Abdullah Alqarni

Professor Wilson

9/22/2017

Question 1

In a hypothesis initially promulgated by Nobel laureate, holds that the unregulated market cannot be relied upon to safeguard the environment. In this hypothesis, clean air and water are "free products" whose value is not revealed by processes in the market. Likely polluters do not care about the social expenses of their activity, but only the expenses they incur. Besides, since endeavors to sustain a clean, healthy environment benefits everyone even those who did not contribute in making the environment clean, people will naturally avoid making any efforts. The people do not have control over their town's pollution because the challenges originate upstream. The communities upstream do not have any incentives to clean up the lakes, rivers because it requires a lot of money and resources. With this in mind, the only reasonable way to deal with pollution is through regulations which are enforced by the state, county and federal levels ("big government"). Sometimes this is the only way to protect the common individuals in the society. This is the reason people rely on the government for protection (Rosenbaum, 2014). But the government is not the only way to protect the environment. There are other ways.

In a way, the government has failed to protect the environment. An oppressive national government can sometimes be a slur to progress in numerous ways, and environmental measures and implementation are no exceptions. The EPA (Environmental Protection Agency), which was initially acquainted by President Nixon to protect human health and environment, has turned into a politicized amass that acts beyond its restrictions in a dangerous, rather than useful way

(Rosenbaum, 2014). What presumably is a couple of disengaged incidents with the development of EPA and execution of its plans is, indeed, a pattern of questionable, determinedly neglectful activities and power grabs by the body.

Like private people, the government has experienced difficulties identifying the source and impact of pollutants. Shockingly, it has in this manner tended to embrace measures that do not request solid evidence linking emissions with harm. For instance, the gas and oil industry invested over ninety billion dollars in low and zero carbon emission technologies since the beginning of the twenty-first century. However, the EPA felt the desire to introduce a regulatory liability on an industry that was already moving towards better technology and fewer emissions. This primarily affected the oil prices and the economy at large. Under the present administration, the suspicion of damages, with the inclusion of educated guesses concerning pollution, are driving approaches that have massive costs (Rosenbaum, 2014). The government not only lacks the appropriate data to control pollution, but politicians frequently have a less motivating force to obtain the data. The politicians find it more familiar and easier with most counties to implement a stance of atrocity against polluters. Indeed, generating atrocity is a powerful approach of garnering votes (Pielke, 2014). The entry of Superfund supported the professions of various members of Congress, despite the fact that it came about because of falsehood about Love Canal and the inaccurate ramifications that each town had a potential fiasco in its lawn.

The political weight that overwhelms government likewise conflict with taking the long outlook. Officials in the government are legitimately barred from explicitly capturing any value that they assist in making; correspondingly they incur no financial losses for deteriorating property (Pielke, 2014). By contrast, a land proprietor will see the property value change promptly after a noteworthy investment, because the value mirrors future costs and benefits

stemming from his activities. Because such capitalized value does not exist in a government setting, officials are more intrigued by augmenting political power as opposed to economic value.

Question 4

I believe that the market-based approach will assist in solving the environmental pollution challenges both in the long and short-term. A free market solution would perfectly work. Through voluntary agreements, courts a free market approach would compel polluters to indemnify the individuals the effect by polluting the environment. If the property privileges of the aggrieved party were upheld, it would result in a situation where the parties would concur to a pollution premium: a bisect point where the polluter is repaying the local individuals to keep polluting. However, this approach would have the outcome of incentivizing the polluters to leave the urban areas (Rosenbaum, 2014). It may likewise incentivize individuals who think less about their lungs, similar to smokers, to move to regions of higher contamination. The enormous impediment to this is that the innovation for measuring the quality of the air is very primitive, and possibly would not enable people to locate this balance. However, this is not a huge problem as it appears: the very actuality of these property rights being maintained (even roughly) would boost development in separating property rights.

The best part is that it would rebalance the comparative cost of unsafe fills, similar to coal, against more secure fuels, such as nuclear power and shale gas. Presently, nuclear power is not feasible as a source of free market fuel as it requires huge government appropriations for the underlying investment. With a "free market approach" instrument that puts regard for property rights at its center, this could change concerning oil and coal, nuclear may turn out to be very

aggressive. Shale gas, inexpensive and moderately perfect, would most likely turn out to be much more invested in that it is currently. In addition, the exact pollution costs would be alleviated to a satisfactory level. There is no requirement for complex control and self-assertive "social" tax assessment. For a vitality industry that bears the expenses of its contamination, property rights should just be perceived.

Improved stress on accountability via common law could result in salutary developments (Rosenbaum, 2014). For instance, a chemical that may escape into the air or water may be branded by radioactive isotopes or dyes to assist identify their origin. The companies responsible could secure themselves with branding. It would clear them from the damage caused by the contaminants if they did not have their brands. Additionally, encountered by laws that guarantee the potential polluters' solvency and that make liability more real for anyone whose pollutants invade others' property, insurers accountable for possible damages could offer a bull market for the enhancement of superior forensic technology, and better decontamination and containment processes. Stressing general accountability instead of certain behavior helps to better the incentive to prevent damage. In sum, regarding maintenance of quality of the environment, securing natural beauty, and preservation of wild habitat, corporation have for a long time doing a better job than the "big government." Reason being that their activities do not have to reflect the views of the majority, which changes often.

References

Pielke, R.A (2014). The Rightful Place of Science: Disasters and Climate Change. *Consortium for Science, Policy, & Outcomes.*

Rosenbaum, W. A. (2014). *Environmental politics and policy*. Los Angeles: SAGE, pp. 79-122.

Abdullah Algarni

Introduction Issue placed in context, importance Outline of answer	4 /5	**10**
Main Body Direct answer to question Understanding of issue/problem Relevant and well-stated example Demonstrated ability to incorporate reading/lecture materials Demonstrated critical thinking	8 /9	**20**
Conclusion Concise summary of answer Primary points restated	4 /5	**10**
Style/Requirements Writing Style Correct usage, grammar, maximum length Correct Citations – usage and style Demonstrated ability to communicate effectively	4 /4	**10**
Total	43	**50**

43

Intro

- 9-10 Well-stated, clear outline of answer and appropriate context
- 7-8 Outline or context not clearly developed
- 5-6 Missing expected element
- 1-4 Limited effort

Main Body

- 19-20 Direct answer, all other elements
- 17-18 Missing one/more required element
- 15-16 No direct answer to question, other elements included
- 13-14 No direct answer and missing one/more of requirements
- 11-12 Includes some elements, some missing
- 1-10 Limited effort, most elements missing, all missing

Conclusion

- 9-10 Clearly summarizes main argument, includes original thinking
- 7-8 Summarizes main argument
- 5-6 Missing expected elements
- 1-4 Limited effort

Learning Outcomes

Communicate Sensibly - *Think and Create, Communicate*
Recognize and Understand Environmental Policy – *Learn and Integrate, Think and Create*