

# Elite Think Tank Admits to Ongoing Climate Engineering Experiments

By [Nicholas West](#)

Theme: [Environment](#)

Global Research, January 10, 2018


[Activist Post](#) 8 December 2014

This article first appeared on GR in December 2014.

*If we could experiment with the atmosphere and literally play God, it's very tempting to a scientist. - Kenyan earth scientist **Richard Odingo***

For those who know about the history of geoengineering - aka chemtrails - you might be noticing a spate of admissions from the halls of establishment science and government that the "conspiracy theory" is no longer ... it is a fact.

Perhaps the efforts of independent researchers have forced such open disclosure, at least putting us over the hurdle of abject denial. However, the narrative being created for mainstream media consumption is disingenuous at best, and full-throttle manipulation at worst. Case in point is an admission from The Royal Society that geoengineering experiments are being debated for full rollout even in the absence of policy restrictions.



The elite UK think-tank, [The Royal Society](#), has for years openly discussed control over the planet's weather. Their 2011 ~~propaganda~~ press release entitled "[Who Decides?](#)" is an overtly Orwellian exercise in problem-reaction-solution that, naturally, argues for a cabal of technocratic insiders to implement godlike power over the unwashed masses who are threatened both by their own ignorance as well as "rogue elements" that could hijack weather manipulation technology.

Mainstream outlet The Verge wound up echoing these supposed concerns in their 2013 article, [“Weather wars: who should be allowed to engineer our climate?”](#) which has the subtitle, “Geoengineering could be the silver bullet in fighting climate change — or the start of something even worse.”

Let’s bypass for a moment that there still is intense scientific debate about the legitimacy of those who assign climate change to certain man-made activities, and instead look to these attempts to portray a full consensus that leapfrogs us to do-or-die solutions.

Even though the above story appears to have been originally disseminated by the Associated Press, what was not mentioned in any of the establishment outlets is the backstory that indicates a much longer timeline in getting to the conclusion that geoengineering is possibly the only hope that remains for saving the earth.

The Royal Society published a paper further back in 2009, which was based upon a 12-month study; the results were given the title: [“Geoengineering the climate: science, governance and uncertainty.”](#)

If we look at the recommendations from this report, then look at what is being discussed today as something supposedly novel, an agenda emerges. The report recommends:

- Parties to the UNFCCC (United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change - *Ed.*) should make increased efforts towards mitigating and adapting to climate change and in particular to agreeing to global emissions reductions of at least 50% on 1990 levels by 2050 and more thereafter;
- CDR (Carbon Dioxide Removal - *Ed.*) and SRM (Solar Radiation Management - *Ed.*) geoengineering methods should only be considered as part of a wider package of options for addressing climate change. CDR methods should be regarded as preferable to SRM methods.
- Relevant UK government departments, in association with the UK Research Councils, should together fund a 10 year geoengineering research programme at a level of the order of £10M per annum.
- The Royal Society, in collaboration with international science partners, should develop a code of practice for geoengineering research and provide recommendations to the international scientific community for a voluntary research governance framework.

Citing the slow path of debate and legislation, the panel of “twelve leading academics representing science, economics, law and social science” advocate for climate engineering as a [“final hope.”](#) This was 2009, of course; so when we read their latest press release [“Atmospheric particles can brighten cold clouds as well as warm ones”](#) an otherwise innocuous title should trigger an alarm.

Indeed, here we see that what is bullet-pointed above – and discussed within the study – as a non-preferable, potentially dangerous tinkering with global systems is underway.

For the first time, modeling research led by Pacific Northwest National Laboratory found that atmospheric particles can brighten cold clouds in the Arctic. Using simulations, they showed that low clouds over the Arctic may be brightened by deliberately injecting small particles known as aerosols. **It’s**

**already well known that injecting aerosols into low clouds over the warm ocean can, in some circumstances, reduce the amount of sunlight that reaches the surface.** The concept, **untested over the Arctic until now**, is called marine cloud brightening, and it can also happen when ships send exhaust into the atmosphere.

The full report consists of 14 articles discussing several climate engineering methods, some [openly available here](#) (others are locked). There appears to be a consistent message that the politics of proper governance could impede much-needed field experimentation.

However, there is additional vague language similar to the section above which leaves uncertainty about what exactly has been modeled by computers and what might have already been tested in the open. What cannot be doubted, however, is that the volume of scientific articles now published indicates a real agenda with massive scope, a massive budget and massive consequences.

Also clear is a reinforcement of the meme that climate scientists are *proceeding with caution* – a notion highlighted recently [by Harvard](#), but which has very little basis in the general history of scientific endeavors that have claimed a do-or-die right to proceed (nuclear, GMO, vaccines, etc.).

As with all things secretive, governmental, and possessing a military component, we only can do our best to independently research cause and effect. Such research by those who have dedicated their energy to [uncovering the climate change/geoengineering agenda](#) seem to conclude that engineering the planet's weather is not a "final hope" ... but more likely to be our Finale.

**Main source:**

<http://phys.org/news/2014-12-atmospheric-particles-brighten-cold-clouds.html>

**Additional Sources:**

[Geoengineering Watch](#)

[Chemtrails Planet](#)

[Aircrap.org](#)

[Obama Takes Bold Step to Geoengineer Climate Change](#)

The original source of this article is [Activist Post](#)

Copyright © [Nicholas West](#), [Activist Post](#), 2018

---

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Nicholas West](#)

**Disclaimer:** The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants

permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)

[www.globalresearch.ca](http://www.globalresearch.ca) contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)