

[New Scientist](#) | [Space](#) | [Technology](#) | [Environment](#) | [New Scientist Jobs](#) | [Subscribe to New Scientist](#)



NewScientist **Environment**

SEARCH

[Go](#) [» Search Tips](#)

HOME

[STORIES](#)

[BLOG](#)

[VIDEO](#)


[SPECIAL REPORTS](#)

[SUBSCRIBE](#)

[SEARCH](#)

[FEEDS](#)

Subscriptions



- [» Subscribe](#)
- [» Renew](#)
- [» Change address](#)
- [» Customer service](#)
- [» Free E-Zine](#)
- [» RSS](#)

'Planetary sunshade' could strip ozone layer by 76%

19:00 24 April 2008

[NewScientist.com news service](#)

Catherine Brahic

Planetary engineering projects to cool the planet could backfire quite spectacularly: a new model shows that a "sulphate sunshade" would punch huge holes through the ozone layer above the Arctic.

To make matters worse, it would also delay the full recovery of the Antarctic ozone hole by up to 70 years.

Pumping tiny sulphate particles into the atmosphere to create a sunshield that would keep the planet cool was first suggested as a solution to global warming by [Edward Teller](#), a physicist was best known for his involvement in the development of the hydrogen bomb.

[Simone Tilmes](#) of the National Center for Atmospheric Research in Colorado, US, used computer models to see how a sulphate sunshade would affect the ozone layer, which protects us from harmful UV rays. She says it could have "a drastic impact".

Tilmes modelled two different scenarios: one in which "large" particles measuring 0.43 microns in diameter are used, and one where the particles are two-and-a-half times

[Print](#)
 [Feeds](#)



(Image: stock.xchng) [Enlarge](#)

Tools

digg	MY YAHOO!	GOO
reddit	newsvine	cite

Advertisement

NewScientist.com

- › Bat squeaks louder than a rock concert
- › Monster black hole found escaping home galaxy
- › Is there a hidden order to the Northern Lights?

NewScientistTech

- › Cheap diamonds are a biologist's best friend
- › English village to be invaded in spybot competition
- › Glass chip spins silk just like a spider

NewScientistSpace

- › Monster black hole found escaping home galaxy
- › Is there a hidden order to the Northern Lights?
- › Mirrors on the Moon could catch alien eyes

smaller.

Cooling effect

Sulphate particles catalyse the breakdown of ozone molecules by chlorine atoms. Western economies have almost entirely stopped using chlorine-based coolants called CFCs, thanks to the Montreal Protocol. However, such substances are increasingly being used in Asia and the atmosphere is still full of CFCs emitted during the 20th century.

In January 2008, researchers described how much of each type of sulphate particle would need to be injected into the stratosphere in order to compensate for a doubling in atmospheric carbon dioxide concentrations (*Geophysical Research Letters*, DOI: 10.1029/2007GL032179). Tilmes used these volumes in her computer models.

She found that injections of small particles over the next 20 years could reduce the wintertime ozone layer over the Arctic by between 22 and 76%. Large particles, which would have less of a cooling effect, according to previous research, would still reduce Arctic ozone by 15 to 50% during the winter.

In the Antarctic, the injections would delay the recovery of the existing ozone hole by 30 to 70 years.

Cancer increase

A thinner ozone layer – popularly known as an ozone "hole" – lets more UV-B through, which can cause an increase in the incidence of various cancers. According to NASA, a 1% decrease in the ozone layer can cause an estimated 2% increase in UV-B irradiation, leading to a 4% increase in basal carcinoma, the most common form of skin cancer.

In 2007, Ken Caldeira of the Carnegie Institution of Washington in the US found that if a sulphate sunshield were deployed and then removed – for instance because of a change in governments – the effects of global warming after removal would be far worse than before the sunshield.

Caldeira has also found that a sunshade could cause severe drought.

Journal reference: *Science* (DOI: 10.1126/science.1153966)

Climate Change – Want to know more about global warming – the science, impacts and political debate? Visit our continually updated special report



Comment

subject

Comment
No HTML
except lower
case italic tags
or lower case
bold tags,
please:
<i> or

Your name

Your email

We need your email in case we need to contact you about the comment. We will not use it for any other purpose.

There are 19 comments on 3 pages

1 | [2](#) | [3](#) | [Next](#) | [Most Recent](#) | [See all](#)

Ozone Layer

[VIEW THR](#)

By Paul Emeny

Thu Apr 24 20:24:49 BST 2008

Has anyone thought that the seeding of atmosphere by russians for m parades has had an effect on ozone layer. Is there any way to extrapc data to see if this has had an effect.

[REPORT](#) | [REPLY](#)

Question About Atmospheric Co2

[VIEW THR](#)

By Rob

Thu Apr 24 21:18:15 BST 2008

It has always seemed intuitive to me that there could be a way to seq CO2 from the atmosphere. Is it feaseble to send up molecules into the atmoshere that would either bind to or react to CO2, creating either a l molecule that would fall to the earth or perhaps 2 less harmful molecu Can anyone speak to this idea/set me straight?

