

Geoengineering Violates Your Human Right to a Healthy Environment; Here's What YOU Can Do About It!

 consciouslifeneeds.com/geoengineering-violates-human-healthy-environment-justice/1120778/

Ross Pittman

Numerous treaties and agreements have documented your human right to a healthy environment. Geoengineering violates your right to a healthy environment in many ways including numerous health, agricultural, and environmental issues. [1]

You also have the right to participate in decisions pertaining to the environment. When your rights are violated, you have a right to have access to justice. This article documents your rights to a healthy environment, how geoengineering violates those rights, and some steps you can take to obtain justice.

The Risks and Potential Dangers of Geoengineering to the Environment and Humanity

Numerous scientific studies and analysis have concluded that geoengineering schemes are high-risk endeavors. Some of those risks are detailed below.

According to a computer modeling study published in the June 4, 2007 online edition of *The Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, a catastrophic spike in global temperatures would occur if the geoengineering program were to fail or be cancelled:

“Radical steps to engineer Earth’s climate by blocking sunlight could drastically cool the planet, but could just as easily worsen the situation if these projects fail or are suddenly halted... If any hypothetical geoengineering program were to fail or be cancelled for any reason, a catastrophic, decade-long spike in global temperatures could result, along with rates of warming 20 times greater than we are experiencing today.” [2]

“Geoengineering schemes have been proposed as a cheap fix that could let us have our cake and eat it, too. But geoengineering schemes are not well understood. Our study shows that planet-sized geoengineering means planet-sized risks.” [3] – Ken Caldeira of the Carnegie Institution’s Department of Global Ecology and co-author of the study

A study performed by National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR) and published in *Science Express* in April 2008 concluded that a proposed geoengineering strategy to cool the planet by injecting sulfates into the atmosphere:

“likely would destroy between about one-fourth to three-fourths of the ozone layer above the Arctic... The sulfates would also delay the expected recovery of the ozone hole over the Antarctic by about 30 to 70 years.” [4]

A report published in March 2010 by the House of Commons Science and Technology, titled *The Regulation of Geoengineering*, concluded that geoengineering would likely affect rainfall quality and distribution as well as produce droughts:

“Schemes that inject particles into the atmosphere are likely to alter the distribution of rainfall and also cause some reduction in the global quantity of rainfall.” [5]

“Solar Radiation Management (SRM) could produce droughts with severe implications for regional and global food production, and delay the recovery of the ozone layer by decades.” [6]

Scientists and scholars who met in the UK in early 2011 to debate the use of geoengineering to cool the atmosphere came to a similar conclusion regarding undesired consequences of such actions:

“Cloud experimentation or localized solar ‘dimming’ could – intentionally or unintentionally – cause droughts or floods in neighboring areas, arousing suspicions and international disputes.” [7]

The ETC Group report titled *Geopiracy: The Case Against Geoengineering* provides a good summary of the risks associated with geoengineering and strongly recommends a moratorium on geoengineering:

“The geoengineering suite of technologies affects outer space, the atmosphere, the land, the oceans and fresh water bodies, the weather, the production of food, the protection of health and livelihoods, and national sovereignty. It entails risks that we know about and many more that we cannot yet predict. Until there has been a full debate on the course all countries wish to go, there must be a moratorium on all geoengineering activities outside the laboratory. Anything else is folly, putting the planet and its peoples at tremendous and unjustifiable risk.” [8]

Geoengineering endangers the environment and the ability to sustain life on Planet Earth. It could destroy the entire natural ecosystem worldwide because the forest, the flora, the fauna, the air, and the water do not recognize borders between nations. If our entire ecosystem is damaged or ruined, then, at a minimum, the quality of life on the planet will be greatly diminished.

Geoengineering is Happening Now and is Being Covered Up

Geoengineering has been secretly implemented worldwide as documented in the *Case Orange* report by the Belfort Group:

“Manipulation of climate through modification of Cirrus clouds is neither a hoax nor a conspiracy theory, but currently the best-option in geo-engineering by decision makers to counter global warming... The technology to organize spraying operations on a global scale is widely available. Both civil and military aviation is used for that purpose.” [13]

For more about existing geoengineering programs and their impact on the environment and your health, see sections 1-4 of the document *Human Rights Approach on Trans-National Hazardous Environmental Programs*.

