

Climate & Earth Systems | Jan 13, 2026 | 21 min read | By Bryan White

From Project Cirrus to Stratospheric Aerosols: The Evolution of Weather Control

Environment * Climate Change * History

Abstract

In the grand epoch of the Anthropocene, humanity has inadvertently become a geological force, altering the chemical composition of the atmosphere and the heat balance of the planet. As the twenty-first century advances and the threshold of 1.5 degrees Celsius of warming is breached, a new and contentious discipline has moved from the fringes of science fiction to the center of global policy: geoengineering. This report provides an exhaustive chronicle of climate intervention, tracing its lineage from the rain-making ambitions of the Cold War to the carbon-scrubbing industrial cathedrals of the 2020s. It dissects the physical mechanisms of Solar Radiation Modification (SRM) and Carbon Dioxide Removal (CDR), exploring the intricate microphysics of stratospheric aerosols and the thermodynamics of direct air capture. Furthermore, it analyzes the profound risks -- from the termination shock to the disruption of the Asian monsoon -- and the paralysis of global governance that defines the current era. This is a narrative of technological hubris, scientific desperation, and the uncertain quest to engineer a thermostat for the Earth.

Part I: The Historical Arc of Climate Intervention

The Origins of Weather Control: From Rainmakers to Cold Warriors

The dream of controlling the weather is as old as agriculture itself, but it was not until the mid-twentieth century that this ambition was married to the industrial and military capabilities of the superpowers. The intellectual genesis of modern geoengineering can be found not in climate science, but in the immediate post-war desire to weaponize the atmosphere.

In 1947, the United States military, in collaboration with General Electric, launched Project Cirrus. This initiative sought to modify hurricanes by seeding them with crushed dry ice (solid carbon dioxide). The theory was based on the principle of nucleation: by introducing freezing nuclei into supercooled clouds, one could trigger the phase change of water vapor into ice crystals, releasing latent heat and theoretically altering the storm's thermodynamics. On October 13, 1947, Project Cirrus seeded a hurricane off the coast of Florida. Shortly thereafter, the storm abruptly changed course and made landfall near Savannah, Georgia. While the causal link remained a subject of fierce debate, the incident demonstrated the high stakes of atmospheric tinkering.[1]

This era of experimentation reached its zenith -- and its moral nadir -- during the Vietnam War. Under the codename Operation Popeye (1967-1972), the U.S. Air Force conducted thousands of cloud-seeding sorties over the Ho Chi Minh Trail. The objective was to extend the monsoon season, flooding the supply routes of the North

Vietnamese Army. This successful weaponization of weather alarmed the international community, leading directly to the 1976 Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques (ENMOD). ENMOD established the first "red line" in geoengineering governance: the distinction between hostile and peaceful modification.[2]

The Soviet Vision: Mikhail Budyko and the Stratospheric Shield

While the Americans focused on tactical weather modification, Soviet scientists began to conceptualize climate engineering on a planetary scale. The Soviet Union, with its vast territory and reliance on agriculture, was keenly aware of the climate's volatility.

In 1974, the visionary climatologist Mikhail Budyko published a proposal that would become the blueprint for modern Solar Radiation Modification. Budyko was among the first to calculate the Earth's energy balance and predict global warming. He proposed that if the planet became dangerously hot, humanity could mimic the cooling effect of volcanoes. By injecting sulfur dioxide into the stratosphere, Budyko argued, we could create a global haze of sulfate aerosols that would reflect a fraction of sunlight back into space, thereby cooling the surface. This concept, often termed "Budyko's Blanket," was framed as a conservation measure -- a way to preserve the Holocene climate regime in the face of industrialization.[3]

Budyko's proposal was mathematically elegant. He calculated that a relatively small mass of sulfur, due to its residence time of years in the stratosphere, could offset the warming effect of a much larger mass of carbon dioxide. He also addressed early concerns about pollution, arguing that the amount of sulfur required for geoengineering would be negligible compared to the anthropogenic sulfur emissions already occurring in the troposphere.[4]

The Great Taboo and the Crutzen Threshold (2006)

Following the 1970s, the concept of geoengineering fell into disrepute. It was viewed as a dangerous distraction -- a "moral hazard" that would encourage fossil fuel consumption by offering a theoretical "technofix." For three decades, the scientific community maintained a de facto silence on the subject, focusing exclusively on mitigation (emissions reduction) and adaptation.