[REPORT](#) | [REPLY](#)

Question About Atmospheric Co2

By Gaphthemind

Thu Apr 24 22:28:28 BST 2008

The idea is that CO₂ is a stable molecule, so it takes energy to separate it out into one carbon and 2 oxygen atoms. To summon the kind of energy, we'd need to burn fuel, which would inherently be less than 100% efficient, and therefore would release more CO₂ into the atmosphere than it uses up.

An alternative is to use a non-fossil source of energy, like the sun, but nature already does that. Research into the energy efficiencies of various organisms makes me suppose that plants are about as efficient at turning the environment into plants as anything could ever get. Of course a plant's goals aren't our goals, so CO₂ sequestration gains might be genetically engineered. That's in the future, though.

So the simple for-now answer is.. Plant some plants.

[REPORT](#) | [REPLY](#)

[VIEW THREAD >>](#)

Question About Atmospheric Co₂

By Sam

Fri Apr 25 14:14:14 BST 2008

Two less harmful products? you mean Carbon and Oxygen? it give oxygen but carbon is probably equally harmful. Only difference is carbon is more damaging to our health and CO₂ is damaging to our environment.

I agree, best way so far is to decrease deforestation and increase afforestation by a large amount.

[REPORT](#) | [REPLY](#)

Question About Atmospheric Co₂

By Soylent

Tue Apr 29 08:43:29 BST 2008

"it give you oxygen but carbon is probably equally harmful."

Carbon or coal is safe in bulk quantities, it's breathing in the very fine particulates you have to worry about.

[REPORT](#) | [REPLY](#)

[VIEW THREAD >>](#)

Question About Atmospheric Co2

By Soylent

Tue Apr 29 08:40:46 BST 2008

6 billion tonnes of coal per year is ~20 billion tonnes of CO2. That's around 4 000 cubic miles of CO2 at standard temperature and pressure that you need to capture and shove into an hole somewhere and hope it doesn't come back up. And you need to do so at a handful of dollars per tonne and without using a whole lot of energy.

Leaving the coal in the ground and using nuclear fission for electricity might be a saner approach.

[REPORT](#) | [REPLY](#)

[VIEW THREAD >>](#)

Acid Rain

[VIEW THE](#)

By Ugly American

Thu Apr 24 21:44:11 BST 2008

Sulphates precipitate out as acid rain.

[REPORT](#) | [REPLY](#)

Acid Rain

By Ecoeng

Thu Apr 24 22:16:40 BST 2008

Most sulfates precipitate out as ammonium sulfate and are not acid

[REPORT](#) | [REPLY](#)

Acid Rain

By Toxophilomaniac

Fri Apr 25 13:21:09 BST 2008

Sorry, but you are slightly incorrect. Ammonium sulphate is the product of a weak base (ammonium hydroxide) and a strong acid (sulphuric acid), and as such will return a slightly acidic solution.

[REPORT](#) | [REPLY](#)

Acid Rain

By Ugly American

Mon Apr 28 09:01:39 BST 2008

That's misleading. Ammonium sulfate decomposes to sulfuric acid

in both soil and water. It's even used commercially acidify alkaline soil.

The problem is lowering the pH of lakes and even costal waterways has already caused severe disruption in the ecosystem. It's not that adult fish dissolve - it's that the things they eat never hatch.

PS - worldwide fish yield peaked in 1987 and we can see the dead zones from space

[REPORT](#) | [REPLY](#)

[VIEW THREAD >>](#)

There are 19 comments on 3 pages

[1](#) | [2](#) | [3](#) | [Next](#) | [Most Recent](#) | [See all](#)

All comments should respect the [New Scientist House Rules](#). If you think a particula comment breaks these rules then please use the "Report" link in that comment to re us.

If you are having a technical problem posting a comment, please [contact technical s](#)

Related Articles

['Sunshade' for global warming could cause drought](#)

[Solar shield could be quick fix for global warming](#)

Web Links

[Simone Tilmes, NCAR](#)

[Ken Caldeira, Carnegie Institution of Washington](#)



- ▶ **For exclusive news and expert analysis every week [subscribe New Scientist Print Edition](#)**
- ▶ For what's in New Scientist magazine this week see [contents](#)
- ▶ [Search](#) all stories
- ▶ [Contact us](#) about this story
- ▶ [Sign up](#) for our free newsletter



[Subscribe](#) | [Contact Us](#) | [FAQ / Help](#) | [Advertise](#) | [Disclaimer](#) | [Terms and Conditions](#) | [Cookies](#) | [Privacy](#)
[About NewScientist.com](#) | [About New Scientist magazine](#) | [Publisher BI](#)

© Copyright Reed Business Information Ltd.