

Solar radiation modification: Moral hazard? Moral imperative? Or both?



Moral hazard

Some argue that exploring SRM presents a moral hazard, a distraction from urgently needed action needed to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases, remove them from the atmosphere, and adapt to climate impacts.

Governance is needed to manage conflicting concerns

Governance is needed to prioritise and strike a balance between conflicting concerns such as the moral hazard or moral imperative posed by SRM.



Moral imperative

Some argue that better understanding the implications of a future with or without SRM represents a moral imperative, a responsible course, in the event that greenhouse gas emissions persist, and the planet faces the impacts from overshooting 1.5°C.

We must explore all options to protect us from climate impacts!

How can governance address both?

We mustn't be distracted from mitigation and adaptation!

How can we avoid moral hazards while still learning enough to make decisions?