This silence was shattered in August 2006 by Paul Crutzen, the Dutch atmospheric chemist who had won the Nobel Prize for explaining the formation and decomposition of ozone. In a controversial editorial for the journal *Climatic Change*, Crutzen argued that the world's efforts to reduce emissions were a "pious wish" and had largely failed. He declared that research into stratospheric aerosol injection was no longer just a scientific curiosity but a policy imperative -- an "escape route" should the climate system tip into catastrophe.[1]

Crutzen's intervention was pivotal because it grounded the theoretical proposal in empirical reality. He pointed to the 1991 eruption of Mount Pinatubo in the Philippines, which had ejected approximately 20 million tons of sulfur dioxide into the stratosphere. The resulting aerosol cloud cooled the global average temperature by about 0.5 degrees Celsius for over a year. By framing geoengineering as an "artificial Pinatubo," Crutzen provided a proof-of-concept provided by nature

itself. The taboo was broken, and the modern era of geoengineering research began.[4]

Governance Emerges: The Oxford Principles

As research accelerated in the wake of Crutzen's paper, the governance gap became glaring. In 2009, a group of scholars submitted a memorandum to the UK House of Commons, outlining the Oxford Principles. These principles sought to establish the ethical guardrails for the field:

- * Geoengineering to be regulated as a public good: It should not be the domain of private profit or patent-hoarding.
- * Public participation in decision-making: Those affected (potentially the entire planet) must have a say.
- * Disclosure of research and open publication: Complete transparency is required to build trust.
- * Independent assessment of impacts: Self-regulation by researchers is insufficient.
- * Governance before deployment: Regulatory frameworks must be in place before any large-scale activity occurs.[9]

These principles remain the foundational text of geoengineering ethics, though their non-binding nature has been tested severely by the commercial developments of the 2020s.

Part II: Solar Radiation Modification (SRM) - The Science of Reflection

Solar Radiation Modification (SRM) is the approach of reducing the Earth's temperature by reflecting a small percentage (roughly 1% to 2%) of incoming solar radiation back into space. It operates on the supply side of the Earth's energy budget.

Stratospheric Aerosol Injection (SAI)

Stratospheric Aerosol Injection (SAI) is the most studied and most potent form of SRM. The objective is to introduce reflective particles into the stratosphere, the stable atmospheric layer extending from roughly 10 kilometers to 50 kilometers above the surface. Unlike the turbulent troposphere below, where rain washes out pollutants in days, the stratosphere is dry and stratified. Particles injected here can remain suspended for 12 to 18 months, circulating globally.[11]

The primary candidate material is sulfur. The process involves injecting a precursor gas, typically sulfur dioxide gas (SO₂), which creates a cascade of chemical reactions. The sulfur dioxide oxidizes to form sulfuric acid vapor. This vapor then nucleates with water vapor to form microscopic droplets of liquid sulfuric acid. These droplets are the active agents of cooling.[12]

The cooling efficiency depends entirely on the size of these droplets. The interaction of light with particles is governed by scattering physics:

- * Rayleigh Scattering: This occurs when particles are much smaller than the

wavelength of light (e.g., gas molecules). It scatters light uniformly in all directions. This is why the sky is blue.

* Mie Scattering: This occurs when particles are roughly the same size as the wavelength of light (e.g., cloud droplets, aerosols). This type of scattering is stronger and can be directed forward or backward.

For SAI, the goal is to maximize backscattering (reflecting light to space) and minimize forward scattering (which creates a diffuse, white sky). The optimal particle size is in the "accumulation mode," typically between 0.1 and 0.5 micrometers. If the particles grow too large, they become less efficient at scattering sunlight and begin to absorb terrestrial heat (longwave radiation), which creates a warming effect in the stratosphere -- the opposite of the desired outcome.[13]

A major technical hurdle is "coagulation." Models show that if too much sulfur is injected into a single plume, the high concentration causes the particles to collide and stick together. These larger particles fall out of the stratosphere faster and are less reflective per unit of mass. This nonlinearity means that to achieve double the cooling, one might need to inject quadruple the sulfur, leading to diminishing returns and escalating side effects. Research has explored "pulsed" injections or distributing injections across different latitudes to minimize this coagulation effect.[15]

Marine Cloud Brightening (MCB)

While SAI works in the upper atmosphere, Marine Cloud Brightening (MCB) targets the lowest layer: the marine boundary layer. The goal is to enhance the albedo (whiteness) of the vast decks of stratocumulus clouds that cover the oceans.

