

## **Climate Change, Global Warming, Politics, and Environmental Law in the United States**

**Earnest N. Bracey, Ph.D., DPA, Army LTC (Ret.)**

Professor of Political Science

College of Southern Nevada

Social Science Department

6375 West Charleston Boulevard W2C

Las Vegas, Nevada 89146-1164

United States of America

### **Abstract**

---

*There are no real justifications for what corporate polluters are doing to our environment and ecosystems. Unfortunately, conservative politicians continue to pooh poo the good works of environmentalists. But we still have unresolved issues of “climate change” and global warming and our polluted environments in the United States. Indeed, how can we approach these serious issues in a way that will foster understanding and action when it comes to our various ecosystems? To be clear, some Americans and peoples of the world haven't learned anything that would indicate that they know much about our environmental challenges.*

*Sadly, we also have a crisis of faith in our federal government — in terms of enacting environmental laws and policies that are supposed to protect our health and lives. Fortunately, environmental groups remain a bastion against environmental crimes and government deregulations in their support of polluting industries. In a fundamental way, we must also stand against filthy, polluting corporations. In other words, we have a broken or spotty record in protecting our fragile planet — that is, when it comes to ensuring our waters, air, and lands are clean. Therefore, citizens of the United States must exert maximum pressure on polluting organizations, and the power-that-be, to protect Americans from deliberate contamination. In essence, what we are doing today is inadequate. Question: Can we put the genie back in the bottle, to use the metaphor, to reverse our altered world by (dirty) pollution?*

---

**Keywords:** Climate, EPA, pollution, emissions, politicians, environment, regulations, ecosystems

### **Introduction: Climate Chaos and Environmental Threats**

It is unfortunately, but polluting corporations continue to hide or lie about the real dangers of their businesses, like the production of “forever chemicals” that poison our waters and threaten the health of human beings everywhere on the planet. To be certain, and as presented in this paper, we can say that “Environmental issues, such as global warming, air and water pollution, and unsustainable exploitation of renewable resources, are often described as collective action problems” (Bianco & Canon, 2009, p. 175) (Note 1). And these environmental problems are not going away any time soon, particularly the *unpredictability* of human interaction and selfish activities. In this regard, “Natural resources are being depleted; forests are being razed; access to freshwater is severely limited in some places; plants and animal species are disappearing; and air and water pollution are rampant” (Mingst & McKibben, 2021, p. 392). Also, minority neighborhoods are at the front lines of these environmental threats. And it is extremely hard for depressed communities to fight back — that is, they don't have the financial resources or economic *wherewithal* to stop or *interdict* the wealthy, corporate polluters. Additionally, we must take time to consider the *pros* and *cons* of protecting the environment through state and local government laws and policies.

There seemed to be no limits to how many ways we can address our environmental problems, including non-violent protests. In addition, what exactly is wrong with making ecologically sound decisions about our polluted environment? As former political science professor, John T. Rourke (2011), at the University of Connecticut tells us:

Environmental threats pay no attention to national borders. Annually, the United States suffers extensive damage to native species of flora and fauna and spends hundreds of millions of dollars trying to combat such foreign invaders as the Asian longhorn beetles and kudzu vines. The spewing of chemicals such as chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) used in refrigerants and products into the atmosphere has thinned the earth's ozone layer, which helps shield us from cancer-causing ultraviolet rays. As a creased 250% since 1975. Global warming caused by the worldwide emission of 43 billion tons of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) and other greenhouse gases into the atmosphere annually is altering climate conditions everywhere (p. 18).

Nevertheless, polluting businesses continue to change the ground rules, using the courts to thwart environmental cleanup efforts. Notably, because it adds another layer of uncertainty about future environmental policies from various governments that should protect us all. Nonetheless, *environmentalists* are constantly fighting to protect our lands, waters, and air from unscrupulous corporate polluters. Indeed, a clean environment should be the *bedrock* of our society and other democracies. To wit, working on our environmental problems shouldn't be seen as a politically expedient act. To be clear, the issue of polluting our environment is not so distant anymore, especially when we are all being negatively affected by waste material. Moreover, a polluted environment is not something that we should ignore, nor should we "roll back regulations implementing an environmental law." However, the current White House "says [regulations] needlessly delays federal approvals for energy and infrastructure projects" ("Plan readied," 2025, p. 4). But such misguided and destructive plans will only exacerbate our "climate change" problems moving into the future. After all, our environmental laws were created to deal "with the maintenance and protection of the environment, including preventive measures such as the requirements of environmental-impact statements, as well as measures to assign liability and provide cleanup for incidents that harm the environment" ("environmental law," 1999, p. 555). Therefore, it is worth pondering the reason why conservative administrations want to get rid of environmental regulations; but such measures as deregulation of polluting organizations can be to our detriment. Is it because our government wants to protect or give cover to polluting industries? Perhaps. As journalist Steve Paul (2014) cogently writes:

Opponents of environmental regulations like to use the term "overreach" as if their free-market liberties were under siege by a rampant federal invasion of suits and black helicopters. They rarely seem willing to accept the notions of stewardship and wildlife conservation and that perhaps, in the long run, unregulated exploitation of natural resources — land, water, air, wildlife, etc. — has consequences perhaps even more serious than whatever short-term economic adaptations environmental laws might require (p. 3).

Of course, we must clearly understand that "Most environmental regulations also come from the national government, since problems of dirty air, polluted water, and acid rain spill across state boundaries. Many civil rights and environmental regulations, therefore, are enforced by the federal courts" (Greenberg & Page, 2003, p. 75). More importantly, we must focus and especially note that our fragile, contaminated environment is *unsustainable*. And crying out for environmental regulations by our government, which can protect vulnerable citizens, is being disregarded. To be sure, *naysayers* continue to believe that "climate change" or global warming isn't really a problem — and many ignore the *red flags* concerning our unclean and unhealthy world. Perhaps they see the planet through "distorted lens." Which is to say that "Although most Americans agree that global warming is happening, the public is split on what is causing it" (Bianco & Canon, 2009, p. 175).

### **Environmental Laws and Government Policies**

Essentially, across the planet, environmental law is being conveniently ignored by conservative governments and corporate polluters, as we are desperately grasping for answers and solutions. This attitude matters, because we must outmaneuver conservatives who lie about polluting industries and their disinformation regarding dangerous, business operations and practices. This is to say that some of their information about "climate change" is misleading, inaccurate, and outright wrong, as well as their rhetoric — that is, rather than accepting the facts about climate regulations and "corporate emissions data."

