

Motion

from the members Nicole Höchst, Dr. Michael Kaufmann, Adam Balten, Dr. Christoph Birghan, Dr. Ingo Hahn, Andreas Meyer, Stefan Schröder, Sergej Minich, Robin Jünger, Dr. Paul Schmidt, René Bochmann, Sven Wendorf, and Maximilian Kneller of the AfD faction

Take the risks of weather manipulations seriously – Examine the impacts on humans and the environment

The Bundestag wishes to decide:

I. The German Bundestag establishes:

Weather modifications and weather manipulations are more relevant than ever. The technical term for such weather manipulations is referred to in research as "geoengineering." Various actors, particularly the Center for International Environmental Law (CIEL), have pointed out that an Israeli company named "Stardust" is likely to conduct high-risk and extensive experiments related to this as early as 2026.

This makes the entire topic a political point of debate about geoengineering that cannot be delayed, as the use of geoengineering can have global consequences. Furthermore, other countries or companies may see this process as an incentive to carry out weather modifications themselves.

But what exactly is meant by the term geoengineering?

In the context of a method of geoengineering, sulfates are introduced into the stratosphere, justified by the so-called climate rescue. The fact that geoengineering is also needed or can be needed for a significantly different reason was demonstrated by the "Blue Sky" project in China, where the clouds on the day of the Communist Party Congress in Beijing in 2021 were artificially created days in advance through geoengineering and then induced to rain, so that on the specified day the sky would be cloudless and bright blue.³ Similar methods were already used during the Olympics in China in 2008.⁴ But such methods are not only being applied in distant China; they are also being used in the United Kingdom by the Advanced Research and Invention Agency (ARIA).

¹ See www.ciel.org/news/us-israeli-start-up-announces-reckless-solar-geoengineering-experiments-from-april-2026/, as of 23.01.2026² See <https://t3n.de/news/geoengineering-der-sonne-gegen-den-klimawandel-1721489/>, as of 23.01.2026³ See www.diepresse.com/18209045/geoengineering-wer-darf-die-erde-kuenstlich-kuehlen, as of 05.06.2025⁴ See [www.meine-news.de/miltenberg/c-politik/geo-engineering-wie-weit-ist-die-technologie_a155522](https://www.meine-news.de/miltenberg/c-politik/geo-engineering-wie-weit-ist-die-technologie-a155522), as of 05.06.2025

such projects are specifically funded.⁵ In the 18th German Bundestag, there was an independent report regarding this matter from the Technology Assessment of the German Bundestag (TAB report), which presented various patterns of argumentation within the report and weighed opportunities and risks. In response to the famous argument that the method of geoengineering is to be understood as the last effective weapon against the allegedly man-made climate change, and that it would be almost irrelevant what consequences these methods would have individually, as the dangers of climate change for humans would supposedly prove to be clearly riskier, the TAB report responded as follows:

Furthermore, a precise specification is necessary to demonstrate, based on climate modeling or empirical methods, that a Radiation-Management (RM) intervention (or its consequences) actually represents the lesser evil compared to the realities of a climate catastrophe. Additionally, given the difficulties in modeling nonlinear climate effects, such as crossing a tipping point, or even being able to predict them, the fundamental question arises, at least from today's perspective, of whether an impending climate catastrophe could be anticipated in time to still prevent it through an RM intervention."⁶

Nevertheless, these practices, means, and methods are employed as described above. The applicants are indeed surprised that, in a TAB report just over ten years ago, there was still a question of whether the damage caused by these methods could even be assessed, and now the political climate regarding this has changed significantly.

The "Tagesschau" recently reported on the aforementioned geoengineering in two articles. While one article stated, "The associated risks are very high."⁷ In another article, however, physicist Wieners is quoted as follows:

"And even physicist Wieners, who is researching the SAI technology [Stratospheric Aerosol Injection technology], is skeptical. "I wouldn't pursue this research either if we didn't already have a huge problem," she says. It is bizarre that we have even reached this point, "where we are seriously considering such a mess."⁸

It seems that interest in the use of these methods has significantly increased, as some actors are now loudly arguing from "seriously considering" to an argument of "there is no choice." This creates a new political situation that needs to be politically reassessed, and concrete steps should be proposed to the Bundestag as soon as possible. These are the goals and tasks of this proposal.

