

[Here](#) is her NY Times piece and here is a direct quote:

“Mr. George and his ocean-altering experiment provides an opportunity for public debate about an issue essentially absent during the election cycle: What are the real solutions to climate change? Wouldn't it be better to change our behavior — to reduce our use of fossil fuels — before we begin fiddling with the planet's basic life-support systems?

Unless we change course, we can expect to hear many more reports about sun-shielders and ocean fiddlers like Mr. George, whose iron dumping exploit did more than test a thesis about ocean fertilization: it also tested the waters for future geoengineering experiments. And judging by the muted response so far, the results of Mr. George's test are clear: geoengineers proceed, caution be damned.”

I'm confused about what she is trying to achieve with this piece. This piece will not nudge the world to embrace a carbon tax. Growth in the developing world will continue and thus world GHG emissions will continue to rise. Taking this reality as a given, what happens next? Do you embrace adaptation and/or do we explore geo-engineering options? Pro-active people, cities and nations have a better chance to cope with the “new normal”.