I value morality. The nature of laws implies we must look to the united will. Ripstein:[[1]](#footnote--1)

All people have the right to act for themselves. Kant argues that provision for the poor follows directly from the very idea of a united will. He remarks that the idea of a united lawgiving will requires that citizens regard the state as existing in perpetuity. By this he does not mean to impose an absurd requirement that people live forever,or even the weaker one that it must sustain an adequate population, or make sure that all of its members survive. The state does need to maintain its material preconditions, and as we saw in Chapter 7, this need generates its entitlement to “administer the state’s economy and finance.The state’s existence in perpetuity, however, is presented as a pure normative requirement, grounded in its ability to speak and act for everyone. That ability must be able to survive changes in the state’s membership. You are the same person you were a year ago because your normative principle of organization has stayed the same through changes in the matter making you up. As a being entitled to set and pursue your own purposes, you decide what your continuing body will do. That is why your deeds can be imputed to you even after every molecule in your body has changed, and even if you have forgotten what you did. The unity of your agency is created by the normative principle that makes your actions imputable to you. In the same way, the state must sustain its basic normative principle of organization through time, even as some members die or move away and new ones are born or move in. As we saw in Chapter 7, its unifying principle—“in terms of which alone we can think of the legitimacy of the state”—is the idea of the original contract, through which people are bound by laws they have given themselves through public institutions. The state must have the structure that is required in order for everyone to be bound by it, so that it can legitimately claim to speak and act for all across time. The requirement of unity across time is clear in the cases of legislation by officials: if the official’s decision were only binding while [Obama] a particular human being held office, a citizen [could] would be entitled to regard laws as void once [Obama left] the official’s term ended. Because each person is master of him- or herself, one person is only bound by the authority of another through the idea of a united will. [sustains the legitimacy of] So the idea of a united will presupposes some manner in which it exists through time. Past legislation, like past agreement, can only bind those who come after if the structure through which laws are made is one that can bind everyone it governs.

Thus, the united will must look to universal reasons since that’s the only thing that everyone can accept and access at any given time whereas pleasure constantly conflicts. Thus, following universal reasons are the only way to explain the nature of laws and impute actions to “developing countries” and not specific leaders. Thus the standard is looking to universal reasons.

I contend the maxim of environmental protection is not universalizable. Patruti:[[2]](#footnote-0)

However, the so called “preventive” legislation – the laws which aim at preventing a future possibility of environmental damage – is by itself aggressive[11]. Most of the actual environmental laws fall into this “preventive” category, the following paragraph form the European Directiv0e 94/62/CE being extremely suggestive: “... in order, on the one hand, to prevent any impact thereof (packaging waste) on the environment or to reduce such impact, thus providing a high level of environmental protection... Whereas the best means of preventing the creation of packaging waste is to reduce the overall volume of packaging” It is clear that such a law institutionalizes aggression and hampers economic progress. Moreover, it we employ reductio ad absurdum, in order to prevent any impact of packaging waste on the environment, the only logical solution is to give up packaging altogether. Of course, the same logic can apply to all the other productive processes. In this case, it is obvious that environmental legislation represents a restrict[s]ion upon economic freedom. However, many economists (Block 2008, p. 45-60) consider that there is no reason to believe that economic freedom (the so called laissez-faire approach) and environmental protection should be two opposite concepts. Moreover, in their opinion, the free market is the most efficient mechanism for environment protection.

Thus it’s a contradiction in thought. You can’t conceive of a world where all acts that harm the environment are stopped since everything harms the earth, even breathing, which emits CO2. Even environmental protection hurts the environment.
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