There are two overarching categories of methods to distinguish.⁹ One is the so-called Greenhouse Gas Removal (GGR) or, in terms of limiting to CO₂ – as Carbon Dioxide Removal (CDR) – and the other is the so-called SRM (Solar Radiation Management). It should be noted that in the United Kingdom, the clearly more dangerous variant, namely SRM, is not only being researched but is already being experimented with using this method.

⁵ See

w

www.faz.net/aktuell/wirtschaft/klima-nachhaltigkeit/geo-engineering-wie-kuenstliche-wolken-sonnen-strahlen-reflektieren-sollen-110439244.html, (as of June 2, 2025)⁶ See the report of the Committee on Education, Research and Technology Assessment (18th Committee) pursuant to § 56a of the Rules of Procedure Technology Assessment (TA) Climate Engineering – document 18/2121, p. 158⁷ See www.tagesschau.de/wetter/wetterthema/geoengineering-100.html, as of August 29, 2025⁸ www.tagesschau.de/wissen/klima/sonne-verdunkeln-100.html, as of August 29, 2025⁹ See www.umweltbundesamt.de/themen/klima-energie/internationale-klimapolitik/geoengineering#--2, as of June 6, 2025.

Although there have been several warnings about unpredictable consequences, such as those from Harvard, and a related project at the University of Harvard has been discontinued ¹¹, , the University of Cambridge is open to such experimentation ¹², . At least the director of the Centre for Climate Repair described SRM experimentation as "a [significant] milestone". Hugh Hunt, the vice-chancellor of the entire University of Cambridge, also supports accepting such risks, as the "[...] risks of doing nothing [...] [are far] greater." ¹³

It is evident that both methods, namely the aforementioned CDR and the unequivocally more dangerous SRM, constitute hazardous interventions in biodiversity, as the consequences are far from being fully researched.

The AfD Bundestag faction warns against such interventions and experiments, which pose significant risks and unforeseeable consequences for humanity. In addition to the so-called ocean fertilization, there is the method of 'manipulation of marine stratification,' which presents a significantly increased risk for marine organisms and consequently for humans, such as due to fishing, etc.

The second type of geoengineering is referred to as SRM and poses an even greater threat than the previously mentioned CDR.

The Federal Environment Agency writes or defines the goal and implementation of SRM as follows:

"The aim of such approaches is to reduce the solar radiation reaching the Earth and thereby lower the global average temperature. This includes proposals such as the installation of mirrors in space or increasing the reflectivity of sunlight (albedo) by brightening settlements (e.g., painting roofs white). The most frequently discussed approach in the literature is the release of gases with suspended particles (aerosols) into the stratosphere to scatter sunlight and thus achieve lower solar radiation at the Earth's surface."¹⁴

Or, to put it differently: Solar geoengineering itself is very diverse or consists of different sub-methods, one of which is injecting a large amount of sulfur particles into the aforementioned stratosphere to create a kind of barrier against sunlight (this is called "stratospheric aerosol injection"¹⁵).¹⁶ Another method is injecting saltwater into marine clouds (this is referred to as "marine cloud brightening").

The methods of SRM are still sharply criticized today by many committees; typical further SRM methods include, for example, "Marine Cloud Formation," the aforementioned "Stratospheric Influence," "Installation in Near-Earth Space," and "Installation in Distant Space."¹⁷

¹⁰ See

W

www.faz.net/aktuell/wirtschaft/klima-nachhaltigkeit/geo-engineering-wie-kuenstliche-wolken-sonnen-strahlen-reflektieren-sollen-110439244.html, (As of: June 2, 2025);¹¹ See

W

www.faz.net/aktuell/wirtschaft/klima-nachhaltigkeit/geo-engineering-wie-kuenstliche-wolken-sonnen-strahlen-reflektieren-sollen-110439244.html, (As of: June 2, 2025);¹² See

W

www.faz.net/aktuell/wirtschaft/klima-nachhaltigkeit/geo-engineering-wie-kuenstliche-wolken-sonnen-strahlen-reflektieren-sollen-110439244.html, (As of: June 2, 2025);¹³ See

