

Letter to the editor of *The New York Times*

You recently featured a hit piece on myself and my organization titled, "Conspiracy Theorists and Vaccine skeptics Have a New Target: Geoengineering." I responded to Mr. Flavelle, yet in the article he said I failed to respond. My reply to him included "The New York Times" articles dating back to the 1970s. "[Cloud Seeding Hits Bumpy Weather](#)" (1976), "The Portland General Electric Company had had clouds seeded to increase precipitation." "[In the Pursuit of "Weather Modification](#)" (2009) "Weather modification is the ultimate impact on the environment. You are dumping toxic chemicals onto people, plants and animals.." Plus several others.

That same day you ran one titled, "[Silicon Renegades pollute the Sky to Save the Planet.](#)"

My response also included three precedents in law where weather modification was banned. Including a 1965 Maryland law which read, "Whereas a number of studies of weather control are being undertaken by the United States Congress, by other public groups and by private groups, and it is desirable to prevent further conflict until solutions can be found."

Additionally, weather modification was added to Tenn. Code Ann. [58-2-116](#).

But we are just dumb Tennessee hicks who don't know anything per Mr. Flavelle's irresponsible name-calling brand of journalism; label people instead of debating the issue.

What is curious is why would Mr. Flavelle not want to include information showing even "The New York Times" has had a bi-polar take on weather modification over the years? So why vilify those who don't want to participate in the experiment mandated [here](#).

Mr. Flavelle also failed to include part of our argument was the Federal government doesn't have Constitutional delegated authority in Article 1 Section 8 to experiment on Tennesseans without our consent. Supposedly the FAA and EPA were given jurisdiction. The FAA is approving these planes as stated [here](#). Additionally the law is wholly unconstitutional. If it isn't delegated to the federal government, which weather modification wasn't, it defers to the 9th and 10th. The Supremacy Clause does not mean all federal laws are supreme. It means Constitutional federal laws are supreme. If the federal government wasn't delegated authority, it isn't constitutional.

Tennessee was flexing the tenth amendment and claiming governance. If California wants to be a part of the experiment that is up to them. But Tennessee and Tennesseans have the right to opt out. Why vilify people for opting out of an experiment of which harm supposedly hasn't been determined? Why shame people into accepting something he claims he doesn't know is beneficial? Who benefits from such a low-information narrative or argument? Why not instead, encourage vigorous debate? Why suppress the truth? So people don't recognize the flavor of your lies?

Danielle Goodrich, East Tennessee Freedom