To make matters worse, the public is being deliberately deceived about geoengineering. M. Granger Morgan, the head of the Department of Engineering and Public Policy at Carnegie Mellon University, made the following statement at a Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) meeting on “*Developing an International Framework for Geoengineering*” [14]:

“First of all, of course, there is a lot of money getting spent to make sure that a very substantial portion of the public stays totally confused about this. And, I mean, it’s been really quite pernicious. But there’s been literally tens of millions of dollars spent on every little thing that comes along that might, you know, relate to some uncertainty.”

Human Rights Pertaining to the Environment

“Following Pythagoras’ words that the man is not only a body, but everything that surrounds him, in such a way that he could never be considered as a separate being from his environment [9], we could say that – according to this – a citizen in a contemporary society cannot be considered as one, without the concept of a healthy and worth-living environment around him. As such, the environment and its natural resources play an essential role in securing a safe, healthy and productive life for our global community.” [10]

The individual right to a healthy environment is documented in many different global and regional texts of human rights. The following chronological list, from the June 2003 proceedings of *the 7th*

International Conference on Environmental Law [11], details the evolution of the documented human right to a healthy environment:

“1972 The first explicit link between environmental protection and human rights was made in the Stockholm Declaration, of which Principle 1 proclaims that “man has the fundamental right to freedom, equality and adequate conditions of life, in an environment of a quality that permits a life of dignity and well-being, and he bears a solemn responsibility to protect and improve the environment for present and future generations.”

“1981 The African Charter of Human and People’s Rights was adopted, of which Article 24 recognizes that “all peoples shall have the right to a general satisfactory environment favorable to their development”.

“1986 The Experts Group on Environmental Law of the World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED) considering that there was not yet a well-recognized right to a healthy environment under international law, proposed a draft of universal legal principles on environmental protection, which could have been later incorporated in a global, legally binding instrument. The draft included: “All human beings have the fundamental right to an environment adequate for their health and well-being”.

“1988 In Article 11 of the San Salvador Protocol to the American Convention on Human Rights –for the first time in history – the individual right to environment was explicitly mentioned: “everyone shall have the right to live in a healthy environment and to have access to basic public services.”

“The UN Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities adopted Resolution 1988/26, which stated that the movement and dumping of toxic and dangerous products ‘endangers basic human rights, such as ... the right to live in a sound and healthy environment’.

“1989 The Hague Declaration, signed by the heads of states of 24 countries, recognized ‘the right to live in dignity in a viable global environment, and the consequent duty of the community of nations vis-à-vis present and future generations to do all that can be done to preserve the quality of the atmosphere.’

“1990 The UN Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities while “affirming the inextricable relationship between human rights and the environment” appointed a Special Rapporteur to study the relationship between human rights and the environment.

“The Commission on Human Rights adopted Resolution 1990/41, which underscored the link between preservation of the environment and promotion of human rights.

“The European Council adopted the Dublin Declaration on “The Environmental Imperative” stating that the objective of the Community action for the protection of the environment “must be to guarantee citizens the right to a clean and healthy environment”.

“1991 The Commission on Human Rights adopted Resolution 1991/44, which recognizes that ‘all individuals are entitled to live in an environment adequate for their health and well-being.’

“1992 No provision explicitly addressed the issue in the Rio Declaration, although Principle 1 states that ‘human beings are at the center of concerns for sustainable development. They are entitled to a healthy and productive life in harmony with nature.’ The Declaration does recognize though in Principle 10 the procedural right of a human right to a healthy environment.

“1994 The UN General Assembly in its Resolution 45/94, recognized ‘that all individuals are entitled to live in an environment adequate for their health and well-being.’

“More than 20 experts on human rights and the environment met in Geneva and produced the Draft Declaration of Principles on Human Rights and the Environment. The document explains the concept of

'the right to a secure and healthy and ecologically sound environment' and becomes a reference point for further development of environmental human rights.

"The Ksentini Final Report was adopted together with the Draft Declaration on Principles of Human Rights and the Environment.

"1998 The Aarhus Convention on *Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters* was agreed upon at the Environment for Europe Ministerial Conference, which stated: '...every person has the right to live in an environment adequate to his or her health and well-being.'

"1999 The Commission on Human Rights adopted a resolution reaffirming that 'illicit traffic and dumping of toxic and dangerous products constitute a serious threat to the human right to life, health and a sound environment for every individual.' [12] Many delegates opposed the consideration of hazardous wastes and other environmental issues by the Commission, claiming it was not the right forum for solving those problems."

