds.**

While there are two types of clouds, warm and cold, the scientists are making efforts to trigger rainfall.

In 1946, the first American experiments in cloud seeding, by Vincent J. Schaefer of
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the General Electric Research Laboratory in Schenectady, were aimed at supercooled cloud- seeding. From an airplane, Mr. Schaefer dropped hollow glass or plastic pellets (formed from carbon dioxide) into clouds to create billions of glistening ice crystals.

"Return to us.

Dry ice—or silver iodide, which is more commonly used today—turns moisture in the clouds to ice crystals that grow larger and larger until they become heavy enough to fall as either rain or snow.

Silver iodide is ordinarily used as the seeding agent because its crystals are similar to those of ice and it is more effective in causing supercooled water drops to freeze.

Warm clouds, salt or silver iodide particles can cause moisture to condense into water droplets large enough to fall as rain. This would be the type of experiments that could be effective in tropical or semitropical areas, such as Southeast Asia.

The type of seeding agent that could cause a lightning strike simply reported in Southeast Asia, has not been discovered. Civilian scientists are lost to devise the possibility, especially to the fact that the method has a name—hygroscopic seeding.

Many cloud-seeding operations are conducted over the country—the C-130 in Vietnam. But small rockets can also be used to deliver the seeding agent.

WEATHER WAR: A GATHERING STORM

(By Victor Cohn)

Technological America, that accomplished laser-radar-electronic warrior, has been turned loose in remote-control weapon: control of the weather for military purposes.

In Polynesia—by the evidence of a long- ignored passage in the Pentagon Papers—it has been a test battleground, the site of purely theoretical cloud-seeding experiments. Source learning, government- held American rain-makers responsible for the cloud disasters that struck North Vietnam last year.

How much there is a hard kernel of truth behind an array of increasingly serious warnings this summer. Yet the very possibility that there has been a serious weather war—as well as the emerging fact that North Vietnam has been systematically developing a rain-making capability—is enough to chill many scientists.

Here are some fearful prophets who warn of future "geophysical warfare"—wars waged by adjusting, changing, modifying, hurricanes or preventing hail to help farmers and everyone else.

OPERATION POP XEYE

The term "weather warfare" simply means making the proper clouds yield rain, or destroying the force, by bombarding them with silver iodide particles. It is not as condensation nuclei around which water can form. The would-be cloud engineers want to develop programs through international cooperation. But they are really studying cloud and weather modification ignores borders.

"Farther modification, these men believe, is on the verge of becoming a fact. There has been only a period of concentrated research, in framework of interstate and international rules.

But "if it turns out that the U.S. has military war, then is one of those people who believe it is important for nations to agree not to wage weather war—before, as he puts it, "it becomes a reality."

Sen. Claiborne Pell (D.-R.I.) is prominent among those who believe that America has a responsibility to do something, and that there's no doubt in my mind that it's going on in Vietnam."

"I think there's no doubt rain-making was being used in Vietnam," says a Senate committee aide well versed in defense matters.

"And I think there's little doubt that it has been used fairly recently: that is, in 1971."

Such use, in 1971 or otherwise, may have been only a fluke; several sources believe.

"Otherwise," said one, "a lot more people would have known about it long ago."

"It was a "successful" pre-1967 use, sometime in the year of Vietnam escalation, possibly in 1966, that is documented in the "Senator Gravel" edition of the Pentagon Papers. In late February, 1967, this document discloses the Joint Chiefs of Staff prepared a list of "alternative strategies" for President John-

One, titled "Lao Operations," read:

"Continue as at present plus Operation Pop Eye (Mr. Lansdale's charade of infiltration routes ... Authorization required to implement operational phase of weather modification programs previously successfully tested and evaluated in same area."

(Von Dikes added.)

In late—according to columnist Jack Ander-

son, who published the first alleged report of Indo-China rain-making—U.S. forces started secret project Intermediary Compa-

ny, or "the Weather Group" (together with ... [with] claimed success in creating substantial snow bursts ... [and] flooding conditions" along the Ho Chi Minh Trails, making them "impossible.

