

Reduce pollution would be more moral essay

[Finance](#)



There are many kinds of indoor and outdoor pollution, including photochemical smog, acid rain, and second hand smoke. Air pollution threatens the health of our flora and fauna as well as human health. The impact of these kinds of pollution results in such conditions as the development of diseases like cancer and environmental and human threats such as ozone layer depletion. Reducing pollution without worrying about the costs will be more moral because the whole planet will benefit from it. Air Pollution have adverse effects on human health .

It has been that target of some of the most complicated legislation ever discussed. In 1970, the United States Congress passed legislation aimed at curbing sources of air pollution and setting standards for air quality. One of the strongest weapons against industrial pollution that many factories are currently using to combat air pollution is a scrubber. A scrubber is a series of filters placed in smoke stacks and other points of industrial emissions to try and filter out many of the contaminants that tend to be released into the atmosphere.

In addition to factory emissions, auto emission pollutants have also been reduced by the use of a tool that has been around for quite some time, the catalytic converter. Catalytic converters have been proven to be very beneficial in reducing the amount of harmful gases released into the atmosphere. In addition to the recycling of various wastes into new products, another topic that is of great interest to environmentalists is alternative or renewable power sources. Some of Nature's cleanest power sources are solar energy, wind energy, hydropower, and geothermal energy.

Solar devices now exist that are capable of supplying all the energy needs of a residence, including electricity, water and space heating, and space cooling. It was not until the 1940s and 1950s that governments began to form policies designed to maintain air quality. Large scale air pollution disasters in Europe and the U.

S. convinced officials that air pollution was potentially fatal to humans and perhaps even the planet itself. One of these disasters was known as the okiller fogo in Denora, Pennsylvania, that killed 50, and a much more virulent ofogo in London in 1952 that resulted in the deaths of 4, 000 people (Rising, 1998-99, 1). Since that time attempts at combating air pollution have been challenged by increasing industrialism the world over. Many government efforts have been made to reduce other forms of air pollution like photochemical smog.

Many of these efforts have fallen far short of targets. For example, in some of Chinese cities, particulate levels are more than six times higher than World Health Organization Guidelines (Rising, 1998-99, 1). Reducing pollution produces measurable health gains, according to a new study that found cleaner air had lengthened life expectancy by five months in 51 U. S. cities. Researchers at Brigham Young University and Harvard School of Public Health found that average life expectancy increased by three years between 1980 and 2000 in those cities, and that approximately five months of that gain owed to cleaner air. Such a significant increase in life expectancy attributable to reducing air pollution is remarkable," said C.

Arden Pope III, a BYU epidemiologist and lead author on the study, published in the New England Journal of Medicine. Countries in poorer parts of the world like China and India are demanding that wealthier regions like the European Union and North America finance their efforts at developing clean energy technologies and help them adapt to the effects of climate change caused largely by accumulated emissions from the industrialized West. Money to finance these efforts is seen as a precondition for reaching an agreement at United Nations climate talks in Copenhagen in December, when nations gather to hammer out a successor treaty to the Kyoto Protocol. European finance ministers meeting over lunch in Luxembourg on Tuesday are expected to discuss the thorny question of what would represent a fair amount, according to diplomats.

Indeed, some of the numbers on the table are substantial. In one of the possibilities that is expected to be discussed by European ministers on Tuesday, more affluent countries would pay developing countries more than \$140 billion each year. Nations all over the world should work together to fight pollution. Whatever the costs are at the end everyone will profit the clean air and enjoy the good healthy. Unlike our ancestors who left the planet full of wars and nuclear arms we should give our descendents a better planet because they also have the right to enjoy their life like everyone else did. So let's give them that opportunity.

.