

Top British Climate Scientist Acknowledges Ongoing Geoengineering Interventions

By [James Hodgskiss](#)

Global Research, October 31, 2015

[Chemtrails Project UK](#) 17 October 2015

Region: [Europe](#)

Theme: [Environment](#)

In-depth Report: [Climate Change](#)

Professor Tim Lenton (Chair in Climate Change/Earth Systems Science, University of Exeter) provided one of the many positive outcomes of this summer's climate change conference in Paris.

You may have missed this major admission from Professor Lenton which we originally broke in our [Paris Report](#), so we revisit it here and round off with a little more discussion.


His "revelations" occurred on day 2 of the climate change conference in Paris that ran from 7th to 10th July, 2015.

As you will see from the transcript and video excerpts, below, Professor Lenton initially denied that geoengineering activities were already occurring but, when pressed further, he threw in the towel and conceded that the geoengineering of our skies was indeed already happening.



For any newcomers to this topic, we are officially told by Her Majesty's Government that geoengineering – which includes releasing vast amounts of toxic substances into the sky from aircraft in a supposed bid to block out the sun and reduce 'global warming' – is just a proposal, and that any current geoengineering "experiments" are being performed only on a "small scale."

Transcript of Geoengineering-related Discussions

 Olga Raffa, [Chemtrails Project UK](#): My name's Olga Raffa, from ClimateChangeSense.org. I represent a large group of people who are wondering why programmes such as weather modification and ongoing geoengineering programmes throughout the World have not been taken into consideration with a lot of the research done. And we notice, on a daily basis, that our environment is being tipped through the aerosols being dumped into the atmosphere blocking our sun. And there seems to be a lot of aluminium in the environment – within the bees now have aluminium, and it's destroying their, well, there's a bee collapse obviously with the insects and the biodiversity. Aluminium... found in whales. So we recognise this is a military programme. And the EMFs – so you've got your cell towers, your HAARP... which is putting heat into the atmosphere, into the ionosphere and seems to be moving the jet streams. Have you done any research and published on the tipping points that this is doing and will cause in the future. Thank you.

 Prof. Tim Lenton, University of Exeter: Not precisely on those interventions, but I am

someone who's obviously worked on tipping points and also on trying to evaluate these... well, I would think of them more as proposed, existing proposals for geoengineering interventions – either in the camp of sunlight reflection methods or large-scale carbon removal methods. I've been on my own journey with my thinking about that but, as I've said publicly and in the literature, I'm now of a view that the risks posed by large-scale attempts to reflect sunlight back to space... far outweigh the potential benefits in terms of reducing risk of higher temperatures and associated tipping points. So I still feel that there's a space for and there's a need, in fact, to look at the options for carbon removal as I think we may need that later this century. But that's not what you're most concerned about.

The next Q&A covers another subject raised by another attendee, before the geoengineering topic is rekindled by Dr. Colin Pritchard.

✖ [Dr. Colin Pritchard](#), University of Edinburgh: My question is again for Tim. Colin Pritchard, Edinburgh University. Hi, Tim. Thank you very much for your very cogent explanation. I would basically agree with you on geoengineering – except, may I infer that you prefer an enormous global-scale uncontrolled experiment in geoengineering as opposed to a small-scale uncontrolled [sic] one. At the moment we are in the former. And it seems to be a little bizarre to prefer the former to the latter.

✖ Prof. Tim Lenton, University of Exeter: I'm certainly not preferring carrying on with our current uncontrolled experiment. And I'm not – what's the right word – I'm not monolithically set against things that are being discussed under the banner of geoengineering. So it's quite a nuance... I think that's quite a nuance discussion to have, perhaps over lunch, because it really depends on the options you're considering. So you've got some things which would be reflective roofs and road surfaces that are very practical, local adaptation options against urban heat islands that, if you did on a large enough scale, could have some measurable effect on regional climate and I think are very sensible. So we have to just be... I think we have to be nuanced on specific proposals, specific technologies. But I think we can perhaps all agree that certainly none of us want to continue the current uncontrolled experiment. I guess, knowing the numbers, we realise that we would like the strongest mitigation efforts possible but we now know that additional things including carbon removal from the atmosphere may... we may want to develop that capability because we may need it as part of the risk management portfolio.

Video Excerpt

Lasting 4 minutes 24 seconds (if you cut out the interjecting question/answer by skipping from 1:26:16 to 1:29:59), here are the above exchanges from the official footage:

The [original, full video](#) from this session last 1 hour 39 minutes 43 seconds.

Conclusion

It's Happening

✖ Professor Lenton's U-turn on whether geoengineering activities are already underway, although spectacular, is actually quite understandable.

Geoengineers proposing to spray aerosols from aircraft to block out the sun when the same effects, we're told, are already being achieved with "ordinary condensation trails" is the

ludicrous scenario currently being served up by Her Majesty's Government (HMG) – one that does not merit the vast amounts of taxpayers' money that has already been invested in geoengineering.

It appears the fine line being walked by Professor Lenton and company is that, on one hand, they must not be seen emboldening ridiculous claims such as the “ordinary condensation trails” one made by HMG but, on the other hand, trying not to bite that same hand that is feeding them financially. I believe it is this dilemma that we witness Professor Lenton struggle with as it best explains his initial denial then later admission that geoengineering is already occurring.

It is reasonable, therefore, to conclude that the money received by these establishments is adversely affecting the quality of their work. They are compromised.