"CLASIFIED" WORK

Sen. Pell, most persistently, and Rep. Clarence B. D. O'Nan of Wyoming, on behalf of the Senate for Peace Through Law, have showered the Pentagon with inquiries since Anderson published his thesis on February 1967. The Senate's Special Minority Melvin Laird and Director of Defense Research and Engineering John Foster have reportedly refused to cooperate (Senator Laird);

"Some aspects of our work in the area have a definite relationship to national security and are classified accordingly."

In April, Senate Foreign Relations Com-

mittee Chairman J. William Fulbright (D.-
Ark.), pressed further, asking Laird: "Why do you decline to discuss weather control activities in North Vietnam, yet you freely discuss B-52 flights over Vietnam?"

Laird replied blandly, "We have never engaged in that kind of activity over North Vietnam.

Fulbright failed to go on to ask Laird about Laos and the Gulf of Ton-
kin, where some Vietnam weather originates. "He just didn't follow up on that question," said one of his staff. "I think he was trying to cover a whole range of things."

The Defense Department freely reports that it has "weather utilities" for making rain. It used them in Thailand in 1969, in a six-month "precipitation augmentation proj-

ect" at the Philippines request; in India in 1967, as a test over Okinawa and Midway Islands, and in June, July and August, 1971, over drought-stricken Texas. Sources, at the urging of, Attorney, Mr. F. Smith.

Pierre Saint-Amand, head of the inter-

planetary sciences for the Naval Ordnance Laboratory in California, led the Philippine Project, which that government considered highly successful. The India and Midway tests failed for lack of suitable clouds. But the Lao operations, one Senate aide's view.

Rain-makers are currently involved in two long-range California programs—one in the Pacific area of Santa Barbara, an effort to increase the area's forest; the other in the Central Sierra to try to increase the snow-pack for electric utilities that depend on it. Air Force weather modifying is done by Air Weather Service, working out of Scott Field, Ill. Lt. St. Louis, a participation by the Environmental Research Applications Center at Sault, MI. Operations are done from U.S. Air Force Base, Thailand, says a Senate aide.

"None of the weather research work in the entire DOD is classified," said Senator St. Ambrose adds—"the words were not used here. "Our labs are open to anyone who wants to come in and see what we're doing."" Chief Scientist John N. Howard of the Air Force Cambridge Research Laboratories at Bedford, Mass., made a similar statement, The Defense Department's Air Defense Research Projects Agency (ARPA) likewise reports conducting only classified research.

ARPA study called "Cloud Blue" has been censored by some of the military's scientists as prime evidence of nefarious DOD rainmaking. Actually, Nile Blue is too basic to study by computer of how purposeful or accidental man-made changes might affect the globe's year-to-year climate... in the day-to-day conditions called weather.

Nile Blue has been funded this year at $1.5 million, but will rise to $3.1 million in fiscal 1973, when a supercomputer, Illiac IV, designed at the University of Illinois and now being installed at ARPA in Cambridge, Mass. The Defense Department, ARPA Director Stephen J. Luteski told the Senate Appro-

priations Committee in March: "Since it now appears highly probable that our computer powers the ability to make modifications that might be seriously detrimental to the security of the world, Nile Blue ... was established in FY 70 to achieve a U.S. capability to (1) evaluate all consequences of these modifications, (2) detect trends in the global circulation which forecast changes ... and determine the interrelationships of potentially deleterious climatic changes ..."

"What this means," Luteski explains, "is less repeated broad sweeps to tickle the atmosphere to perturb the global climate. I guess we'd call it a threat assessment.

A VIEW OF ECOLOGY

How might such changes be made by one country designed to harm another?

The highly respected Dr. McDonald, who will leave the White House soon to teach at Dartmouth, wrote a 1968 warning against geophysical warfare, titled "How to Wreck the Environment." On weather war in Indo-

china, he now says only, "I wouldn't know about that."

But melting the Arctic ice by some means, he conjectured in 1968, might be one future way in which a land-locked equatorial country could flood the world's coastal cities while insuring itself a temperate climate—a real climate.

"As economic controls among many advanced nations heightens," he warned, "it will become a country's advantage to ensure a peaceful natural environment and a disturbed environment for its competitors.\n
Two actions... might be carried out covertly... The years-long term would be attributed to unkindly nature... and only after a nation were thoroughly drained could it claim an "environmental" effect."

Far-fetched? Short-term rain-making— which McDonald in 1968 called only a "fu-
ture" military possibility—already seems an easier, if capricious, weapon.