Clouds are composed of water droplets that condense onto microscopic particles called Cloud Condensation Nuclei (CCN), such as sea salt or dust. The brightness of a cloud is determined by the size and number of these droplets.

* Low CCN: A cloud with few nuclei will form fewer, larger droplets. These are darker and more prone to raining out.

* High CCN: A cloud with many nuclei (for the same amount of water) will form billions of tiny droplets.

The Twomey Effect states that for a constant liquid water content, a cloud with more, smaller droplets has a larger total surface area and thus reflects more sunlight. MCB proposes to spray vast quantities of sub-micron sea salt particles into the air to serve as artificial CCN, brightening the clouds.[17]

MCB has moved further into field testing than SAI. In 2020, researchers began the Reef Restoration and Adaptation Program in Australia, spraying sea mist over the Great Barrier Reef to cool the water and prevent coral bleaching. In the United States, researchers have used coastal sites and ships to test spray nozzles. Recent research by NOAA has also uncovered a surprising interaction: sulfate particles injected into the stratosphere (SAI) eventually descend into the troposphere, where they can act as CCN and brighten marine clouds. This suggests that SAI might have a "passive" MCB bonus effect, amplifying the cooling by up to 10%.[20]

Cirrus Cloud Thinning (CCT)

A third, less common approach is Cirrus Cloud Thinning. Unlike the previous two, which reflect sunlight (shortwave), CCT deals with heat escaping the Earth (longwave). High-altitude cirrus clouds act as a blanket, trapping heat. By seeding these clouds with ice nuclei (like bismuth triiodide), proponents hope to create fewer, larger ice crystals that fall out of the sky more quickly. This would "thin" the cloud cover, allowing more heat to escape into space. However, the physics is precarious; improper seeding could accidentally thicken the clouds, warming the planet further.[18]

Part III: Carbon Dioxide Removal (CDR) - The Cleanup Crew

Carbon Dioxide Removal (CDR) addresses the root cause of warming by extracting CO₂ from the atmosphere. Unlike SRM, which is fast and cheap but masks the problem, CDR is slow and expensive but provides a true cure.

Direct Air Capture (DAC)

Direct Air Capture (DAC) involves industrial facilities that chemically scrub CO₂ from ambient air. Because CO₂ is dilute (0.04% of air), this process is energy-intensive.

The Swiss company Climeworks utilizes a solid filter approach.

- * Adsorption: Fans draw air through a collector containing a filter material coated with amines. Amines are chemical groups derived from ammonia that bind selectively to CO₂ at ambient temperatures.

- * Desorption: Once the filter is saturated, the collector is closed and heated to roughly 100 deg C. This heat breaks the chemical bond, releasing the CO₂ as a pure gas.

- * Storage: In the Climeworks "Mammoth" plant in Iceland, this gas is dissolved in water and injected into basaltic bedrock. The acidic CO₂-charged water reacts with the basalt, precipitating as solid carbonate minerals (stone) within two years.[22]

The liquid solvent approach, pioneered by Carbon Engineering and adapted by Heirloom, uses a wet chemical process.

- * Air Contactor: Air is pulled through a honeycomb structure wetted with a strong base, typically potassium hydroxide. The CO₂ reacts with the hydroxide to form liquid potassium carbonate.

- * Pellet Reactor: The potassium carbonate is mixed with calcium hydroxide (slaked lime). The carbonate ions switch partners to form solid calcium carbonate (limestone) pellets, regenerating the potassium hydroxide.

- * Calcination: The limestone pellets are heated in a kiln to 900 deg C. This decomposes the rock into pure CO₂ gas (for storage) and calcium oxide (quicklime).

- * Slaking: The quicklime is hydrated with water to reform calcium hydroxide, closing the loop.