W

www.faz.net/aktuell/wirtschaft/klima-nachhaltigkeit/geo-engineering-wie-kuenstliche-wolken-sonnen-strahlen-reflektieren-sollen-110439244.html, As of: June 6, 2025;¹⁴ See

www.umweltbundesamt.de/themen/nachhaltigkeit-strategien-internationales/umweltrecht/umweltvoelkerrecht/geoengineering-governance#was-ist-geoengineering, As of: May 6, 2025;¹⁵ See www.boell.de/de/2025/01/17/solares-geoengineering-verbieten, As of: May 30, 2025;¹⁶ See

www.boell.de/de/2025/01/17/solares-geoengineering-verbieten, As of: May 30, 2025;¹⁷ See

www.bundeswehr.de/resource/blob/140534/0e09f412cb61da2bef8e5279772c31e3/geo-data.pdf, p. 18, As of: May 7, 2025

Strangely, the Federal Government of the 19th electoral term of the German Bundestag responded to a minor inquiry from the AfD faction in Bundestag document 19/20183, stating that it literally "does not plan any legal regulation of further methods for influencing the weather or climate [...]"¹⁸

Furthermore, the Federal Government of the 21st electoral term also confirmed this course in response to Written Question 124 from Member of Parliament Nicole Höchst in Bundestag document 21/396:

"The Federal Government does not plan to support development and research activities related to SRM."¹⁹

However, this is not the end of the Federal Government's response to Written Question 124 from Member of Parliament Nicole Höchst in Bundestag document 21/396. The current Federal Government continues as follows:

Nevertheless, it analyzes and evaluates the risks and implications of SRM in accordance with the precautionary principle. The following research projects, funded by the Federal budget or through public funding by German institutions, were identified for the period 2017 to 2025, which focus on SRM:

- "Geoengineering: Possible Synergies and Conflicts with the Sustainable Development Goals" (Project period: 2022 to 2024; Copernicus Institute of Sustainable Development and Utrecht University).
- "Action4Cooling": ESA-funded project by DLR, National Observatory of Athens (NOA ReACT), and Leipzig University.
- In the priority program (SPP) 1689 of the German Research Foundation (DFG) on "Climate Engineering," nine projects dealt with the risks and side effects of SRM from 2016 to 2019 [...]"²⁰

Furthermore, there are two projects, namely GENIE and Co-Create, within the general EU funding project Horizon, which is supported by the European Research Council (ERC). It is interesting that the Federal Government, in its response to Written Question 146 from Member of Parliament Nicole Höchst, commented on Bundestag document 21/469 as follows:

Question: "How does the Federal Government position itself regarding the application of SRM methods of geoengineering for climate protection, in light of the fact that the Heinrich Böll Foundation has clearly opposed this methodology of geoengineering and spoke of 'irreparable damage' (see www.boell.de/de/2020/12/08/geoengineering-ist-der-falsche-weg, as of May 30, 2025), and does the Federal Government nevertheless agree with the funding of projects like GENIE within the Horizon project of the European Union?"

The answer: "As the Federal Government has stated in its climate foreign policy strategy, Solar Radiation Management (SRM) is currently not considered a climate policy option due to existing uncertainties, implications, and risks. GENIE is a project funded by the European Research Council (ERC). The ERC operates independently."

In response to another written question from the Member of Parliament Nicole Höchst (response of the Federal Government to the written question 66 from the Member of Parliament Nicole Höchst on Bundestag Document 21/512), regarding how the Federal Government would assess or evaluate the relevant security situation, as the consequences

¹⁸ Document 19/20183 – p. 4.¹⁹ Response of the Federal Government to Written Question 124 from Member of Parliament Nicole Höchst on Bundestag document 21/396²⁰ See also: Bundestag document 21/396, p. 81.

of SRM experiments would also affect Germany, the Federal Government responded, among other things, as follows:

The Federal Government does not evaluate individual research projects of third parties.²¹

However, one form of strict regulation is necessary not only according to the applicants, as the consequences of these interventions on the world climate are hardly predictable, thus a proper Technology Assessment is not provided and cannot be expected in the near future.

The aforementioned view, namely that these interventions pose a danger to both humans and the climate, is now increasingly shared internationally. Both at UN summits and science summits, the risks are recognized.²² However, no changes or implementations of a possible regulation or even a ban have occurred. Therefore, there must be a general regulation of these interventions. Furthermore, it needs to be determined to what extent these interventions ultimately affect human health. It would be advisable for the Federal Government to advocate for the Bundestag to establish its own enquiry commission to investigate the effects of these interventions on public health. Additionally, the potential for military misuse must also be considered. The planning office of the Bundeswehr published a relevant report,²³ which clearly outlines the mentioned risks. The applicants are aware that, on average, technologies are difficult to regulate or even prohibit, as barriers for technologies rarely apply globally, making serious regulation through sanctions challenging. However, this concerns national security. The danger should therefore be taken seriously, and the demand stated below should be implemented.