Unfortunately, “we are operating in a world without actionable corporate climate data.” For example, as Harvard University professors Lauren Cohen (2026), Ethan Rouen, and University of Michigan professor Kunal Sachdeva write: “An analysis of emissions disclosures filed by S&P 500 companies over a decade found that 74% of firms revised their reported greenhouse gas emissions at least once. This isn’t a minor accounting adjustment,” because “We’re talking about 135 million tons of underreported [polluting] emissions — more than the entire annual emissions of Venezuela, Nigeria, Qatar or Kuwait in 2020” (p. 7A). In the final analysis, opponents are scornful of accurate or exact information and the evidence about pollution — and unmoved by the real or objective, environmental facts. Nevertheless, the *environmental law* is clear — that is:

[Specific] government intervention concerning the environment is the subject of great partisan debate, with some seeing government action as both necessary for the planet’s future and a likely economic boon, and others viewing environmental protection and efforts to combat climate change as government overreach and an assault on jobs. (Ginsberg et al., 2023, pp. 622-623).

Beyond such irresponsible actions by governments and corporations, there are still questions about the sickening environmental pollutions that need to be addressed, even if they (polluting companies) wrongly believed that such issues don’t directly affect them or matter. Thus, it should be no surprise that accepting a narrative about emissions and world pollution, driven by lies and conspiracy theories, not the truth, is not the solution to what *ails* our different environments. We, therefore, need to immediately stop going down the wrong path about this environmental issue. Take for example, the *Exxon Mobil Corporation*, which is suing the state of California “over a pair of 2023 climate disclosure laws that the company says infringe upon its [so-called] free speech rights, namely by forcing it to embrace the message that large companies are uniquely to blame for climate change” (“Exxon Mobil,” 2025, p. 5B) (Note 2). However, the *Exxon Mobil Corporation* does not explain how they are *not* responsible for global warming and “climate change.” Moreover, how exactly can *Exxon Mobil* explain how they are poisoning our sensitive wetlands with oil-drilling, which has threatened different *ecosystems* across the globe. Equally, how exactly can/should we adequately address the environmental issues of global warming and “climate change,” particularly when “Most climate scientists agree that the global climate is changing, that human activity is a major source of such change, and that climate changes will pose very serious problems for people in many ways” (Janda et al., 2022, p. 117) (Note 3). Of course, humans are responsible for ensuring that we have a clean environment. This is to say that we must remain good stewards of our planet, no matter the circumstances, while maintaining positive momentum to repair our waters and lands, which is vital and necessary for the quality of life for all peoples. It is also fair to say that without a continuous effort amid “climate change” problems and challenges, we might not have a world to save, particularly when it comes to “the environmental costs of burning coal, oil and gas” (Leovy, 2018, p. 2). Indeed, such irresponsible activities will not help the human race in the long run, especially when life-threatening matters and the unintended consequences of pollution take hold. Indeed, the dirtying of any part of our environment shouldn’t be tolerated. Hence, we should reject polluting corporations and those that ignore the “climate change” sciences.

To be certain, “The focus on climate change [has] elevated the issue of environmental protection to a global level, and most of the efforts to raise awareness about global warming [has come] from the scientific community” (Gitelson, Dudley & Dubnick, 2016, p. 215). For example, environmental scientists define the environment as “The conditions and influences of the place in which an organism lives.” However, “the large number of different types of environment (eg urban environment, tropical rainforest environment) makes it impossible to formulate a single definition” (“environment,” 1994, p. 389). Furthermore, a *pollution-free* environment should be of primary concern when we make *any* human modifications that might damage the air, water or soil. This particular concern is in stark contrast with “the current focus on climate change [which] is substantially different from the issues of air and water pollution that were central to the mass [environmental] movement that reached its peak in 1970s” (Gitelson, Dudley & Dubnick, 2016, p. 217). Another sticking point: “Urban climates are distinguished from those of less built-up areas by differences of air temperature, humidity, wind speed and direction, and [the] amount of precipitation.” This is to say that “tall buildings, paved streets, and parking lots [can negatively] affect wind flow, precipitation runoff, and local energy balance.” All in all, “any set of climate conditions that prevail in a large metropolitan area,” might affect climate change, in “its rural surroundings” (“urban climate,” 2000, p. 1676). Moreover, pollution in the various cities, of course, can cause health issues ranging from cancers and mental degradation.

It is also worth pressing the case of government policies and regulations, because “Even though U.S. environmental regulations are a form of domestic policy, it is becoming increasingly clear that the most severe environmental problems cannot be satisfactorily addressed without global cooperation because [the] earth is a unified ecosystem.” Indeed, our planet “is composed of interrelated systems of air and atmosphere, fresh waters and oceans, and soils and forests” (Edwards & Lippucci, 1998, pp. 739-740). As Maria Cecilia Hinojos Pressey (2021), who is the operations director for Oregon’s farmworker union, argues:

Climate change is putting all our lives at risk, but [especially] people that are out [on farms], who can’t stop working, because that means that we [will] no longer have access to food. Farmworkers are [therefore] putting their lives on the line to pick food for our [various] communities. Farmworkers [also] feel like they can’t take a day off or they can’t take a break, or they can’t miss work — be it because they’re sick, [or running away from ICE,] or because there’s smoke that’s so bad that you can’t even see or breathe, or there’s heat that’s so bad that it’s impacting [their] well-being — because they need to be able to make that money to provide for their family (p. 21).

But in a specific metropolitan area or large city, we must understand that in terms of global warming and climate change, “New York City is going to flood” eventually. Hence, “Adaptation is a matter of survival, and the city may have to throw every solution available at a worsening [environmental] situation” (Surico & Underwood, 2025, p. 4). This environmental condition might be par-for-course for *any* large, busy metropolis.

Therefore, we must be cognizant that “The issue of pollution vividly illustrates the regulatory dilemma. Critics of strict controls on air, water, and noise pollution say the pursuit of a clean environment increases costs of products and causes unemployment.” However, nothing can be further from the reality. Furthermore, what exactly is wrong with penalizing or fining companies with pollution violations by our governments? According to James Macgregor Burns, et al., “Until relatively recently, governments at all levels did little to protect the environment, and what little was done was by state and local government” (Burns et al., 2002, p. 398). However, governments today must continue to assess the *unsavory* environmental situations and choose the right path when it comes to environmental policies and regulations, because more can be done. Sadly, polluting industries can manipulate our political systems by paying a small fine for breaking environmental laws or regulations called “a penalty fee,” which is essentially a settlement for their disgusting pollution. But such a payment or punishment will not make up for the assault of pollution incurred across different environments. In this regard, we can assume that polluting corporations are *unfazed* by their continued abuse to our world and because of their contaminating businesses. In so many words, some polluting corporations are irresponsible, but they like having the political advantage, while obfuscating the truth about their dirty businesses. Hence, polluting companies have certain legal rights and privileges, which actually impede the progress to cleanup our already damaged environment. Moreover, many conservative politicians express their willingness to oppose government regulations that affect the so-called free market and polluting corporations. Why? Nevertheless, the federal government might later or eventually take the lead on protecting our environment by employing the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), which is a powerful independent agency, that “is responsible for implementing federal legislation dealing with clean air, safe drinking water, solid waste disposal, pesticides, radiation and toxic substances” (Dye, 2007, p. 355) (Note 4). But today, the EPA is seen as an *impotent*, compromised agency, without a lot of power, because they haven’t been able to check the evil forces of corporations. Furthermore, polluting businesses and companies operate under the guise of being the true protector of the environment and our planet. But this is not true and a falsehood. Consider what is going on in Columbus, Ohio, in the United States, where the *Ohio Oil and Gas Land Management Commission* is allowing oil and gas drilling in wildlife areas. What? This specific commission is also allowing for hydraulic fracturing on public lands (“Ohio, Columbus,” 2026, p. 4B). Therefore, we must ask: Who exactly will benefit from such foul, (environmental) activities? And who will be harmed?