Numerous Human Rights Treaties are being violated by Geoengineering Programs

The geoengineering programs that have been implemented worldwide violate basic human rights – the right to live in a safe and healthy environment. Below is a partial list of International Treaties that could be violated geoengineering [15]:

- The Aarhus Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-Making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters (Europe); 48 signatory parties (see the list of countries below); Relevance: This treaty links the environment to human rights. It acknowledges our debt to future generations with its emphasis on public accountability.
- Vienna Convention on Protection of the Ozone Layer, and Montreal Protocol; 196 signatory parties; Relevance: Injection of sulphate or aluminum aerosols into the stratosphere is expected to harm the ozone layer.
- Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques (or ENMOD, Environmental Modification Convention); 73 signatory parties; Relevance: Prohibits intentional use of environmental modification of one party against another for hostile purposes. It outright bans weather warfare.
- Convention on Biological Diversity; 193 signatory parties; Relevance: Has established de facto moratorium on ocean fertilization. Discussions underway on impact of geoengineering on biodiversity.
- Convention on Long Range Transboundary Air Pollution (Europe); 53 signatory parties; Relevance: Long-range transboundary air pollution is defined as the human introduction of substances or energy into the air which has deleterious effects on human health, the environment, or material property in another country, and for which the contribution of individual emission sources or groups of sources cannot be distinguished.
- International Convention on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights; 160 signatory parties; Relevance: Protects the right to food, health and an adequate standard of living under the general principle of "progressive realization."
- United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and Kyoto Protocol; 192 signatory parties; Relevance: The main treaty dealing with climate change. It establishes principles such as common but differentiated responsibilities. It also establishes carbon credits through the CDM and flexibility mechanisms whose rules affect the profitability of geoengineering.
- UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS); 160 signatory parties; Relevance: Widely seen as constitution of the ocean. It is mandated to control ocean pollution from any source. ARTICLE 195 states that "Parties shall not transfer directly or indirectly damage or hazards from

one area to another or transform one type of pollution into another.”

- Outer Space Treaty; 99 signatory parties; Relevance: This treaty defines celestial resources as common heritage of mankind to be used for peaceful purposes. It gives all Parties rights of consultation with a state that is planning experiments in outer space.
- United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa; 194 signatory parties; Relevance: Certain geoengineering technologies will have direct impacts on deserts.

The Obligation of Government to Protect the Environment

The second principle of the *Declaration of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment* states that it is the duty of ALL governments to protect and improve the environment:

“The protection and improvement of the human environment is a major issue which affects the well-being of peoples and economic development throughout the world; it is the urgent desire of the peoples of the whole world and the duty of all Governments.” [16]

In addition, the 10th session of the Conference of Parties on Biological Diversity (COP10), which took place in October 2010 in Nagoya, Japan, declared a moratorium on geoengineering activities and stated that such activities must not occur unless there has been an adequate scientific investigation into the benefits and associated risks:

“No climate-related geo-engineering activities that may affect biodiversity take place, until there is an adequate scientific basis on which to justify such activities and appropriate consideration of the associated risks for the environment and biodiversity and associated social, economic and cultural impacts, with the exception of small-scale scientific research studies.” [17]

The 193 member UN body at COP10 reached a consensus decision to mandate a moratorium on geoengineering activities until sufficient studies have been performed because the risks are too dangerous for the human environment. [18]

YOU have the right to complain that the COP10 agreement has not been upheld. A gentleman in Greece named Giorgios Perdikis filed a complaint to Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Environment for the Republic of Cyprus. Mr. Perdikis expressed concerns regarding “chemical aerial spraying in the airspace of Cyprus” that is in violation of the COP10 agreement.

Click [here](#) for a copy of the letter from the Office of the Minister in which he informs the President of the House of Representatives that “a decision has been taken for investigation of this question [from Mr. Perdikis] by the competent authorities.”

Note that although over 190 countries agreed to the moratorium, the United States did not. Instead, the U.S. appears to want to expand geoengineering programs. For more, see the article: *Is the U.S. Bullying Other Nations into Geoengineering/Chemtrail Spraying?*

If you live in the U.S., you can easily fax a letter to your elected official asking for an explanation as to why the U.S. did not agree to the moratorium on geoengineering since it is meant to protect the environment, which is “the duty of ALL governments.”

It is vitally important that you do NOT use the word “chemtrail” in your correspondence because the U.S. Air Force has stated that the chemtrail theory is a hoax that “has been investigated and refuted by many established and accredited universities, scientific organizations, and major media publications.” Therefore, if you do use the word chemtrail, you are guaranteed to get a canned response stating that chemtrails are a hoax. So, please use the word “geoengineering” instead.