Heirloom uses a variation called "passive looping." They heat limestone to create

lime, then spread the lime on trays exposed to the air. The lime naturally absorbs CO₂ over days to become limestone again. This avoids the energy-intensive fans of other methods but requires large surface areas.[25]

Enhanced Rock Weathering (ERW)

Enhanced Rock Weathering accelerates the Earth's natural silicate-carbonate cycle. In nature, rain (which is slightly acidic) falls on silicate rocks, dissolving them and converting atmospheric carbon into bicarbonate ions that wash into the ocean.

Project Vesta (now Vesta) is a leader in this field, specifically "Coastal Carbon Capture." They mine olivine, a ubiquitous green mineral. Olivine is highly reactive. Vesta grinds olivine into sand and places it in high-energy coastal environments. The wave action mechanically breaks down the particles, preventing the formation of passivating layers (silica shells) that slow the reaction. The olivine dissolves in seawater, sequestering carbon as alkalinity (bicarbonate) and reducing ocean acidification.

The chemical simplification is:

Olivine + CO₂ + Water → Magnesium Ions + Bicarbonate + Silicic Acid

Vesta's field trials, such as the deployment in Duck, North Carolina in 2024, focus on measuring the rate of this dissolution and ensuring that trace metals in the rock (like nickel) do not harm marine ecosystems.[28]

Part IV: The Current Landscape (2024-2026)

The mid-2020s have defined the divergence of the two geoengineering paths: CDR has entered an industrial boom, while SRM faces a governance crisis.

The Cancellation of SCoPEX

The Stratospheric Controlled Perturbation Experiment (SCoPEX) at Harvard University was intended to be the first major outdoor experiment for SAI. The plan was to launch a balloon to release a kilogram of calcium carbonate dust. Despite its small scale, the project faced fierce opposition. The Saami Council, representing Indigenous people in Sweden (where a flight was proposed), argued that the experiment violated their worldview of living in harmony with nature and opened the door to a technology that could not be governed. In March 2024, after years of delay, Harvard announced the termination of SCoPEX. This was a watershed moment, demonstrating that social license is as critical as engineering feasibility.[32]

The Rise of the DAC Hubs

Conversely, DAC has received massive state support. The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) launched the Regional DAC Hubs program.

* Project Cypress: Located in Louisiana, this hub is a partnership between Battelle, Climeworks, and Heirloom. It aims to capture over one million tons of CO₂ annually. By 2025, the project was navigating the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review, with construction imminent. The project integrates Climeworks' solid sorbent tech and Heirloom's limestone looping tech, funded by up to \$600 million in federal grants.[35]

* Cost Trajectories: Current costs for DAC remain high, often exceeding \$600 per ton. The industry goal, supported by reports from the Belfer Center and IEA, is to reach \$100-\$200 per ton by 2050 through learning-by-doing and economies of scale.[37]

The Rogue Actor: Make Sunsets

In a chaotic development, a startup called Make Sunsets began selling "cooling credits" to the public in 2023 and 2024. They launched weather balloons filled with sulfur dioxide from parking lots in Mexico and the United States (Nevada). This unauthorized deployment bypassed scientific review and international norms. The Mexican government responded by banning geoengineering experiments. The U.S. EPA launched an investigation into the company's compliance with air pollution laws. Make Sunsets highlighted the "governance gap": the technology for SAI is so cheap (\$10 balloon kits) that non-state actors can unilaterally intervene in the climate.[39]

Part V: Risks, Challenges, and the "Termination Shock"

The Termination Shock

The most terrifying risk of SRM is the "termination shock." Because SRM masks warming rather than removing the greenhouse gases, the radiative forcing from CO₂ continues to accumulate. If the SRM system were suddenly stopped -- due to war, terrorism, or economic collapse -- the accumulated warming would be unleashed rapidly. Models predict that temperatures could spike by several degrees within a decade, a rate of change 10 to 20 times faster than current warming. This would likely cause the collapse of ecosystems and agriculture, which cannot adapt to such velocity.[41]