### **Advent of the Environmental Protection Agency**

Sadly, “Environmental contamination [or pollution] produced by [oil companies and] factory exhaust, toxic water, and water pollution is a collective problem without a natural market solution.” In this regard, it should be noted that “Regulatory policies requiring industrial polluters to constrain or repair environmental damage impose a form of social responsibility on industries that otherwise would, out of self-interest, exercise their liberty to avoid or ignore these costs” (Kerbel, 2024, p. 461). To put it another way, polluting companies and corporations don’t really want to pay for *any* environment damages that they might have caused or engendered.

And for decades, conservative politicians believe whatever they *only* purport to believe about “climate change,” global warming, or the environment. They even think that *everyone* should believe in what they believe about our polluted world. However, we should never be influenced by these misguided individuals and/or corporations. Of course, what *environmentalists* think about our environment doesn’t really matter to corporations and *codependent*, Republican/conservative politicians. And many of these disingenuous, conservative politicians are not even knowledgeable enough to comment about environmental issues. Take for example, the issue of *air pollution* in the United States. According to journalist Maxine Joselow (2026), “For decades, the Environmental Protection Agency has calculated the health benefits of reducing air pollution, using the cost estimates of avoided asthma attacks and premature deaths to justify clean-air rules” (p. 1). However, the current administration has change the *protocol* for measuring *air pollution*, which actually assists polluting power plants, like in Winfield, West Virginia. In an unheard of shift, change, or reversal, the EPA now wants “to calculate only the cost to [a polluting] industry when setting polluting limits, not the monetary value of saving human lives...” (Joselow, 2026, p. 1) (Note 5). Apparently, the current White House and its *viziers* don’t care about the human health of the local community or larger population. Or is this an exaggeration? We should also note that the *foul* air emanating from New York State’s *Seneca Meadows*, which is the “largest landfill: Rising nearly 300 feet, it’s almost as tall as the Statue of Liberty, including its pedestal” (McKinley, 2023, p. 34). And this smellable place where all kind of trash is dumped, people who live near the area, “have long complained about a bevy of [environmental] problems related to the site, including... choking dust and the potential for landfill runoff — known as leachate — to contaminate drinking water” (McKinley, 2023, p. 34) (Note 6). In addition, we should take into account the many gas leaks from trains and (spilled from) truck accidents across the country, like what happened with “an anhydrous ammonia leak” in Yazoo City, Mississippi, or in Weatherford, Oklahoma, where in 2025, “A leaking tanker truck spewed dangerous ammonia gas outside a hotel overnight, filling its hallways with [odorous] fumes and forcing hundreds of nearby residents... to evacuate...” Later, “At least 500 to 600 people went to a shelter... while others were ordered to remain inside their homes for hours,” while “Some nursing homes were evacuated, and schools were closed for the day” (“Ammonia gas,” 2025, p. 6A) (Note 7). Chemical companies, of course, are the true villains of this story, and some of the major *culprits* of toxic waste dumping and *air pollution*. In this respect, how can we hold polluting corporations accountable for contaminating our air, and hurting human lives? Also, like what is happening in Ulan Bator, Mongolia, American “Babies and young children are especially vulnerable to [air] pollution because they have small lungs, breathe more rapidly than adults, and their immune systems are not fully developed” (Hincks, 2018, p. 48). Inextricably, what is occurring in polluted cities across the United States is not advantageous or good for the health and welfare of its people — that is, because of deadly pollutants.

Fortunately, “In 1970, [the U.S.] Congress established the EPA, whose most important responsibility was implementing the Clean Air Act.” And “Under the act, EPA officials were charged with setting limits for the amount of pollution that could be emitted by steel mills, chemical plants, motor vehicles, and other [particular] sources” (Coleman, Goldstein & Howell, 2011, p. 592) (Note 8). Inevitably, cleaning-up *air pollution* might not actually come to *fruition*. We must also remember that there is nothing special about industries/companies that continue to poison our air in the United States and around the world, while hiding their disagreeable, pollution activities. For example, evidence for the contamination of our air by fuel exhaust and waste gases continues to mount; and it is well documented. To wit, it has been reported that:

More than 40 percent of Americans are breathing heavily polluted air, increasing their risk for lung cancer, asthma, heart problems, and other health issues. That’s the worrisome conclusion of the American Lung Association’s latest annual “State of the Air” report, which has been tracking air quality across the U.S. for 19 years. The report concluded that 133.9 million Americans lived in areas that get an F for air pollution in 2016, up from 125 million in 2015 (“Air pollution,” 2018, p. 19) (Note 9).

Besides *air pollution*, we must also consider *water pollution* as another aspect of our environmental problem/focus, because it requires our undivided attention. Unfortunately, ancient lakes and other (pristine) water sources are being destroyed because of various *water pollution*; and it will fundamentally alter our environment in negative ways. Indeed, how can we combat against unsafe water sources? For decades, environmental scientists have warned us that our polluted waters will be to our injury or detriment. Additionally, it should be understood that “Water is... unequally used: agriculture accounts for about two-thirds of the use of water, industry about one-quarter, and human consumption slightly less than one-tenth. Some new technologies may also be using [water] faster than it is replenished.”