"When the proper meteorological condi-

tions are favorable...DNC clouds capable of spreading from one area to another... or to an area where there have been a number should be dispersed, according to a Senior's letter in November, "it is a relatively simple matter to increase the amount..."
of rain which will fall. The amount of in-
crease is frequently of the order of 30 or 50
per cent.”

Laird carefully added: “Massive downpours
have not been produced, and theoretical
knowledge at hand indicates that this will
probably always be the case.” This, if oblique,
stands in contradiction to the allegations that
the 1971 North Vietnam floods have been pro-
duced by the Pentagon. Fell, however, main-
tains that the climate change is due to the
floods, which he says killed thousands.

“I TELL ENTIRELY POSSIBLE”

Robert M. White, the nation’s chief weather
man as director of the National Oceanographic
and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), de-
clared to discuss military matters in an interview.
But to the question “Could it cause flooding?” he—unlike Laird—said, “Yes, it is
totally possible to get heavy rains out of
these storms.”

“In the past decade, White added, “there
has been a considerable change in view in
the atmosphere which must now be per-
aspected. I think most knowledgeable people
would agree that we have primitive cap-
abilities of understanding certain weather pa-
terns. And it is reasonable now to look to
possible development of more sophisticated
ones.”

Among patterns that “predictably” can be
modified, he said, are: cold fog (which can be
cleared from airports); cold fog over the
Florida Keys—most common in the tropics—”In Florida,” White said, “we have been able almost at
will to make them grow explosively”; cold
fog over the Lake Michigan area—“In the
mountains”); cold fog over the mountain—“At the right temperature you can begin thinking of making them for
weather ... (which can often be suppressed, according to recent claims by the
Russians, who fire silver iodide into the
air to cause rainfall.”

Beyond these, there are storms like hur-
cicanes—as Hurricane Agnes, for example—which
can not be predicted, White answered.

“If for which we have some encouraging
results,” in White’s view.

All in all, he summed up, “We’re beginning
to get some situation where everything that
happens in the atmosphere is an act
of God where some things are an act
of man.”

THE MORAL ISSUE

What perturbs many scientists is the mor-
ality of using such “acts of man” for mil-
tary purposes.

The Navy’s South-Ambrose emphatically
does not see turning weather into a weapon
as something inherently evil. “If you estimate
the amount of damage done by impeding
somebody’s transportation versus blowing up
buildings, I can see why it is immoral,” he told
Science magazine.

Most scientists, left-wing and establish-
ment alike, oppose it.

The Science for Vietnam, Chicago Collect-
ive—a radical anti-war group of scientists and
engineers—has issued a report warning of the
floods in the Pentagon Papers—charges that “the U.S. gov-
ernment has embarked on a totally new and
incredible form of warfare that would disrupt
the economy and social structure of a small
country; it could create famine . . .

University of Connecticut Graduate Dean
Dean Thomas, director of the Union Acad-
emy of Sciences’ Weather Modification
Panel, likewise says: “I’m opposed to it.” He
urges scientists would not to be concerned
their weather weapon but go on to encourage Interna-
tional weather modifications in a positive
way.” A 1971 Army study charged the United
States to sponsor a United Nations resolution
dealing with all attempts to modify weather
peace.

Unless nations do, Maloney told Science, “we will face huge problems in the future
putting the goodwill of the Kennedy Administra-
tion and the Johnson Administration and
the Nixon Administration on the line of
weather weapons.”

Fell argues that present military activities
“could very well lead to another interna-
tional arms race.” “The use of rainmaking as a
weapon of war can only lead to the develop-
ment of vastly more dangerous environ-
mental weapons,” he warned. “We must look
quickly to place weather, climate and geo-
physical modification off limits.”

Joanne Langs and others of the McKee
Group (Mooney, Humphrey, Cline, Cooper, Cranomat, Hart,
Hughes, Javits, Kennedy, Moulite, Norman,
Tonney and Williams), he has proposed to
Senate leaders urging that the United
States seek to bar both weather war and
research into it. As chairman of the
Senate Foreign Relations Committee’s Inter-
national environment subcommittee, Fell will
try to make Laird out further at up-
coming hearings, perhaps this month.

LACK OF RESPONSE

The administration, too, may be consid-
ering the subject. But how seriously it is
doing so is uncertain.