The Monsoon and the ITCZ

Climate intervention is not uniform. Models show that injecting aerosols, especially if done asymmetrically between hemispheres, can shift the Intertropical Convergence Zone (ITCZ), the global rain belt. A shift in the ITCZ could disrupt the South Asian Monsoon, potentially reducing rainfall over India and China. This creates a severe geopolitical risk: a deployment that cools the Arctic (benefiting Russia or Canada) might starve the Tropics. Even "balanced" injections could reduce global precipitation averages, as sunlight drives the hydrological cycle.[43]

Ozone Depletion

Sulfate aerosols provide surface area for chemical reactions that destroy ozone. In the presence of chlorine (from legacy CFCs), sulfate SAI would catalyze the destruction of ozone molecules, potentially delaying the recovery of the Antarctic Ozone Hole by decades and increasing UV radiation at the surface.[45]

Moral Hazard

Sociologists warn of the "moral hazard": the risk that the mere existence of a "Plan B" will reduce the political will to cut emissions. Studies suggest that if policymakers believe geoengineering is a cheap option, they may delay

decarbonization, trapping the world in a high-CO2, high-risk future.[47]

Part VI: The Governance Stalemate

The UNEA-6 Failure

In early 2024, the United Nations Environment Assembly (UNEA-6) attempted to pass a resolution to assess the risks and governance of SRM. The resolution was withdrawn after fierce opposition from the African Group and other nations, who argued that even studying the technology legitimized it. This diplomatic failure signaled that the world is nowhere near a consensus on how to handle solar geoengineering.[49]

The Non-Use Agreement vs. Responsible Research

The academic community is fractured.

* The Non-Use Agreement: A coalition of scholars has called for an International Non-Use Agreement on Solar Geoengineering. They argue the technology is inherently ungovernable and too risky. They demand a ban on public funding, outdoor experiments, and patents.

* Responsible Research: Groups like the NGO SilverLining and the University of Chicago's Climate Systems Engineering initiative argue that ignorance is dangerous. They advocate for rigorous, transparent research to understand the risks, arguing that we may need these tools to prevent catastrophic tipping points.[51]

Conclusion

We have entered the "pre-deployment" era. The machinery of Carbon Dioxide Removal is being bolted to the ground in Iceland and Louisiana, beginning the arduous task of scrubbing the sky. Meanwhile, Solar Radiation Modification hangs over the world like a sword of Damocles -- technically feasible, frighteningly cheap, and politically radioactive. The history of geoengineering has moved from the cloud seeders of Vietnam to the boardrooms of climate startups. The next chapter will be written not just by scientists, but by the diplomats, activists, and rogue actors who will decide whether to pull the emergency brake on a warming world.

Table 1: Comparative Analysis of Major Geoengineering Approaches

Feature	Stratospheric Aerosol Injection (SAI)	Marine Cloud Brightening (MCB)	Direct Air Capture (DAC)	Enhanced Rock Weathering (ERW)
Category	Solar Radiation Modification (SRM)	Solar Radiation Modification (SRM)	Carbon Dioxide Removal (CDR)	Carbon Dioxide Removal (CDR)
Primary Mechanism	Scattering sunlight via sulfate aerosols in the stratosphere.	Enhancing cloud albedo via salt spray (Twomey Effect).	Chemical scrubbing of CO2 from ambient air.	Accelerating natural silicate-carbonate cycle.
Implementation	Aircraft or balloon injection at ~20km altitude.	Ships spraying sub-micron sea water droplets.	Industrial plants with fans and chemical contactors.	Spreading ground rock dust on land or beaches.
Speed of Cooling	Rapid (Months).	Rapid (Weeks).	Slow (Decades to	

scale). | | Slow (Years to Decades). |
Estimated Cost		Low (~\$10-20 Billion/year).		Medium.		High (\$600/ton currently; target \$100).		Medium (\$50-200/ton).
Key Risks		Termination shock, Ozone loss, Monsoon disruption.		Regional weather shifts, over-seeding (warming).		High energy use, chemical handling.		Heavy metal accumulation, mining impacts.
2025 Status		Research only (Outdoor tests blocked).		Small field trials (Australia, USA).		Commercial deployment (Iceland, USA).		Field trials (Coastal/Agricultural).