Moreover, “The use of water as an aid to natural gas and petroleum extraction (a process most commonly known as fracking) threatens shortages in some locals and has caused contamination issues” (Mingst & McKibben, 2021, p. 407) (Note 10). Therefore, having clean water is essential for maintaining human life and a healthy planet. According to a study from *Consumer Reports*, “Perchlorate, a chemical... in rocket fuel, has contaminated water and food and is more likely to be found in food given to babies and children...” (Gomes, 2024, p. 6A) (Note 11). Furthermore, we have a serious problem with illegal, waste dumping. For example, according to journalist Mick Akers (2025), “Elon Musk’s Boring Co. was fined nearly \$500,000 for illegally dumping apparent drill fluid into the Clark County Water Reclamation District’s sewer system...” (p. 1) (Note 12). But Musk did nothing to clean up this toxic, drilling fluid, which was/is a problem in itself. Apparently, conservatives like Musk see polluting our waters as less obvious to them, and the impact not that significant. But individuals like Musk should understand that *nasty* polluted water is an obvious threat to the lives of *all* humans. Also, this specific, environmental concern can be seen as *low-hanging fruit* in terms of the pollution of our waters — and no one is being held accountable or adequately punished for contaminating our waters without a care in the world. Or so it seems. Another example of our federal government backing-off agreements with state governments to provide safe-drinking water occurred when the Justice Department withdrew “from an agreement with the city of Houston (Texas) to curb illegal dumping in Black and Latino neighborhoods” in an effort to dismantle “environmental justice initiatives.” But our government officials should know that “Without federal monitoring, advocates in Houston [believe that] city officials have become less responsive to residents affiliated [or afflicted] by persistent [waste] dumping” (“Illegal dumping,” 2025, p. 4A) (Note 13). In the final rendering, *water pollution* will always shape our environment, our nation, and humanity at large.

### Climate Change and Destruction of the Environment

As already mentioned/intimated in this paper, and further discussed by Thomas M. Magstadt (2006): It is hardly surprising that recent decades have witnessed a growing international awareness of environmental issues. Acid rain; global warming; the need to conserve water resources, forests, and fisheries; and the continued heavy use of the earth’s nonrenewable natural resources such as oil, gas, and minerals [which] have all recently provided incentives to governments to cooperate in fashioning international [and national] agreements. [And,] Although thus far these agreements have been limited in scope, [some] progress has been made (p. 538) (Note 14).

Generally speaking, as Magstadt infers, the fight against polluting industries in the United States now seem justified, as the environmental issues about air and water — and moving forward — will negatively affect generations of humans across the planet. Furthermore, “Another trouble spot for American policy makers is international environmental policy.” Indeed, “The Environment is a global matter, since pollutants produced in one country affect all others and America along with other industrial nations like China, [which] is a major producer of pollution” (Ginsberg et al., 2025, p. 463) (Note 15). Meanwhile, the gradual destruction of our planet continues — that is, in terms of having a filthy environment, which is the worst thing that can possibly happen to our world. Therefore, it is important to wonder whether we can *fix* our ailing, polluted earth. Or are we willing to accept whatever negative consequences that may come our way? To say the least, we can’t take our mind off disastrous environmental situations, like with the pollution of our lands, air, and water, just because we can’t instantly change things. To be sure, humans everywhere must also recognize the *long-lasting*, negative impact of *global warming* across our entire globe in terms of “climate change,” because our “earth is warming, with a projected increase of between 1.9 and 3 degrees Celsius estimated by the end of the twenty-first century.” Professors Karen A. Mingst and Heather Elko McKibben (2021) go on to warn us that: “This increase [in pollution] may seem insignificant, but [the] increase acceleration in atmospheric and ocean warming has resulted in glacial and ice sheet melting and sea level rise, as well as rising temperatures on land and the exponential increase in the number of extreme weather events like hurricanes, flood, and fires” (p. 401). In this regard, *global warming* is undeniable, and we *cannot* admit that this issue of *global warming* is not an environmental problem.

Furthermore, at the end of the day, how can we move forward without addressing “climate change” and other environmental problems? Mingst and McKibben (2021) write: “Some environmental issues such as climate change are particularly intractable: they affect the entire globe, but their effects may not be felt by everyone at the same time.” Therefore, “No one state [or country] is able to address the [climate change] problem alone, yet both the quality of human life and the chances for human survival are potentially impacted” (p. 399).

Which is to say that we must pay attention to our surroundings when it comes to all aspects the environment, which should be the priority of all humans, particularly in the United States. In essence, we must strengthen environmental policies and agreements that protect the lands and people across the planet. Unfortunately, conservatives (in our government) minimize the very real dangers of global warming, “climate change” and other environmental issues; or they ignore these matters entirely. Why? Apparently, some people, for whatever reason, cannot or will not listen to reason, or believe in environmental science, mainly because it doesn’t fit with their ideological beliefs. In so many words, many conservatives/Republicans firmly believe that “climate change” is an overly political *hoax*. What? It is also a convenient way of avoiding the truth and environmental science about these issues, especially in our profoundly un-ordinary, polluted world. Moving forward in regard to these environmental problems and denial prompts the obvious question: What are we afraid of when it comes to wanting a cleaner planet?

Humans have much to answer for, all things considering — that is, concerning our fragile environment. For example, what is our federal government doing or enacting in the United States in terms of environmental laws? First, government officials have “made it harder to find scientific assessments of how climate change is endangering the nation and its people.” Furthermore, “the official government websites that hosted the peer-reviewed national climate assessment went dark” (“Government website,” 2025, p. 3A), or it was entirely shut down. But it would be a mistake to ignore the science of “climate change,” and destructive, environmental pollution. Therefore, we cannot disregard what is going on around us and the world, nor can we keep putting off these matters as being unreasonable. In this respect, we should understand the extraordinary need to fight against unscientific nonsense, our federal government, the wealthy elite, and polluting corporations. Second, environmental enforcement in the United States “has hit historic lows,” because the current administration, which “has brought fewer lawsuits against companies for environmental violations in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, underscoring that the current administration has scaled back rules that protect vulnerable communities from pollution” (Calderon, 2025, p. 3A). Because of such thoughtless moves by our federal government, they might cause irreversible damage to the people who live in affected or polluted states. Thus, *environmentalists* must continue to implicitly acknowledge the obvious: Protecting our environment for the future — in all areas — is a good thing, and also a human right. Moreover, it should upset *all* Americans, particularly when pollution leads to eventual death for those who are exposed. Equally important, we must also call-out and challenge false assumptions made about “climate change,” and other assorted lies concerning the pollution of our nation, like with Kentucky Attorney General Russell Coleman, who “made a series of false or unsupported claims” to the EPA “about the science of climate change, including suggestions that higher carbon dioxide levels would bring “net benefits” for millions of Americans” (“Kentucky, Frankfort,” 2025, p. 4B). What nonsense. Of course, Coleman never talks about these so-called “net benefits.” What exactly is he talking about?