The Pentagon’s Foster told Globe that the
National Security Council Under Secretaries’
Committee “at the request of the Dr. Kissinger
is currently formulating a direct interna-
tional policy. Presumably this policy, when
completed, will be announced to the nation in some
resounding speech.”

The NEC unit involved is headed by
Herman Pollock, the State Department’s
director of international affairs.

Fell reported that he has asked adminis-
tration response so far to the pleas that it
supports its proposed treaty, or the that the
President declare war. The United States will
never be first to wage weather war.

“I remember what happened five years ago
when I first introduced a draft treaty to
make weather weapons = from the seas,” he
said. “I got rather unusual executive branch
response, not really as we’re getting now. But
have drawn very we see it in the Ukrainian
while the Atlantic ridge and ‘creepy cracker’
tank-like underwater missiles—were on
the White House board at the Pentagon.

“The see the response now, I think that
given a few years, we’ll get some sort
of treaty here.

Of all fields of science, Dean Maloney has
alone has produced more world coopera-
tion than meteorology. The 1974 Venice
Conference on Weather Modification, held in
Venice last year, was international.

“FELL SELLS U. S. CLIMATE WEATHER

WARFARE

(William Driscoll)

Washington—The Pentagon has the pow-
er to change the weather and already may
have used that power to kill and destroy in
Southeast Asia.

“I strongly believe clouds have been
seeded in Southeast Asia for military rea-
sions,” he added. “There is very little doubt in my mind,”

Sen. Claiborne Pellel said during an interview
in his Washington office last week.

David Kearney, a member of the profes-
sional state science foreign relations
committee, is less cautious. “I have no doubt
at all,” he said.

Sen. J. William Fulbright, chairman of the
committee hearing with Sen. J. William Fulbright of Arkansas, they have refused to con-
firm, but certainly avoided denying, that such
activities are underneath the Southeast Asia.

Beginning in June of last year and lasting
well to the end of the year, the area was
by heavy rains, typhoons and floods.

According to reports by Pierre Darcourt, a
French journalist, the heavy rains triggered
and washed away or weakened roads
and bridges.

The Associated Press reported that flooding
destroyed 10 per cent of the country’s rice
crop and killed 75,000 people.

North Vietnamese Premier Pham Van
Dong, the Christian Science Monitor reported,
said water levels in the entire Red River
and Thai Binh River system rose to “unprec-
cedented levels.” He said the flooding the
worst disaster since the beginning of the war.

An act of God? Perhaps?

But Senator Fells said he believes the disa-
er was merely the most successful of Pen-
tagon rainmaking efforts in the region.

The best evidence that the Pentagon is
pouring the weather is in direct remarks in the
Pentagon Papers. The significance of the remarks apparently went largely
noticed during the hearings. All other sensa-
tional disclosures in the documents.

According to the Grand edition of the paper
this time, the Pentagon has a joint Chiefs
of Staff presented President Lyndon B. John-
son with a memo in 1967 suggesting that
modifying the weather in the region might
be one way of widening the war without
creating discontent at home.

The memo stated in part:

The memo stated in part:

"The memorandum continues as at present
plus Operation Pop Eye to reduce trafficability
along infiltration routes. Authority/Policy
changes are recommended to improve
operational phase of weather modification
process previously successful tested
and validated in some areas.

Later that year, the President was pre-
pared with a list of escalation proposals, the
Papers indicate. The list included the following:

"Cause interdicting rains in or near Laos."

Other evidences that the rainmaking efforts are circumstantial.

In March of last year, Jack Anderson, a
nationwide syndicated columnist, claimed in
his column that the Pentagon has been
seeding
clouds over Laos and Cambodia since
1967. He said the project went by the code
code name "Intermediary-Crisplant.""*

Unlike other Anderson columns, such as the one on the ITT memo or the disclosure
of a secret U.S. Project that the Indian-Pak-
istan war, this column went largely unnoticed.

Last Sept. 23, Senator Fells sent a letter to
Rudy Johnson, assistant secretary of de-
fense for legislative affairs, inquiring about
the "Air Force weather modification activities
against the North Vietnamese.”

The letter, and all subsequent communica-
tions, was made public by the senator and was
attached to the H. R. 26 Congressional
Report.

