
Issue#3: Are Environmental Regulations too restrictive?

For some time, governments around the world have been putting some regulations concerning environmental issues. In this issue, the weight of these regulations is the main point. First argument states that they are, indeed, too restrictive. The second argument maintains those regulations are not too restrictive.

The first side, against regulations, did not present their argument well enough. They used examples from the past and only from a specific location (Theodore Roosevelt and the U.S.). The past is over, so we cannot use past as an example. Second, there are other parts of the world other than the U.S. The strongest argument was about economic and freedom interfering. The government is interfering with personal economical and freedom rights. The examples in the text are relevant enough (pg39, paragraph2). Personally, I thought their argument lacked evidence and did not make sense. The only logical argument they proposed was the one about aesthetics [A sense on aesthetics would get us...and harmless. (pg46, paragraph 3).] This argument is basically saying priests and propagandists should not affect scientific decisions.

As for the other argument, which is for government regulations, I can easily say that it was much stronger and more effective. First it listed 9 “false facts” about regulations and environment overall [Environmental scientists...the economy (pg50, 4th paragraph)]. Also, they focus on decision-makers. They claim that “decision-makers, too, have a tendency to focus mostly on the more obvious and immediate environmental problems” (pg 51, 3rd paragraph). Also, they continue; “most people still don’t realize that humanity has become a true global force, interfering with a very real and direct way in many of the planet’s natural cycles.” The examples they have given are sufficient

enough to back this argument up (pg51, 4th paragraph). I think their strongest argument was the one about the public. It goes like this; “the public often seems unaware of the success of actions taken at the instigation of the environmental movement. People can easily see the disadvantages of environmental regulations but not the despoliation that would exit without them” (pg 51, 5th paragraph). What I really liked about this side of the issue was that they presented a survey. In the survey, it was concluded that over half of the Americans felt that environmental issues were serious and 58 percent would choose protecting the environment over economic growth (pg 55, 3rd paragraph). These results mean the public now has a deeper sense of the issues’ seriousness.

All in all, I think it is clear that the second argument was much more powerful and probably influence more people. Summarizing both arguments, we can conclude in one statement. Even though it is natural for people to feel they are limited to some extent, the regulations are an effective way to keep the world in order in terms of environment. As said in the second argument, “it is natural for many people to feel personally threatened by efforts to preserve a healthy environment “(pg 52, 1st paragraph). However, “the environmental problems of the planet can be solved only in a spirit of cooperation, not one of conflict” (pg56, 2nd paragraph). This summarizes what I think