Click [here](#) for a complete list of fax numbers for U.S. Congress, Senate, and governors. After you get the names and fax numbers of your elected officials, you can send up to two faxes per day for free via

faxzero.com. Click here for a video that contains simple, step-by-step instructions for using faxzero.

The Right to Participate in Decisions that Affect the Environment

In addition to the right to a healthy environment, citizens have a right to participate in decisions that affect the environment. Principle 10 of the 1992 Rio Declaration, Public Participation, states:

“Environmental issues are best handled with participation of all concerned citizens, at the relevant level. At the national level, each individual shall have appropriate access to information concerning the environment that is held by public authorities, including information on hazardous materials and activities in their communities, and the opportunity to participate in decision-making processes. States shall facilitate and encourage public awareness and participation by making information widely available. Effective access to judicial and administrative proceedings, including redress and remedy, shall be provided.”

Access to environmental information and citizen participation in environmental decisions are mentioned throughout the “The Blueprint for Sustainable Development” (Agenda 21) text of the United Nations, which was adopted by the UN in 1992. Agenda 21 emphasizes the role of the citizens in developing, implementing, and enforcing environmental laws and policies.

The 1998 Aarhus Convention is the most complete framework for the implementation of Principle 10 of the Rio Declaration. The preamble of the Convention includes the following:

“Affirming the need to protect, preserve and improve the state of the environment and to ensure sustainable and environmentally sound development,

“Recognizing that adequate protection of the environment is essential to human well-being and the enjoyment of basic human rights, including the right to life itself,

“Recognizing also that every person has the right to live in an environment adequate to his or her health and well-being, and the duty, both individually and in association with others, to protect and improve the environment for the benefit of present and future generations,

“Considering that, to be able to assert this right and observe this duty, citizens must have access to information, be entitled to participate in decision-making and have access to justice in environmental matters, and acknowledging in this regard that citizens may need assistance in order to exercise their rights,

“Recognizing that, in the field of the environment, improved access to information and public participation in decision-making enhance the quality and the implementation of decisions, contribute to public awareness of environmental issues, give the public the opportunity to express its concerns and enable public authorities to take due account of such concerns,

“Aiming thereby to further the accountability of and transparency in decision-making and to strengthen public support for decisions on the environment...”

The Aarhus Convention was initially a regional convention. Its participants primarily include European Union states and most of the former Soviet states. However, it is open to any state to participate. For example, Canada is a party to the Aarhus Convention. See below for a list of the parties to the Aarhus Convention.

“The Aarhus Convention recognizes every person’s right to a healthy environment as well as his or her duty to protect it... The Convention pursues its objective of a healthy environment for all by upholding the right of every person to have access to information about the environment... And it promotes easy and effective access to justice if those rights are denied.” [19]

The Right of Access to Justice

The Aarhus Convention stipulates the following regarding the rights of citizens to have access to justice in matters pertaining to the environment:

“For access to information and public participation in decision-making to be effective, the public must have recourse to a court of law or administrative proceeding. Such a review mechanism provides a means of challenging the authorities’ decisions and ensuring the effective implementation of the Convention.” [20]

“Breaches of the rights to information and to public participation can be appealed to a court of law (or another independent and impartial body, such as an ombudsman). Members of the public can sue if the law has been violated or if the authority has failed to follow the proper procedures. There must be access to a review process that is fair, equitable, timely, and free or inexpensive. Final decisions must be in writing and must be binding on the public authority.” [21]

Access to justice is not just limited to cases about the right to information and public participation:

“Under the Convention, members of the public should in principle be able to challenge any violation of national law relating to the environment. If public authorities or private persons have broken such a law, citizens should be able to challenge the acts or omissions in court, even if they have not suffered personal harm.” [22]

Click here for a copy of *Your Right to a Healthy Environment: A simplified guide to the Aarhus Convention* to learn more about the Aarhus Convention and your right to access to justice.

