



Written by [James Murphy](#) on August 11, 2021

UN May Consider Risky Geoengineering Methods to Combat Global Warming

With the dust still settling from the release of the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's (IPCC) [sixth assessment](#) on the state of the climate, news is coming out on controversial new methods that the would-be one-world government is considering to attack the problem. Among those methods are forms of geoengineering.

Geoengineering can be described as a deliberate large-scale manipulation of an environmental process that affects the earth's climate, typically in an attempt to lessen the impact of so-called global warming.



TinasDreamworld/iStock/Getty Images Plus

Reuters is [reporting](#) that the UN may be considering using solar-radiation management as well as greenhouse-gas removal to address global warming. Although the IPCC report discussed both methods of geoengineering, it made no recommendations on whether to use them.

Commonly proposed methods of solar-radiation management include the spraying of reflective aerosol sulfate material into the atmosphere, which would supposedly mimic the way that ash clouds cool the planet after a large volcanic eruption. The plan could include spraying these aerosols into the stratosphere, 12-16 miles above the Earth's surface, to reflect sunlight back out into space, thus lowering the Earth's temperature.

Vaccine pusher [Bill Gates](#) is a big fan of this procedure.

There are side effects to those methods, however. Introducing sulfate aerosols into the air would likely have the effect of lowering average precipitation. Researchers believe they could counter that effect with more geoengineering, namely thinning out cirrus clouds in the upper atmosphere.

"The science is there," claims Govindasamy Bala, a lead author of the report from the Indian Institute of Science. Bala is also listed as a contributing author of the newest IPCC assessment.

"I think the next big question is, do you want to do it?... That involves uncertainty, moral issues, ethical issues and governance," Bala said.

Why would there be moral and ethical qualms if, as Bala insists, "the science is there?"

It's because the scientists don't really know how such a project would ultimately affect each region of the globe. There are fears that certain regions could lose the ability to grow crops if weather patterns change.

Although it's obviously risky, Bala insists that in a world that cannot stay within the goals of the Paris climate agreement — limiting global temperature rise to 1.5-2.0 degrees Celsius — we would probably be better off using reflective aerosol materials than doing nothing.



Written by [James Murphy](#) on August 11, 2021

Paulo Artaxo, an environmental physicist from the University of São Paulo in Brazil, believes that the IPCC report's mention of geoengineering was more cautionary than an endorsement of such methods.

"Basically the message is more or less the same as [the previous report]: The science is not mature enough," Artaxo said.

"The side effects of any of the known geoengineering techniques can be very significant... Society has to consider if these side effects are too big to try any strategy," Artaxo concluded.

Another strategy the IPCC report discussed is carbon capture and removal from the atmosphere. Unlike spraying aerosol sulfate into the atmosphere, carbon removal has become more or less accepted as a method of mitigating global warming.

In addition to simply cutting carbon emissions to net zero, many scientists believe that there must be a reduction of carbon dioxide already in the atmosphere, which currently stands at about 410 parts per million — less than one half of one percent of the entire atmosphere.

"That's become more clear with the recognition we're going to need negative emissions ... and almost by definition negative emissions have to be through some kind of carbon dioxide removal," said Chris Fields, an earth scientist at Stanford.

Such methods would involve the use of carbon-capture machinery, which engineers are working on but is not available yet; carbon-capture technologies for industrial applications; and even encouraging plant growth in the oceans and planting more forests, which act as carbon sinks.

Question: If plant and forest growth are among the carbon-capture efforts, won't there be a need for more carbon dioxide because of its role in photosynthesis?

Many believe that geoengineering is already occurring through the use of chemtrails and other surreptitious methods, but the governments of the world and the mainstream scientific community deny this and claim that such fears are nothing but conspiracy theories.

The simple fact that the latest IPCC assessment mentions such risky options for "saving the climate" is ominous. The fact that such measures are so risky almost ensures that global agreements to use the options could never be reached.

Which is why we'd need a one-world government to enact such a program.

The alarmist report was released on Sunday and sounded dire warnings about the state of the climate. UN Secretary General António Guterres called the new report a "code red" for humanity. The report spawned a number of [climate panic stories](#) coming from the mainstream media.



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative,
non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



Subscribe

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.