II. The German Bundestag calls on the Federal Government to,

1. to conduct an examination of the security situation regarding the possible impact of geoengineering (both CDR and SRM methods) within the framework of security research;
2. to make it clear that, at present, there is no benefit beyond political propaganda and military applications, and to propose regulations that prohibit the use of large-scale geoengineering except for monitored research projects in Germany;
3. to advocate for a general and legal examination of geoengineering at the relevant bodies under international law due to the associated risks;
4. to push for the establishment of an enquiry commission that will reexamine the aforementioned risks;
5. to become aware of the risk of misuse of the military benefits of geoengineering and to advocate for regulations in both national and international bodies, such as the Security Council, to address this risk of misuse and to return to the well-considered representations as outlined in the aforementioned TAB report of the 18th German Bundestag, thus reverting to the status quo ante;

²¹ See the Federal Government's response to Written Question 66 from Member of Parliament Nicole Höchst on Bundestag document 21/512²² See www.boell.de/de/2024/10/31/un-wissenschaftsgipfel-laender-fordern-den-verzicht-auf-solares-geoengineering, (Status: May 6, 2025)²³ See www.bundeswehr.de/resource/blob/140534/0e09f412cb61da2bef8e5279772c31e3/geo-data.pdf, (Status: June 5, 2025)

6. to advocate for the creation of informational material about the risks of geoengineering.

Berlin, January 27, 2026

Dr. Alice Weidel, Tino Chrupalla and faction

Justification

In June 1991, the Volcano Pinatubo erupted. Dozens of people died. However, this was by no means the only consequence of the eruption. Millions of tons of sulfur entered the stratosphere, and it actually became cooler. Many SRM theorists saw this as confirmation that injecting a massive amount of sulfur particles into the stratosphere would lead to a cooling of the Earth.²⁴ At the same time, it was discovered that the mortality rate in the designated area has risen dramatically over time.²⁵ Whether this is purely about causality and partly about correlations is certainly difficult to assess, but the fact that the ozone hole also significantly enlarged at the same time is definitely a signal that both humans and the environment are at least strongly endangered by this method.

The Federal Government at least leaves it open to plan for these projects in the future, to use or test SRM methods of geoengineering, or to budget funds for such projects, according to the interpretation of the questioners. Ultimately, the Federal Government could demand a general regulation of geoengineering, at least as long as it is not excluded that the consequences for biodiversity, the climate, and also for us humans are in any way negative. However, even if there were such regional prohibitions, the problem is by no means solved, as the impacts and consequences of SRM geoengineering, for example from the United Kingdom, will also affect us. Therefore, there must be an international agreement that prudently subjects both methods of geoengineering and thus any geoengineering to a general and legal examination, as this protects the population from risks that are not even foreseeable. Furthermore, there is the aforementioned risk of misuse, that geoengineering could also be "misused" for other, perhaps even commercial reasons; against this risk of misuse of this technology, the Federal Republic of Germany would be safeguarded.

Furthermore, on one hand, the general openness to technologies in Germany would be maintained, while on the other hand, a regulation for very dangerous technology would be established, which could serve as a model for other countries. At the UN level, regulation of geoengineering has so far failed.

The "United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity" (CBD) issued a very critical statement on geoengineering back in 2008,²⁶ which was further expanded in Decision X/33 on October 29, 2010, and means a "De Facto Moratorium"²⁷ on geoengineering. The applicants urge the Federal Government to constructively consider the statement of the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity and to protect us all from further dangers.

²⁴ See www.mpg.de/16569676/geoengineering, (as of: 06.10.2025)²⁵ See www.fr.de/wissen/pinatubo-vulkan-philippinen-hinweise-vulkanausbruch-luzon-91149138.html, as of: 07.02.2025²⁶ See www.ciel.org/govern-geoengineering/, (as of: June 6, 2025)²⁷ See www.cbd.int/climate/geoengineering, (as of: June 6, 2025)²⁷ www.umweltbundesamt.de/sites/default/files/medien/2378/dokumente/factsheet_cbd_moratorium_12_02_2019.pdf, (as of: June 6, 2025)

