

# Critical assessment

[Linguistics](#), [English](#)



Critical Assessment Critical Assessment [http://iopscience.iop.org/1748-9326/7/3/034019/pdf/1748-9326\\_7\\_3\\_034019.pdf](http://iopscience.iop.org/1748-9326/7/3/034019/pdf/1748-9326_7_3_034019.pdf) Climate engineering, which might drop the speed of global warming through injecting deep particles into the higher atmosphere, has developed in contemporary years as a tremendously controversial technology. For good reason, this carries indefinite risks, and it might weaken pledges to conserving energy. I see it as a morally wrong human violation of the natural world. The latter objection is unwarranted because we have been making use of technology to change our environment for decades, but there are great risks at stake. McClellan, Keith & Apt (2012) provide no naïve suggestion for a simple fix to what is maybe the most difficult question of our time that climate engineering is no silver bullet.

From an engineer who is deeply worried about climate change, it is easy to judge that such as from this article will never take place and feeding our atmosphere with sulfuric acid is way off the scale of "achievable" to be a fraction of a significant discourse on reversing or slowing even climate change. Someone would anticipate for much better writing than this in an article written by three professors from Cambridge Center, Carnegie Mellon University and Harvard University. I could not help but marvel whether this article was hurriedly brought to press in response to a number of the references in the article such as Barker et al. (2007), Blackstock et al. (2009), Robock (2008), Royal Society (2009), and Nordhaus (2008), which were all significant publications concerning this topic of climate change. All these books which the article referenced gave revealing arguments against climate engineering/geoengineering and the authors made them clearly,

movingly, persuasively, and without typos, unlike McClellan, Keith & Apt (2012).

This article fails to make the point that a majority of geoengineerings vocal supporters only have a financial concern in the field. There is tons of cash to be made in this field if the idea of geoengineering finally takes off. McClellan, Keith & Apt (2012) fail to acknowledge they indeed do have such a financial concern in a firm working on eliminating carbon dioxide from the environment, but then they brush that aside through saying their financial concern is not in solar-radiation managing, which is the center of this article. I would opt to read a thoughtful article by any scholar with no financial concern in climate engineering in any way.

The authors are obviously charmed with the lost cost, easiness of tunability and implementation of SRM. However, there is modest discussion of the diverse reactions of the earth to adding of CO<sub>2</sub> in opposition to reduction in solar radiation. The later might allow change of the earth's average temperature, halt sea level rise and block melting of glaciers. These are the most noticeable issues in global warming because of CO<sub>2</sub> increase. They are expected to dictate political thinking and response, which might be dreadfully shortsighted. However, all that aside, this article does make a number of interesting arguments and is helpful to read to consider what potential geoengineers are thinking. I was not swayed, but I do have a much better interpretations of the arguments put forward in this article on climate engineering after reading it.

#### Work Cited

McClellan, J., Keith D. W., & Apt, J. (2012). Cost analysis of stratospheric

albedo modification delivery systems. *Environmental Research Letter*, 7(1), 1-9. Retrieved from [http://iopscience.iop.org/1748-9326/7/3/034019/pdf/1748-9326\\_7\\_3\\_034019.pdf](http://iopscience.iop.org/1748-9326/7/3/034019/pdf/1748-9326_7_3_034019.pdf)