Some conservative politicians, like Coleman, have sentiments in *futility* about our polluted environment, especially when they are *wrong*. Furthermore, corporate polluters work like *Houdini*, so to speak, to get out of paying environmental fees for their pollution; or to escape *liability* for dirtying parts of the larger environment with waste products and/or other toxic materials. To be sure, as scientists Jerry King and Joanne Leovy (2018) suggest: a “Carbon fee and dividend is a win-win solution to climate change,” mainly because “It would greatly reduce our green-house emissions and be a win for our environment and everyone who is concerned about it.” King and Leovy go on to write that a carbon fee “is [also] a win for conservatives who oppose growing the government and increasing government regulation. [Finally, it] is a win for our economy and for American workers” (p. 3E). After all, having energy dominance doesn’t mean that we should pollute or poison our country — and the world. And why is it so hard to even explore real, *long-term*, possible/potential environmental solutions? In a sad way, the actions of our federal government can be *counterproductive*, like when “the EPA, in 2025 terminated a \$7 billion grant program that was intended to help pay for residential solar projects for more than 900,000 lower-income U.S. households” (“EPA pulls,” 2025, p. 4A). Why? Nowadays, in terms of global warming and “climate change,” things haven’t gotten better across the *environmental spectrum*, so to speak. Also, fighting the pollution in our waters against polluters continues to be a real challenge. For example, in a given area or “a community far upstream in a watershed may thus receive relatively clean water, whereas one farther downstream receives a partly diluted mixture of urban, industrial and rural wastes” (“water pollution,” 2000, pp. 1726-1727). To be clear, pollution or waste spills in our waters don’t stay necessarily in one place, because it can cross geographical areas. But it shouldn’t be a risk to drink water. According to president of the Copenhagen Consensus Center, Bjorn Lomborg (2023):

Many people say they are very worried about sea levels rising. That would be a real outcome of global warming, given the fact that water expands as temperatures rise. So it is something we should be concerned about. It is also, however, a problem we know how to address. Humans are not going to stand around on beaches for 80 years watching the water rise until they drown. We will adapt to our changing circumstances, as we have in the past (p. 3).

We should commend Lomborg's *optimism* about our environment. However, we must also be concerned with the quality of our water around the world. No doubt, the pollution of our rivers and oceans could have been avoided had we created *sound* government policies, to make it a serious crime to dump pollutants in our waters.

More important, our waters are slowly being saturated with deadly, toxic chemicals, whether we want to believe it or not. Yet, the EPA in the United States today "is redefining the scope of [our] nation's bedrock clean water law to significantly limit the wetlands it covers, building on a Supreme Court decision... that removed federal protections for vast areas" (Daly, 2025, p. 2A). What? This decision by our highest court is total *madness*. Additionally, the EPA has proposed "a drinking water limit for *perchlorate*, a harmful chemical in rockets and other explosives, but also said... it will seek input on how strict the limit should be for *perchlorate*, which is particularly dangerous for infants, and require utilities to test" ("EPA to," 2025, p. 4A). As we can perhaps ascertain, environmental laws and regulations have been revised or cut significantly under conservative/Republican administrations; and such rash actions do almost nothing to resolve many of the environmental issues discussed in this work. Equally importantly, it will be extremely difficult to *usher* in clean energy when our current federal government continues to cancel funds to oversee and support the needed transitional efforts — that is, to change over from dirty fossil fuels to clean, renewable energy sources. Failure to do *anything* might bring serious consequences for our environment moving forward into the future. To be sure, there will be a price to pay for our stubbornness and ignorance. For example, in 2025, the White House canceled "8 billion in clean energy projects ushered in by the Biden administration across several states..." ("\$8 billion," 2025, p. 4). We must ask: What good will this action do exactly? Perhaps nothing at all. To be clear, will it make things right for our planet and its people — that is, abandoning clean energy projects in a world we think we understand? And what is wrong with finding new approaches and methods to maintain and clean up our poisoned environment? Indeed, how can we *rethink* our understanding of clean energy projects with a different mindset? Is it even possible? It seems baffling that some people believe in environmental lies about clean energy; but "solar and wind power" is inevitable if we want to curtail or slow down global warming and "climate change." Accordingly, we should listen to *environmentalists* and believe in the science — that humans are destroying our ecological systems, as discussed in this work, at a record pace. Instead, the current, Republican administration in the United States is:

Removing environmental regulations on [coal,] oil and gas drilling and pulling the funding from anything remotely green [or involving clean energy projects]; it's also using the threat of tariffs to bully countries into buying America's natural gas. It's an all-out effort to slow down an inevitable [renewable energy] transition (McKibben, 2025, p. 4).

### **Conclusion: An Environmental Diagnosis and Solutions**

Instead of imposing the deregulation of polluting corporations and businesses, our federal government should be concerned with more practical solutions — that is, not cutting projects that might help us clean up polluted, environmental areas. Unfortunately, and by way of an example, the Department of Energy has canceled "\$1 billion in federal funding," which was "intended to jump-start a green hydrogen hub in the Pacific Northwest" (Zhou, 2025, p. 5B) (Note 16), which would, no doubt, help eliminate greenhouse gases. In hindsight, such an abandonment/deregulation *snafu* will only *perplex* our understanding of the issues of "climate change." Make no mistake, unclear, deregulation policies will (also) eventually become a serious, environmental problem. And economically and politically, deregulations will prevent us from learning the truth about what is really going on with our polluted environment. In a nutshell, environmental pollution, because of deregulation, will negatively impact our environment beyond our lifetime on mother earth. To be certain, our federal government's support for polluting companies, like with the coal industry, is not the answer, either, because "coal will never be clean" (Meigs, 2010, p. 50) (Note 17), particularly when it comes to providing energy for our nation, as this notion is *only* a pipe dream for government officials who aren't worried about global warming and "climate change." Of course, clean-up of our ecological systems or polluted areas — in all aspects — shouldn't be arbitrary. To be certain, some polluting corporations constantly undermine the very, real goals of our environmental laws.

It is also worth noting that dirty industries have done almost nothing meaningful to curtail their specific pollution, especially when there are no *repercussions*. Indeed, how can we enforce environmental laws when our current federal government is willing to deregulate polluting organizations? Furthermore, as journalists Karen Zraick and Lisa Friedman write: “The Environmental Protection Agency [in 2025 was even] promising to erase a scientific finding that underpins climate regulations nationwide.” Why? This unintelligible move by the current federal government is particularly concerning, because as Zraick and Friedman (2025) tell us: “some business leaders said they are wary that the move could lead to a costly legal quagmire.” Meaning, it could become even more challenging for different businesses.

Even more important, “If the federal government were to stop regulating greenhouse gases, it could clear the way for states and municipalities to sue companies for damages from climate change” (p. 26) (Note 18). Moreover, how will we be able to expose the environmental crimes committed by polluting industries? In the end, it seems like changing the established environmental rules is the wrong way to go about things. Question: Is the federal government trying to protect and enable corporate polluters in our society — and the world? Perhaps. Meanwhile, and on the other hand, the lack of knowledge about our polluted environment and negligence by our elected officials is *heartbreaking*. After all, they/we must be reminded that:

Prior to the creation of the EPA [or Environmental Protection Agency], our environment was in crisis. Pollution choked the air in our cities to the extent that it created acid rain. Rivers were so filled with garbage and chemical runoff that some caught fire. The EPA enforced regulatory standards and laws to clean all of that [filthy mess] up and required businesses to take responsibility for the pollution they create[d] (Black, 2018, p. 2).