The letter asked the following questions:

“1. What are the objectives of the proj-
"Intermediary-Crisplant")

2. How long has this project been in ex-
istence? Would you provide a rather detailed
report of what has been done?”

3. What is this project conducted?”

4. What amount has been spent on this
project over the last three years?”

5. Is the Department conducting any
same offense-oriented weather modifi-
cation programs? If so, what are the names
and where are they being conducted?”

The letter asked for a reply.

The following day, Mr. Johnson replied,
saying the questions had been referred to
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the director of defense research and engineering.

After waiting for a response for two weeks, Senator Pell sent another letter to Mr. Johnson, again asking for a reply to his earlier questions.

On Nov. 23, Mr. Johnson sent the senator a lengthy reply.

The reply read in part that “the possibilities inherent in weather modification techniques to support military operations have been discussed for more than 20 years. For a number of these years, the Department of Defense has been conducting weather modification programs relating to various forms of weather modification.”

In the letter, Mr. Johnson stated that research has been undertaken for “the suppression of hail and lightning (to reduce damage to military property and equipment) and certain aspects of operations) and the dissipation of fog at airports and within harbors (to enhance operations of aircraft and ships).”

“RELATIVELY SIMPLE”

The letter added that “One example of fruitful research activity has been the investigation of the effects of guns on weather, especially over the Philippines, conducted a six-month rainmaking project on the Philippine Islands to reduce drought.”

When the proper meteorological conditions prevail (that is, when clouds capable of producing rainfall exist), it is relatively simple to increase the amount of rain which will fall. The amount of increase is frequently of the order of 100 percent. In short, some scientists have told him the increase could actually be ten or 20 times that. However, he noted, a 50 percent increase in the annual rainfall of Southeast Asia can have a tremendous impact.

Mr. Johnson’s letter noted that in 1968, the Office of the Defense, at the request of the Philippines, conducted a six-month rain-making project on the Philippine Islands to reduce drought. He wrote, “The results of the experiment were so successful that there have been taken steps to acquire an independent capability.”

“I trust,” the letter closed, “that the foregoing information will be helpful to you and reduce the delay in responding to your inquiry.”

QUESTIONS UNANSWERED

But the letter did not answer a single one of Senator Pell’s questions.

Senator Pell sent a letter to Defense Secretary John R. D. Laird on Dec. 3 stating his dis- satisfaction with the response and requesting “a written response to the specific questions.”

Mr. Laird then answered the letter to John S. Foster Jr., director of defense research and engineering, who sent a written reply to Senator Pell on Dec. 16.

“Despite our work in this area is classified,” Mr. Foster’s letter said. “Recognizing that the Congress is concerned with the question of the military application of weather modification technology, I have, at the direction of Secretary Laird, sent to you that we are not in a position to make public the details of these classified weather modification undertakings by the department.”

“RESPECTFULLY INFORMING”

However, since the information to which I refer has a definite relationship to national security and is classified as a result, I find it necessary to respectfully decline to make any further disclosures of the details of these activities at this time.

Senator Pell sent an understanding of the letter to his Republican aides, and to members of the Senate and House armed services committee, had been briefed on the matter.

The briefings were confidential and make it impossible for those legislators to discuss the matter even if they want to. Senator Pell said he has been offered a classified briefing to accept because it would limit his ability to ask Defense Department officials probing questions about the weather modification program and limit his freedom to speak out on the subject.

LARGELY UNnoticed

Senator Pell and Senator Fullbright have been discussing the matter in private. Senator Pell asked Mr. Laird if the United States had engaged in rainmaking activities for “military reasons in Southeast Asia.”

Mr. Laird replied, “I don’t discuss the activities of the department that we go forward with as far as Southeast Asia specifically, but I would be glad to discuss with you the techniques that have been used outside the battle zone.”

Senator Fullbright asked, “Why do you decline to discuss the weather control activities in Southeast Asia?”

Mr. Laird said, “Many of the climate modification projects in Southeast Asia have been conducted by the government of the Philippines.”

Senator Pell asked Mr. Laird to produce a report on the weather modification activities in the Pacific. Mr. Laird said, “I will produce a report on the weather modification activities in the Pacific.”

Senator Pell said that he plans hearings on the resolution and treaty late next month or in early March.