Table 2: Timeline of Key Events in Geoengineering History

Year	Event	Significance
1947	Project Cirrus	First major attempt by US military/GE to modify a hurricane with dry ice.
1967-1972	Operation Popeye	US military weaponizes weather in Vietnam; leads to ENMOD treaty.
1974	Budyko's Proposal	Mikhail Budyko suggests stratospheric sulfur injection ("Budyko's Blanket").
2006	Crutzen's Essay	Nobel Laureate Paul Crutzen breaks the taboo, advocating for SAI research.
2009	Oxford Principles	Establishment of ethical guidelines for geoengineering governance.
2023	Make Sunsets	Startup conducts unauthorized balloon launches in Mexico, sparking bans.
2024	SCoPEX Cancelled	Harvard cancels flagship SAI experiment due to societal opposition.
2024	Mammoth Operational	Climeworks opens world's largest DAC plant (36k tons/yr) in Iceland.
2024	UNEA-6 Failure	UN fails to agree on a resolution to even study SRM governance.
2025	Project Cypress	Major US DAC Hub (1M tons/yr target) moves toward construction.

Table 3: Current Major Direct Air Capture (DAC) Projects

Project	Location	Technology	Key Partners	Capacity Target	Status
Mammoth	Iceland	Solid Amine Sorbent	Climeworks	36,000 tons/yr	Operational
Project Cypress	Louisiana, USA	Solid Sorbent & Looping	Battelle, Climeworks, Heirloom	1,000,000 tons/yr	Planning/Permitting
Stratos	Texas, USA	Liquid Solvent	1PointFive (Oxy)	500,000 tons/yr	

|| Under Construction |

| South Texas Hub || Texas, USA || Liquid Solvent || 1PointFive || Multi-megaton

|| DOE Funded/Planning |

Works Cited

- * Studying geoengineering with natural and anthropogenic analogs, accessed January 12, 2026,
https://www.kiss.caltech.edu/papers/geoengineering/papers/2012_robock_geoeng_analogs.pdf
- * Solar Geoengineering: History, Methods, Governance, Prospects - Annual Reviews, accessed January 12, 2026,
<https://www.annualreviews.org/content/journals/10.1146/annurev-environ-112321-081911?crawler=true&mimetype=application/pdf>
- * Solar radiation modification - Wikipedia, accessed January 12, 2026,
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Solar_radiation_modification
- * ALBEDO ENHANCEMENT BY STRATOSPHERIC SULFUR INJECTIONS: A CONTRIBUTION TO RESOLVE A POLICY DILEMMA? An Editorial Essay Fossil fuel, accessed January 12, 2026,
http://faculty.washington.edu/stevehar/Geoengineering_packet.pdf
- * A 50-Year-Old Global Warming Forecast That Still Holds Up - Eos.org, accessed January 12, 2026,
<https://eos.org/features/a-50-year-old-global-warming-forecast-that-still-holds-up>
- * Albedo Enhancement by Stratospheric Sulfur Injections: More Research Needed - Rutgers University, accessed January 12, 2026,
https://climate.envsci.rutgers.edu/pdf/Robock-2016-Earth's_Future.pdf
- * (PDF) Albedo Enhancement by Stratospheric Sulfur Injections: A Contribution to Resolve a Policy Dilemma? - ResearchGate, accessed January 12, 2026,
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/226800664_Albedo_Enhancement_by_Stratospheric_Sulfur_Injections_A_Contribution_to
- * The Red Dawn of Geoengineering: First Step Toward an Effective Governance for Stratospheric Injections, accessed January 12, 2026,
<https://scholarship.law.duke.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1288&context=dltr>
- * Solar Geoengineering Research Governance: Proceedings of a Workshop -- in Brief (2020), accessed January 12, 2026, <https://www.nationalacademies.org/read/25811>
- * The Regulation of Geoengineering | Oxford Martin School, accessed January 12, 2026,
<https://www.oxfordmartin.ox.ac.uk/publications/the-regulation-of-geoengineering>
- * An overview of geoengineering of climate using stratospheric sulphate aerosols, accessed January 12, 2026,
<https://royalsocietypublishing.org/rsta/article/366/1882/4007/17403/An-overview-of-geoengineering-of-climate-using>
- * Exploring accumulation-mode H₂SO₄ versus SO₂ stratospheric sulfate geoengineering in a sectional aerosol-chemistry-climate model - The Salata Institute, accessed January 12, 2026,
<https://salatainstitute.harvard.edu/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/acp-19-4877-2019.pdf>
- * Mie scattering - Wikipedia, accessed January 12, 2026,
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mie_scattering