So too the media, creating their nonsensical ‘pro-environmental’ fanfare for the IPCC as they set about hammering the final few nails into our New World Order coffin, with virtually no mention of the [real scientists and the real campaigners](#) who, with no financial incentive, continue to spread the truth about the underlying ‘phenomenon’ of global warming.

Such individuals – those with the intelligence, independence and decency to stand against the mainstream deception – are ensuring that the cracks of [Agenda 21](#) and the NWO continue to progress...

...until the whole system is inevitably exploited for what it is.

It's Being Ignored

✖ The second major issue that is confirmed for us by Professor Lenton (and [as confirmed elsewhere](#)) is that these geoengineering activities – that we now agree exist – have not been taken into account in the IPCC's climate models or in other mainstream climate research.

With the warming effects that persistent aircraft trails can have on surface temperatures already acknowledged by the IPCC but not included in their climate models, scientists such as Professor Lenton must realise that the geoengineering elephant in the room must now be addressed if these scientists – and their work – is to emerge with any credibility whatsoever.

The question we witnessed Dr Pritchard raising was especially helpful as it ultimately caused Professor Lenton to concede, but one is left wondering to what extent other institutions are benefiting from adopting the flawed stance that “the climate is changing due to human activity, but let's ignore the climatic effects of years of geoengineering.”

More specifically, if UK universities are being ‘rewarded’ with vast amounts of research money to facilitate the nonsense of geoengineering, then how lucrative must be the benefits of upholding the underlying [global warming alarmism that we already know to be flawed](#)? To look at it another way, how many millions would it cost them if they allowed the wheels to come off the global warming bandwagon? Ethics aside, it is clear why their main incentive is to promote the paired issues of global warming and geoengineering. Money talks.

By way of contrast, consider the 30,000 independent US scientists (of which 9,000 had PhDs) that signed the Oregon Petition:

We urge the United States government to reject the global warming agreement that was written in Kyoto, Japan in December, 1997, and any other similar proposals. The proposed limits on greenhouse gases would harm the environment, hinder the advance of science and technology, and damage the health and welfare of mankind.

There is no convincing scientific evidence that human release of carbon dioxide, methane, or other greenhouse gases is causing or will, in the foreseeable future, cause catastrophic heating of the Earth's atmosphere and disruption of the Earth's climate. Moreover, there is substantial scientific evidence that increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide produce many beneficial effects upon the natural plant and animal environments of the Earth.

With no financial motivation for these scientists, what prevailed was the opportunity for truth and transparency. No threat required. No spotlight required.

Learn more about the global warming deception that is facilitating the geoengineering crime at our sister site, [Climate Change Sense](#).

There's No Way Forward

✖ For Professor Lenton himself, now that he has conceded geoengineering is contributing to climate change, is he going to continue his absurdly flawed promotion of geoengineering also being *a solution* to climate change?! Or will he find the necessary resources to investigate geoengineering and [chemtrails](#) as a *causal* factor of climate change – and maybe even reconsider his stance on global warming? With no financial incentive, such a change in direction may appear unlikely but, given his own admission, how else can his work be taken seriously?

The same questions, of course, apply to all mainstream climate scientists and the IPCC, because what Professor Lenton's words have done is invalidate *his* work, his department's work and that of the IPCC. This is because we now have official acceptance that geoengineering is happening and it's effects are not being taken into account, which is rendering the whole 'anthropogenic global warming' claim an utter shambles.

For Professor Lenton and every other climate scientist now unable to plead ignorance, without the necessary change in direction, will their work eventually be subject to charges of *fraud*?

We know we live in a World rife in corruption and there is no reason to presume the scientists, politicians and journalists involved in the global warming and geoengineering scandals should be any exception to the rule. Shamefully, the only sacrifice they appear willing to make is to permit the current, growing threat to their own children and grandchildren's physical health.

Such sacrifice appears to be made for the purpose of simply securing their own personal salaries and livelihoods. In today's climate of financial hardship and debt, it can be understood how simply getting themselves over the line may be a priority for the 'me' generation, but any assumption that their offspring may enjoy a net benefit seems especially shortsighted.

Sadly, all too often, cash *is* king. But if their ultimate motive does boil down to financial security, you would expect these intelligent people to engage their foresight and

acknowledge the imminent ramifications of being so closely associated with and facilitating what may deservedly go down as the greatest crime of modern history. A crime that, by their own admission, is now unfolding before us.

May this article serve as a call for these scientists to turn their attentions to the bigger picture and to change their course of action accordingly, so they are no longer:

- Damaging the health of themselves and their own families.
- Risking prosecution for accepting the [known-fraudulent offerings of the IPCC](#) whilst laying the foundations for and/or promoting geoengineering crimes.
- Paving the way for the One World Government / New World Order that permeates [United Nations' Agenda 21](#) and as [promoted by the Pope](#).
- Standing by and watching the destruction of our wildlife, plant life, human life, our food, our water, our land and our oceans. Facilitating the attempted destruction of Mother Nature.

This article has been written to urge these scientists and others in positions of influence to make proper, responsible use of their opportunity – to no longer stand aside and facilitate but to stand strong, to break the hush and to do what they can to bring these disastrous geoengineering crimes to an end. Be the change the World so desperately needs.

To read more:

[CRACKED! Top Climate Scientist Admits to Ongoing Geoengineering](#)

The original source of this article is [Chemtrails Project UK](#)
Copyright © [James Hodgskiss](#), [Chemtrails Project UK](#), 2015

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [James Hodgskiss](#)

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

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