Negation Essay

Student Name

Institutional Affiliation

Due Date

Introduction

The proposition: “The United States federal government should substantially increase its protection of water resources in the United States by fully funding a program to remove harmful pollutants from drinking water” should not be adopted. In this paper, I will be refining my position on this proposition by providing evidence-based reasons as to why the proposition should not be adopted. First, removing harmful pollutants from water is a way of making drinking water safe for use but not protecting water sources from pollutants. In my discussion, I will include both disagreeing and agreeing points to this proposition, a discussion of the claim using the 4-step process of declarative refutation, a response to my affirmation essay, and the additional cost of the affirmation.

This proposition should not be adopted because it is more about making drinking water safe than protecting water sources from pollutants. As per the proposition, the current water in a particular resource will be safe for drinking, free from harmful pollutants but the resource will

not have been protected from future pollutants. This proposition can therefore be an ineffective method to solve the issue. It can also be a waste of resources and funds because its benefits will be minimal compared to the funds used for the program. However, the proposition is only ineffective in the case of long-term protection of water resources from pollutants but it also offers a short-term solution of making the current water for the resource safe for drinking.

A discussion of the proposition from the perspective of the 4-step process of declarative refutation will include identification of the claim, my counterclaim, justification of my counterclaim, and a summary of the importance of my claim. Therefore, the claim I am responding to is that the proposition, "United States federal government should substantially increase its protection of water resources in the United States by fully funding a program to remove harmful pollutants from drinking water". My counterclaim to this claim is that it should not be adopted because it is not an effective method of protecting water resources from pollutants but rather a method of making drinking water safe.

My claim gets a justification from different researches which have provided the best and effective methods of protecting water sources from pollutants. The Environmental Protection Agency of the United States under water resource protection provides different methods of protecting water sources. These include general water source protection practices, source-specific water source protection practices, tools for clean water Act for protection of water sources, and Clean Water Act (Ivey et al. 194).

The general practices for protecting water sources include land use controls, regulations, land conservation, public outreach and education, financial and cost-share programs, mitigation of hazard, and best management habits. The source-specific protection practices include crop and

animal agriculture, forestry, septic systems, storage tanks for chemical be installed below and above earth reservoir tanks, good handling of industrial wastewater, and safeguarding abandoned mines. The Clean Water Act Tools include Water Quality Standards, the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, and Impaired Waters and Total Maximum Daily Loads. The Clean Water Act provides opportunities for protecting water used for drinking and advancing water catchment goals from the resource to the receiver.

The practices provided by the Environmental Protection Agency of the United States are more effective to protect water source pollution than the claim in the proposition. The practices are also not costly as the program proposed in the proposition and are also practicable whereby water resource protection has been taken as a collective responsibility for individuals, the community, and the government.

After conducting research and attaining knowledge on how to save water pollution from the United States Environmental Protection Agency, I tend to disagree with my affirmation essay on how we should save water pollution by funding government programs in saving water. This is because saving water programs include policies and activities of managing natural sources of water to ensure that the current and future demands are met to avoid scarcity (Young, 2013). These do not include policies and activities for saving water pollution such as the ones provided by the United States Environmental Protection Agency. Therefore, natural water will be managed and water will be available but will not be protected from pollution. The methods of saving water do not guarantee it to be free from pollution.

This affirmation is disadvantageous because the cost of funding for the programs outweighs the advantages of the affirmative. The programs may have few or even advantages at

all. When saving water, different equipment and appliances are used. These appliances and equipment might be protected from pollutants and may end up contaminating the water. The only advantage of saving water programs is meeting the current and future demand but none in saving water pollution yet the funding costs for the programs are high.

Conclusion

"The United States federal government should substantially increase its protection of water resources in the United States by fully funding a program to remove harmful pollutants from drinking water" is a proposition that should not be adopted. This is because the proposition focuses more on purifying drinking water to make it safe than protecting the water resources from pollutants the United States Environmental Protection Agency provides best practices of how to protect water resources from pollution. My affirmative on how we should save water pollution by funding government programs in saving water should also not be adopted because it is more of managing water to avoid its scarcity than protecting the source of the water. The cost of both the proposition and the affirmative outweigh their advantages.

References

Ivey, J. L., R. C. De Loe, and R. D. Kreutzwiser. "Planning for source water protection in Ontario." *Applied Geography* 26.3-4 (2006): 192-209..

Young, Rachel. "Saving Water and Energy Together: Helping Utilities Build Better Programs." American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy, 2013.