- * ICP: Aerosols in the Atmosphere - NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies, accessed January 12, 2026, <https://www.giss.nasa.gov/edu/icp/research/ppa/1997/reyes/>
- * Exploring accumulation-mode-H₂SO₄ versus SO₂ stratospheric sulfate geoengineering in a sectional aerosol-chemistry-climate model - ACP, accessed January 12, 2026, <https://acp.copernicus.org/preprints/acp-2018-1070/acp-2018-1070-AR1.pdf>
- * Exploring accumulation-mode H₂SO₄ versus SO₂ stratospheric sulfate geoengineering in a sectional aerosol-chemistry-climate model - ACP, accessed January 12, 2026, <https://acp.copernicus.org/articles/19/4877/2019/>
- * Forcing Susceptibility and Climate Sensitivity to Midlatitude Marine Cloud Brightening in - AMS Journals, accessed January 12, 2026, <https://journals.ametsoc.org/view/journals/clim/39/2/JCLI-D-25-0337.1.xml>
- * Chapter: 2 Assessment of the Current Solar Geoengineering Research and Research Governance Landscape, accessed January 12, 2026, <https://www.nationalacademies.org/read/25762/chapter/4>
- * Cloud brightening over oceans may stave off climate change, but with risk - Mongabay, accessed January 12, 2026, <https://news.mongabay.com/2024/08/cloud-brightening-over-oceans-may-stave-off-climate-change-but-with-risk/>
- * Injecting light-reflecting particles into the stratosphere could also make marine clouds brighter - NOAA Research, accessed January 12, 2026, <https://research.noaa.gov/injecting-light-reflecting-particles-into-the-stratosphere-could-also-make-marine-clouds-brighter/>
- * Climate Intervention: Reflecting Sunlight to Cool Earth - Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, accessed January 12, 2026, https://web.whoi.edu/ocb-fert/wp-content/uploads/sites/100/2017/07/NAP_Reflecting_Sunlight_2015_202564.pdf
- * Climeworks' 2024 year in review, accessed January 12, 2026, <https://climeworks.com/news/2024-year-in-review>
- * Mammoth: our newest direct air capture and storage facility - Climeworks, accessed January 12, 2026, <https://climeworks.com/plant-mammoth>
- * Executive summary - Direct Air Capture 2022 - Analysis - IEA, accessed January 12, 2026, <https://www.iea.org/reports/direct-air-capture-2022/executive-summary>
- * accessed January 12, 2026, <https://docs.nrel.gov/docs/fy24osti/90083.pdf>
- * NETL Case Study Explores Solvent-Based Direct Air Capture Systems for the Removal of Atmospheric CO₂, accessed January 12, 2026, <https://netl.doe.gov/node/12180>
- * CO₂ removal is a necessity - Heirloom Carbon Technologies, accessed January 12, 2026, <https://www.heirloomcarbon.com/technology>
- * Vesta / The Project - Vesta Earth, accessed January 12, 2026, <https://www.veda.earth/the-project>
- * Field Pilots - Vesta Earth, accessed January 12, 2026, <https://www.veda.earth/field-pilots>
- * Duck, NC - Vesta Earth, accessed January 12, 2026, <https://www.veda.earth/duck>
- * Review and syntheses: Ocean alkalinity enhancement and carbon dioxide removal

through marine enhanced rock weathering using olivine - BG, accessed January 12, 2026, <https://bg.copernicus.org/articles/22/355/2025/>

* Current Geoengineering Attempts Briefing: SCoPEX, accessed January 12, 2026, <https://www.geoengineeringmonitor.org/scopex>

* The HOME! Alliance celebrates the defeat of a high-profile solar geoengineering experiment, accessed January 12, 2026, <https://www.geoengineeringmonitor.org/home-scopex-pr>

* Another defeat for solar geoengineering | ETC Group, accessed January 12, 2026, <https://www.etcgroup.org/content/another-defeat-solar-geoengineering>