In this respect, the EPA must still focus on such environmental issues, no matter the policies imposed by Republican administrations. Recently, as a precautionary measure, the EPA rightly “confirmed that hydrocarbons were detected in water samples from the town of Wayne [West Virginia] following a transformer oil release at an Appalachian Power substation...” (“West Virginia,” 2026, p. 4B). This proactive action by the EPA is what the regulatory agency was designed to do. Hopefully, Wayne, West Virginia, along with the federal government, will be able to clean up the waste into the water from other polluting companies. Otherwise, the people of Wayne, West Virginia, might not be able to continue living in their community. In such extraordinary circumstances, we must be good stewards over areas/places like Wayne, West Virginia — and our nation. Hence, there must a connection between environmental laws and government assistance. Of course, no amount of explaining to the contrary is needed when it comes to cleaning up our planet. Furthermore, such proactive actions might bring about positive changes — that is, while executing environmental plans to save the planet. Thus, the issue of our environment should not be a competition between *good* and *evil*. Or are we at a “tipping point?” In other words, humans must be observant, proactive, and willing to try different things in terms of approaches to reverse or eradicate “environmental” pollution entirely. Also, we must not *give up* on trying to solve the issues of “climate change” and global warming, like billionaire Bill Gates, a former (environmental) advocate, who is “quiet-quitting the fight against climate change” (Gongloff, 2025, p. 3). Why? What Gates is doing is not admirable, but conservatives, like columnist George Will (2025), are jubilantly cheering him on (p. 1D). To be abundantly clear, Gates is really a coward who is *unwilling* to do the hard work of real *environmentalists* — who are willing to go to the end of the earth — to save our planet from corporate greed and environmental contamination? After all, Bill Gates recently “circulated a memo criticizing the climate movement while shifting much of his money and focus back to public health — just four years after publishing the book, *How to Avoid a Climate Disaster*” (Graham, 2025, p. 8A) (Note 19). Additionally, why did he jump on the “climate change” *bandwagon* in the first place? Gates should have known better — that is, to give up the environmental fight, because as an unelected *global leader*, he could have influenced millions, rather than stick his head in the sand, to fix the ailing world around us — which is really a *no-brainer*. Uncertainty and questions remain about global warming and “climate change;” but washing our hands of these grave environmental matters is not the answer, either; though, we are not panicking yet. Furthermore, innovative technologies will not immediately solve our worsening climate crisis and other environmental problems. Although environmental pollution will not necessarily “rock our world” in a negative way, it might very well make things worse with *toxic* debris and man-made chemicals *everywhere* in our different ecosystems. Indeed, how can such environmental damage be good for us? And exactly what changed Bill Gates’ mind about supporting environmental issues, like “climate change” and global warming — that is, despite what he has recently announced about quitting the environmental movement?

To be honest, our federal government stands in the way of *environmentalists*, because they allow “federal agencies to limit the scope of their review of the [necessary] environmental impact of [specific] projects they regulate...” (“Utah, Salt Lake,” 2025, p. 4B). Of course, such (negative) government positions must stop immediately — that is, if we are to resolve some of the environmental issues presented in this work/paper. Besides, our government could create and use a system of “civil asset forfeiture” against corporations that illegally pollute our various environments, while they make a profit and commit other crimes against humanity. Indeed, when corporations violate the “rule of law,” they should face substantial penalties for their polluting activities, like with the oil and gas industries. And in this regard, we must be certain about what we are *willing* to do — and this include a serious effort to *clean up* polluted areas across our warming planet with an unflagging commitment. Finally, we must also ask: Will it be enough? Let us hope so, because we have *everything* to lose. In addition, we must broaden our awareness of all the environmental challenges, because “climate change” and global warming are not *unforeseen circumstances*. Furthermore, *environmentalists* even with their necessary, reasonable efforts and activities are continuously undermined by powerful business elites with a stake in polluting operations. To say the least, we need a new perspective about the environment around us. Meaning, we need a “whole-world” approach to tackling our chemically polluted environment. Unfortunately, what some of our elected officials have done or fail to do is *insufficient*. Perhaps many fettle-less politicians believe that focusing on our polluted environment is more of a *nuisance* than anything else — that is, rather than seeing it as a serious threat. Nevertheless, a cleaned environment or world will prove *safer* and more efficient in the long run, particularly in terms of providing green, renewable energy; and this approach is undeniably a *must* thing that we should do. Finally, the United States and other countries shouldn’t feel *off-balance* or uncertain about our environmental future — and the path forward; and with government laws and policies on the side of the American people, we can surely win the environmental fight. To be sure, ignoring “climate change,” toxic or chemical pollution, and *global warming* will have a profound, lethal affect for American citizens — and the world we live in — if we don’t take immediate action.

## References

- \$8 billion in clean energy projects in 16 states axed. (2025, October 2). *Las Vegas Sun* (p. 4A).
- Air pollution worsening in U.S. cities. (2018, May 11). *The Week* (p. 19).
- Akers, M. (2025, November 14). Boring Co. pays fine for illegal dumping. *Las Vegas Review-Journal* (p. 1).
- Ammonia gas leak affects hundreds. (2025, November 14). *Las Vegas Review-Journal*, The Associated Press (p. 6A).
- Bianco, W. T., & Canon, D. T. (2009). *American Politics Today*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company.
- Black, M. (2018, March 14). GOP is a threat to environment. *Las Vegas Sun* (p. 2).
- Burns et al. (2002). *Government by the People*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Calderon, I. (2025, October 14). Enforcing environmental violations drops to new low. *USA Today* (p. 3A).
- Cohen, L., Rouen, E., & Sachdeva, K. (2026, January 12). Companies are lying about damage done to environment. *USA Today* (p. 7A).
- Coleman, J. J., Goldstein, K.M., & Howell, W. G. *Understanding American Politics and Government*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New York: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Daly, M. (2025, November 18). EPA redefining scope of clean water law. *Las Vegas Review-Journal* (p. 2A).
- Debre, I., & Savarese, M. (2025, November 9). Climate summit hears from vulnerable nations. *Las Vegas Review-Journal* (p. 18A).
- Dye, T. R. (2007). *Politics in America*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New Jersey: Pearson Educations, Inc.
- Edwards, D. V., & Lippucci, A. (1998). *Practicing American Politics: An Introduction to Government*. New York: Worth Publishers.
- environment. (1994). In *The Cambridge Encyclopedia* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., p. 389). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- environmental law. (1999). In *Black’s Law Dictionary* (7<sup>th</sup> ed., p. 555). St. Paul, Minn: West Group.
- EPA pulls \$7B grant tied to solar projects for poor. (2025, August 8). *Las Vegas Review-Journal* (p. 4A).
- EPA to propose drinking water limit for perchlorate. (2025, January 6). *Las Vegas Review-Journal* (p. 4A).
- Exxon Mobil sues California over climate report laws. (2025, October 28). *Las Vegas Review-Journal* (p. 5B).
- Ginsberg et al. (2023). *We the People: An Introduction to American Politics*, 14<sup>th</sup> ed. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Ginsberg et al. (2025). *We the People: An Introduction to American Politics*, 15<sup>th</sup> ed. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