Parties to the Aarhus Convention:

The following is a list of the countries that are currently signatory parties to the Aarhus Convention [23]:

1. Albania
2. Armenia
3. Austria
4. Azerbaijan
5. Belarus
6. Belgium
7. Bosnia and Herzegovina
8. Bulgaria
9. Croatia
10. Cyprus
11. Czech Republic
12. Denmark³
13. Estonia
14. European Union
15. Finland
16. France⁴
17. Georgia
18. Germany
19. Greece
20. Hungary

21. Iceland
22. Ireland
23. Italy
24. Kazakhstan
25. Kyrgyzstan
26. Latvia
27. Liechtenstein
28. Lithuania
29. Luxembourg
30. Monaco
31. Montenegro
32. Netherlands
33. Norway
34. Poland
35. Portugal
36. Republic of Moldova
37. Romania
38. Serbia
39. Slovakia
40. Slovenia
41. Spain
42. Sweden
43. Switzerland
44. Tajikistan
45. The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
46. Turkmenistan
47. Ukraine
48. United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

For more information on the Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters (Aarhus Convention), including instructions for submitting complaints to the Compliance Committee and a Guidance Document, visit the UNECE website. [24]

References

[1] Human Rights Approach on Trans-National Hazardous Environmental Programs, August 2011

Prepared for the 4th International Conference on Human Rights & Human Development

by Ross Pittman, Sylvain Henry, Eri Hariono

<http://consciouslifeneeds.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/Human-Rights-Approach-on-Trans-National-Hazardous-Environmental-Programs-26-Aug-2011.pdf>

- [2] Geoengineering: a quick fix with big risks; June 4, 2007;
http://carnegiescience.edu/news/geoengineering_quick_fix_big_risks
- [3] Ibid.
- [4] Stratospheric Injections to Counter Global Warming Could Damage Ozone Layer; April 24, 2008;
<http://www2.ucar.edu/news/942/stratospheric-injections-counter-global-warming-could-damage-ozone-layer>
- [5] The Regulation of Geoengineering by the House of Commons Science and Technology Committee; March 18, 2010; <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200910/cmselect/cmsctech/221/221.pdf>
- [6] Ibid.
- [7] Geoengineering: Scientists Debate Risks Of Sun-Blocking And Other Climate Tweaks To Fight Warming; April 3, 2011
http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/04/04/geoengineering-sun-blocking_n_844324.html
- [8] Geopiracy: The Case Against Geoengineering; October 2010;
http://www.etcgroup.org/upload/publication/pdf_file/ETC_geopiracy2010_0.pdf
- [9] Mario Francisco Valls, Manual de Derecho Ambiental, Buenos Aires; 2001; page 24.
- [10] Rule of Law and Fundamental Rights of Citizens: The European and American Conventions of Human Rights; Page 2;
http://www.eplo.eu/alfall/docs/Grant%20Holders/EFTYCHIA_NIKOLETA%20KATSOULI.pdf
- [11] Water and the Web of Life from the 7th International Conference on Environmental Law; Appendix III; June 2, 2003;
<http://www.generoyambiente.org/arcangel2/documentos/278.pdf>
- [12] UNCHR Resolution 1999/23, Paragraph 4.
- [13] Case Orange report; The Belfort Group; page 69; May 10, 2010;
<http://consciouslifeneeds.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/Case-Orange-Report-Belfort-Group.pdf>
- [14] Developing an International Framework for Geoengineering; March 10, 2010;
<http://www.cfr.org/climate-change/developing-international-framework-geoengineering/p21651>
- [15] Geopiracy: The Case Against Geoengineering; The ETC Group; Appendix 1; October 2010;
http://www.etcgroup.org/upload/publication/pdf_file/ETC_geopiracy2010_0.pdf
- [16] Declaration of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment; United Nations Conference on the Human Environment; Stockholm; June 1972;
<http://www.unep.org/Documents.Multilingual/Default.asp?documentid=97&articleid=1503>
- [17] Report of the Tenth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity; UNEP; October 29, 2010;
<http://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/cop/cop-10/official/cop-10-27-en.pdf>
- [18] Geoengineering sparks international ban, first-ever congressional report. Eilperin, J. (October 29, 2010)

[19] Your Right to a Healthy Environment: A simplified guide to the Aarhus Convention; published by the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe and the United Nations Environment Programme; July 2006;

<http://consciouslifeneeds.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/Aarhus-Simplified-Guide.pdf>

[20] Ibid.

[21] Ibid.

[22] Ibid.

[23] Aarhus Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-Making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters

http://treaties.un.org/Pages/ViewDetails.aspx?src=TREATY&mtdsg_no=XXVII-13&chapter=27&lang=en

[24] Introduction to the Aarhus Convention (plus much more on the Aarhus Convention) on the UNECE website

<http://live.unece.org/env/pp/introduction.html>