* DOE/EIS-0567: Project Cypress Regional Direct Air Capture (DAC) Hub; Calcasieu Parish and Caddo Parish, Louisiana | Department of Energy, accessed January 12, 2026, <https://www.energy.gov/nepa/doeeis-0567-project-cypress-regional-direct-air-capture-dac-hub-calcasieu-parish-and-caddo>

* Project Cypress Direct Air Capture Hub Proposed Action - Department of Energy, accessed January 12, 2026, https://www.energy.gov/sites/default/files/2024-11/scoping-description-eis-0567-project-cypress-2024-11-01_0.pdf

* Prospects for Direct Air Carbon Capture and Storage: Costs, Scale, and Funding, accessed January 12, 2026, <https://www.belfercenter.org/publication/prospects-direct-air-carbon-capture-and-storage-costs-scale-and-funding>

* Achieving net zero: Why costs of direct air capture need to drop for large-scale adoption, accessed January 12, 2026, <https://www.weforum.org/stories/2023/08/how-to-get-direct-air-capture-under-150-per-ton-to-meet-net-zero-goals/>

* Cooling Credits: a cost-effective solution for climate change - Make Sunsets, accessed January 12, 2026, <https://makesunsets.com/products/join-the-next-balloon-launch-and-cool-the-planet>

* EPA Demands Answers from Unregulated Geoengineering Start-Up Launching Sulfur Dioxide into the Air, accessed January 12, 2026, <https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-demands-answers-unregulated-geoengineering-start-launching-sulfur-dioxide-air>

* The Risks of Geoengineering - Center for International Environmental Law | CIEL, accessed January 12, 2026, https://www.ciel.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/10/The-Risks-of-Geoengineering_CIEL_briefing_Nov.pdf

* Solar geoengineering: Risk of 'termination shock' overplayed, study says - Carbon Brief, accessed January 12, 2026, <https://www.carbonbrief.org/solar-geoengineering-risk-termination-shock-overplayed-study/>

* South Asian Summer Monsoon under stratospheric aerosol intervention - the NOAA Institutional Repository, accessed January 12, 2026, <https://repository.library.noaa.gov/view/noaa/71480>

* Quantification of Tropical Monsoon Precipitation Changes in terms of Interhemispheric Differences in Stratospheric Sulfate Aerosol Optical Depth, accessed January 12, 2026, <https://agu.confex.com/agu/fm22/meetingapp.cgi/Paper/1139971>

* accessed January 12, 2026,

<https://news.ucar.edu/942/stratospheric-injections-counter-global-warming-could-damage-ozone-layer#:~:text=Sulfates%20and%20>

* Stratospheric solar geoengineering without ozone loss - PMC - NIH, accessed January 12, 2026, <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5206531/>

* Rethinking Geoengineering Governance Utilizing the Playing God Argument: Considerations of Knowledge, Control, and Benevolence - NIH, accessed January 12, 2026, <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12779705/>

* The Economics and Governance of Solar Geoengineering | Review of Environmental Economics and Policy: Vol 19, No 1, accessed January 12, 2026, <https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/10.1086/733652>

* Sixth session of the United Nations Environment Assembly (UNEA-6) - UNEP, accessed January 12, 2026, <https://www.unep.org/environmentassembly/unea6>

* Solar Radiation Modification resolution withdrawn at UNEA-6 - Third World Network (TWN), accessed January 12, 2026, <https://www.twon.my/title2/climate/info.service/2024/cc240302.htm>

* University of Chicago Launches Groundbreaking New Institute to Confront Climate Change, accessed January 12, 2026, <https://climate.uchicago.edu/news/university-of-chicago-launches-groundbreaking-new-institute-to-confront-climate-change/>

* Silverlining.ngo, accessed January 12, 2026, <https://www.silverlining.ngo/>

* The urgent need for research governance of solar geoengineering - Physics Today, accessed January 12, 2026, <https://physicstoday.aip.org/features/the-urgent-need-for-research-governance-of-solar-geoengineering>

* Signatories - Solar Geoengineering Non-Use Agreement, accessed January 12, 2026, <https://www.solargeoeng.org/non-use-agreement/signatories/>