- Gitelson, A. R., Dudley, R. L., & Dubnick, M. J. (2016). *American Government: Myths and Realities*, election ed. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gomes, J. (2024, August 16). Rocket fuel chemicals may be found in food. *USA Today* (p. 6A).
- Gongloff, M. (2025, November 8). Gates is wrong to quiet-quit the climate fight. *Las Vegas Sun* (p. 3).
- Government website on climate change goes dark. (2025, July 15). *Las Vegas Review-Journal* (p. 3A).
- Graham, T. (2025, January 22). Perpetual climate panic machine collapses. *Las Vegas Review-Journal* (p. 8A).
- Greenberg, E. S., & Page, B. I. (2003). *The Struggle for Democracy*, 6<sup>th</sup> ed. New York: Addison-Wesley Educational Publishers, Inc.
- Halaly, A. (2025, November 17). Drinking water unaffected by illegal dumping. *Las Vegas Review-Journal* (p. 4B).
- Hincks, J. (2018, July 9). The Clouds Over City Life. *Time* (p. 48).
- Illegal dumping agreement with Houston withdrawn. (2025, December 10). *Las Vegas Review-Journal* (p. 4A).
- Janda et al. (2022). *The Challenge of Democracy: American Government in Global Politics*, 15<sup>th</sup> ed. Boston, Mass: Gengage.
- Joselow, M. (2026, January 13). EPA to stop considering lives saved when setting rules on air pollution. *Las Vegas Sun* (p. 1).
- Kentucky, Frankfort. (2025, September 30). *USA Today*, News from across the USA (p. 4B).
- Kerbel, M. R. (2024). *American Government: Your Voice, Your Future*, 7<sup>th</sup> ed. United States: Academic Media Solutions.
- King, J., & Leovy, J. (2018, May 20). A market-oriented answer to climate change. *Las Vegas Review-Journal* (p. 3E).
- Leovy, J. (2018, May 24). Climate change merits attention. *Las Vegas Sun* (p. 2).
- Lomborg, B. (2023, April/May). Thinking Smartly About Climate Change. *Imprimis*, vol. 52, no. 4/5 (p. 3).
- Magstadt, T. M. (2006). *Understanding Politics: Ideas, Institutions, & Issues*, 7<sup>th</sup> ed. Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadworth.
- McKibben, B. (2025, July 20). The White House's War on Clean Energy Will Fail. *The New York Times* (p. 4).
- McKinley, J. (2023, September 17). Biggest Landfill in the State Could Get Even Bigger. *The New York Times* (p. 34).
- Meigs, J. B. (2010, February). The Muth of Clean Coal. *Popular Mechanics* (p. 50).
- Mingst, K. A., & McKibben, H. E. (2021). *Essentials of International Relations*, 9<sup>th</sup> ed. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Ohio, Columbus. (2026, January 19). *USA Today*, News from across the USA (p. 4B).
- Paul, S. (2014, May 26). Environmental law seems more divisive than ever. *Las Vegas Sun* (p. 3).
- Pennsylvania, York. (2025, July 24). *USA Today*, News from across the USA (p. 4B).
- Plan readied to roll back environmental regulations. (2025, January 8). *Las Vegas Review-Journal* (p. 4).
- Pressey, M. C. H. (2021, November). The Frontline Victims of Climate Change. *Sojourners* (p. 21).
- Ransom, R. (2025, November 25). What surviving really looks like. *Las Vegas Sun* (p. 2).
- Rourke, J. T. (2011). *America's Politics: In a Diverse Globalizing World*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Sewage pipe rupture sends wastewater into Potomac. (2026, January 25). *Las Vegas Review-Journal* (p. 6A).
- Surico, J., & Underwood, N. (2025, December 28). The Future of New York: Climate. *The New York Times* (p. 4).
- urban climate. (2000). In *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Encyclopedia* (p. 1676). Mass: Merriam-Webster, Inc.
- Utah, Salt Lake City. (2025, June 2). *USA Today*, News from across the USA (p. 4B).
- water pollution. (2000). In *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Encyclopedia* (pp. 1726-1727). Mass: Merriam-Webster, Inc.
- West Virginia, Wayne. (2026, January 27). *USA Today*, News from across the USA (p. 4B).
- Why hide the benefits of clean air? (2026, February 6). *Las Vegas Sun* (p. 2).
- Will, G. (2025, November 9). Bill Gates' climate rethinking is a gift to the world. *Las Vegas Review-Journal* (p. 1D).
- Zhou, A. (2025, October 5). Washington state loses more than \$1B in federal funding for clean energy projects. *Las Vegas Review-Journal* (p. 5B).
- Zraick, K., & Friedman, L. (2025, October 26). E.P.A. Plan to Kill Climate Rule Worries businesses. *The New York Times* (p. 26).

## Notes

Note 1. It is not hard to imagine how people can or will be negatively affected by “climate change” and global warming. According to journalist Saran Jaffe, however, “Climate chaos will [certainly] displace more people, [particularly] after climate disasters.” Of course, “Some of them [people] have already been displaced by climate change,” because of “heat, fires, and floods.” See Jafee, S. (2023, August/September). The intersection of climate crises and a broken immigration system. *The Progressive* (p. 19).

Note 2. Apparently, Exxon Mobil states in its complaint that “it has for years publicly disclosed its greenhouse gas emissions and climate-related business risks, but it fundamentally disagrees with the states’ new reporting requirements.” See the same reference and page number. More importantly, can we really trust *Exxon Mobil’s* accurate reporting of their emissions — that is, without government oversight? Probably not.

Note 3. Around the world, “a majority of people agree that global climate change is a major threat to their country.” See the same reference and page number.

Note 4. It should be noted that “EPA establishes and enforces comprehensive and complex standards for thousands of substances in the environment.” See the same reference and page number.

Note 5. As Joselow goes on to write: This unexpected shift “runs counter to the EPA’s mission statement, which says the agency’s core responsibility is to protect human health and the environment.” See the same reference and page number. In an editorial that originally appeared in *Bloomberg Opinion* in 2026, “the environmental protection decision to stop quantifying the health benefits of regulating soot and ozone is a victory for polluters and a loss for the public.” In other words, “Masking the benefits will make it easier for the EPA to defend lax regulations on toxic emissions but harder to make America healthy again.” This is to say that “More people will get sick and die, and the EPA will bear some of the blame.” See Why hide the benefits of clean air? (2026, February 6). *Las Vegas Sun* (p. 2).

