



## **Moral Conflicts of a ‘Green Pathway’ to limit Global Warming “to well below 2 °C” regarding the Human Right to Adequate Food**

Patrick Hohlwegler

Christian-Albrechts-Universität zu Kiel, Philosophisches Seminar, Philosophie und Ethik der Umwelt, Kiel, Germany  
(hohlwegler@philsem.uni-kiel.de)

Several terrestrial Negative Emission Technologies (tNETs), like Bioenergy with Carbon Capture and Storage (BECCS), Afforestation/Reforestation (AR) and Enhanced Weathering (EW), rely on natural processes and could therefore be designated as ‘green’ forms of geoengineering. Yet, even ‘green’ tNETs may lead to undesirable side effects and thereby provoke moral concerns and conflicts. In my master thesis, I investigated the moral conflicts of a particular ‘Green Pathway’, encompassing BECCS, AR and terrestrial EW, to limit global warming “to well below 2 °C” regarding the human right to adequate food. Reviewing recent publications concerning BECCS, AR and EW, I found that terrestrial EW would not conflict with the human right to adequate food but would likely even promote agricultural food production due to a higher nutrient provision. Yet, terrestrial EW does not provide a feasible solution to limit global warming to “well below 2 °C”, since a large-scale deployment of EW would require large investments and considerable amounts of energy to grind suitable rock-material. In regard of BECCS and AR, I found that even under the optimistic Representative Concentration Pathway 2.6 (RCP2.6), as projected by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) in its latest synthesis report, a large-scale deployment of BECCS and/or AR would cause moral conflicts regarding the human right to adequate food for present and future generations. Due to these findings and for ethical reasons, I advocate for more and stronger mitigation efforts in line with several land management actions recently designated as “natural climate solutions” (NCS) and a deployment of multiple tNETs in near future.