He said he expects to have “some interesting witnesses” for the hearings and hopes the hearings will provide an opportunity for concern- ing Pentagon weather modification activities.

POLITICAL SPYING

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the whole subject of political spying is one that has intrigued me for some time. As a matter of fact, the whole pursuit has struck me as an exercise in futility from the first time it was ever brought to my attention.

In recent weeks, we have heard a great deal of talk about political spying, and about the so-called "political spying" operation aimed at the Democratic National Committee headquarters in Washington, D.C. Quite naturally, the suspicions and the fears that such tactics would be used to influence the outcome of the election have given rise to much concern among the members of the Republican party.

Mr. President, needless to say, I brought back interesting memories from my own campaign for the Senate in Arizona in 1962. We hired a private detective to follow the political leaders of the Democratic party and to gather information about their activities on behalf of their party. We learned a great deal about the Democratic party, and we used the information to our advantage in the election. We won the election.

Now, I am not suggesting that the Republican party should use the same tactics. I am simply saying that political spying is not only possible, but it is perhaps necessary. And, furthermore, it is not illegal.
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Mr. President, needless to say, I brought back interesting memories from my own campaign for the Senate in Arizona in 1962. We hired a private detective to follow the political leaders of the Democratic party and to gather information about their activities on behalf of their party. We learned a great deal about the Democratic party, and we used the information to our advantage in the election. We won the election.

Now, I am not suggesting that the Republican party should use the same tactics. I am simply saying that political spying is not only possible, but it is perhaps necessary. And, furthermore, it is not illegal.

Mr. President, needless to say, I brought back interesting memories from my own campaign for the Senate in Arizona in 1962. We hired a private detective to follow the political leaders of the Democratic party and to gather information about their activities on behalf of their party. We learned a great deal about the Democratic party, and we used the information to our advantage in the election. We won the election.

Now, I am not suggesting that the Republican party should use the same tactics. I am simply saying that political spying is not only possible, but it is perhaps necessary. And, furthermore, it is not illegal.

Mr. President, needless to say, I brought back interesting memories from my own campaign for the Senate in Arizona in 1962. We hired a private detective to follow the political leaders of the Democratic party and to gather information about their activities on behalf of their party. We learned a great deal about the Democratic party, and we used the information to our advantage in the election. We won the election.

Now, I am not suggesting that the Republican party should use the same tactics. I am simply saying that political spying is not only possible, but it is perhaps necessary. And, furthermore, it is not illegal.

Mr. President, needless to say, I brought back interesting memories from my own campaign for the Senate in Arizona in 1962. We hired a private detective to follow the political leaders of the Democratic party and to gather information about their activities on behalf of their party. We learned a great deal about the Democratic party, and we used the information to our advantage in the election. We won the election.

Now, I am not suggesting that the Republican party should use the same tactics. I am simply saying that political spying is not only possible, but it is perhaps necessary. And, furthermore, it is not illegal.

Mr. President, needless to say, I brought back interesting memories from my own campaign for the Senate in Arizona in 1962. We hired a private detective to follow the political leaders of the Democratic party and to gather information about their activities on behalf of their party. We learned a great deal about the Democratic party, and we used the information to our advantage in the election. We won the election.

Now, I am not suggesting that the Republican party should use the same tactics. I am simply saying that political spying is not only possible, but it is perhaps necessary. And, furthermore, it is not illegal.

Mr. President, needless to say, I brought back interesting memories from my own campaign for the Senate in Arizona in 1962. We hired a private detective to follow the political leaders of the Democratic party and to gather information about their activities on behalf of their party. We learned a great deal about the Democratic party, and we used the information to our advantage in the election. We won the election.

Now, I am not suggesting that the Republican party should use the same tactics. I am simply saying that political spying is not only possible, but it is perhaps necessary. And, furthermore, it is not illegal.

Mr. President, needless to say, I brought back interesting memories from my own campaign for the Senate in Arizona in 1962. We hired a private detective to follow the political leaders of the Democratic party and to gather information about their activities on behalf of their party. We learned a great deal about the Democratic party, and we used the information to our advantage in the election. We won the election.

Now, I am not suggesting that the Republican party should use the same tactics. I am simply saying that political spying is not only possible, but it is perhaps necessary. And, furthermore, it is not illegal.