Note 6. We must also consider the owner(s) of the Texas-based *Waste Connections*, which is “seeking approval to operate [the landfill] until 2040, as part of a large-scale project to fill a 47-acre “valley” between two of the site’s gigantic mounds with more trash, [and] even as the site [will run] out of permitted space.” What might be the long term damage to the place? See the same reference and page number.

Note 7. It should be noted that “Anhydrous ammonia is used as a farm fertilizer to help corn and wheat grow. The colorless gas has a suffocating odor and can be deadly, especially at high concentrations, or causes breathing problems and burns the skin and eyes.” See the same reference and page number.

Note 8. Bear in mind that “The new law, the *National Environmental Policy Act*, was the first of several to dramatically expand the role of the federal government in protecting the environment.” See the same reference and page number.

Note 9. In regard to this matter, “Researchers focuses on the two most common outdoor air pollutants: ozone and particles. Ozone is an odorless toxic gas that occurs naturally in the upper atmosphere, but it can also form at ground level when industrial pollutants react with heat and sunlight. Particle pollution includes dust, fumes, soot, smoke, and aerosols.” See the same reference and page number.

Note 10. It should be noted here that in 2026, “A massive pipe that moves millions of [tons of] sewage... ruptured and sent wastewater flowing into the Potomac River northwest of Washington, D.C., polluting it...” Furthermore, “it’s not clear exactly how much has spilled into the river since the overflow began.” See Sewage pipe rupture sends wastewater into Potomac. (2026, January 25). *Las Vegas Review-Journal* (p. 6A).

Note 11. According to the Department of Toxic Substances Control, *perchlorate* “is naturally occurring and man-made, but it is being found more often in groundwater.” See the same reference and page number.

Note 12. To defend Musk’s poisoning [of] the drinking water in Las Vegas, Southern Nevada officials tell us that we have nothing to worry about from the illegal dumping of “toxic chemicals into [our] manholes.” See Halaly, A. (2025, November 17). Drinking water unaffected by illegal dumping. *Las Vegas Review-Journal* (p. 4B).

Note 13. As a way of fighting back, an environmental group in Pennsylvania “has sued a salvage yard for allegedly illegally discharging pollutants into Codorus Creek.” And this action has been much to the chagrin of J&K Salvage. See Pennsylvania, York. (2025, July 24). *USA Today*, News from across the USA (p. 4B).

Note 14. *Environmentalists* have warned that “it has become almost impossible to keep *global warming* below the key Paris Agreement benchmark of 2.7 Fahrenheit.” See Debre, I., & Savarese, M. (2025, November 9). Climate summit hears from vulnerable nations. *Las Vegas Review-Journal* (p. 18A).

Note 15. It should be noted that “the United States [supposedly] supports various international efforts to protect the environment,” which includes *The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change*, “an international agreement to study and ameliorate harmful changes in the global environment, and the Montreal Protocol, an agreement by over 150 countries to limit the production of substances potentially harmful to the world’s ozone layer.” See the same reference and page number.

Note 16. It should be pointed out that “Hydrogen is a colorless, flammable gas that does not emit carbon or other greenhouse gases when combusted. Currently, it is used for producing fertilizer and refining petroleum, though advocates of the [clean energy] say it could be used to replace natural gas to heat building or power long-haul trucks or ships through hydrogen fuel cells, among other uses.” See the same reference and page number.

Note 17. The “nut of the clean-coal sales pitch is that we can also bottle up the CO<sub>2</sub> produced when coal is burned, most likely by burying it deep in the earth. That may be possible in theory, but it’s devilishly difficult in practice” and possibly dangerous. See the same reference, pp. 50-51.

Note 18. “The [climate] rule, known as the “endangerment finding,” is the conclusion by the E.P.A.,” which is opposed by the Republican agenda that “is all about opening more public land to oil, gas and mining development.” See Black, M. (2018, March 14). GOP is a threat to environment. *Las Vegas Sun* (p. 2). Nevertheless, such activities that produce “greenhouse gases endanger public health and therefore must be regulated by the federal government.” See Zraick, K., & Friedman, L. (2025, October 26). E.P.A. Plan to Kill Climate Rule Worries businesses. *The New York Time* (p. 26).

Note 19. Accordingly, some believe that “humanity will survive climate change regardless of whether we take strong action to mitigate its worst effect.” See Ransom, R. (2025, November 25). What surviving really looks like. *Las Vegas Sun* (p. 2).

## BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

EARNEST N. BRACEY is a retired Army Lieutenant Colonel, with over twenty years of active military service. He was commissioned through Reserve Officer Training (*Distinguished Military Graduate*) at Jackson State University, where he graduated with honors (*Magna Cum Laude*), and received his Bachelor of Arts degree in political science in 1974. In addition, he received the Master of Public Administration in 1979 from Golden Gate University, his Master of Arts degree in International Affairs in 1983 from the Catholic University of America, his Master of Business Administration in 2009 from California Coast University, and his Doctor of Public Administration (with emphasis in Public Policy) in 1993 from George Mason University. Dr. Bracey also earned his Ph.D. in Education from Capella University in 1999.

A recipient of numerous military awards and civilian honors, he is also a graduate of the United States Naval War College and the Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, and previously served as Director of Administration at the prestigious Industrial College of the Armed Forces, Washington, D.C. He was also recognized as Who's Who Among America's Teachers in 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, and 2006. Additionally, Dr. Bracey completed the *Graduate Management Development Program* at Harvard University in 2006. Dr. Bracey was initiated into *Pi Sigma Alpha National Political Science Honor Society* in 2006.

Dr. Bracey is professor of political science and currently teaches American Politics and Black American History at the College of Southern Nevada in Las Vegas. He was formerly Chair and Professor of Political Science at Jackson State University and Chairperson of the Political Science and History Department at Hampton University. He has also served as an editorial board-member for the Nevada Historical Society Quarterly. His work has appeared in professional journals and other publications, and he is the author of the books, *Prophetic Insights: The Higher Education and Pedagogy of African Americans*, University Press of America, 1999, *On Racism: Essays On Black Popular Culture, African American Politics, and the New Black Aesthetics*, University Press of America, 2003, *Daniel "Chappie" James: The First African American Four Star General*, McFarland & Company, Inc., 2003, *Places in Political Time: Voices From the Black Diaspora*, University Press of America, 2005, *The Moulin Rouge and Black Rights in Las Vegas*, McFarland & Company, Inc., 2009, and *Miles Davis and Jazz as Religion*, Lexington Books, 2021. He also co-authored the book, *American Politics and Culture Wars* (2001). He is also the author of the novels, *Choson* (1994) and *The Black Samurai* (1998), and the books of short stories, *Requiem for Black Folks* (2002) and *The Big Black Three* (2022).