

Legislating Tomorrow's Weather: The Paradox of Preventive Environmental Law

Amuthini J, Balabharathi Muthamilselvan

Abstract

Environmental law confronts a fundamental temporal paradox: legal systems historically designed to respond to demonstrable past injury are now being asked to prevent harms that exist only in scientific projections, climate models, and probabilistic forecasts. This paper examines the structural tensions that arise when law attempts to regulate across time — addressing harms not yet materialized, assigning liability for conduct whose consequences may not manifest for decades, and protecting victims not yet born. Through doctrinal analysis of standing, causation, burden of proof, and valuation, the paper identifies the core paradoxes that plague preventive environmental regulation. It further explores regulatory innovations — carbon pricing, rights of nature, climate litigation, and intergenerational standing — as imperfect but evolving responses to these tensions. The paper concludes that the paradox cannot be dissolved; it can only be navigated through institutional creativity, revised legal standards, and a collective willingness to act before absolute certainty arrives.

Keywords: Preventive environmental law, intergenerational equity, precautionary principle, climate litigation, standing doctrine, temporal paradox, causation, rights of nature.

1. Introduction

Law, in its traditional conception, is retrospective. It looks backward — at what was done, what harm resulted, who caused it, and what remedy is owed. Tort law, criminal law, and contract law are all premised on events that have already occurred. A factory discharges pollutants into a river; fish die; communities fall ill; courts assess evidence, establish causation, and assign liability. The sequence is familiar, the logic intuitive, and the evidentiary foundation solid.¹

Preventive environmental law breaks this sequence entirely. It demands that legal systems look forward — at what might happen, what harm could result, and what restrictions are warranted today to prevent consequences that may materialize only decades hence. Carbon emissions released this year may contribute to catastrophic flooding in 2070. Microplastics accumulating in ocean ecosystems now may trigger irreversible ecological disruption long before any court is asked to assess their legality. The legal system is asked to act before harm crystallizes, before evidence becomes irrefutable, and — most critically — before the moment for prevention has passed.²

This temporal paradox is not merely theoretical. It shapes every dimension of environmental regulation: who can sue and when, what evidence is required, how causation is traced across decades and billions of actors, and how future harms are weighed against present economic interests. It determines whether climate legislation survives political challenge, whether regulatory agencies can act boldly or must wait

for certainty that arrives too late, and whether courts will entertain claims brought on behalf of people not yet born.³

This paper maps the contours of that paradox, examines the legal doctrines it strains, surveys the institutional innovations it has prompted, and reflects on what it demands of the relationship between law, democracy, and time. The stakes could not be higher. Environmental harm at planetary scale is not merely a policy failure — it is a failure of legal imagination, institutional design, and collective will. Understanding why law struggles with prevention is the necessary first step toward building legal systems adequate to the challenge.⁴

2. PROBLEM STATEMENT

The central problem this paper addresses is the structural incompatibility between traditional legal architecture and the demands of preventive environmental governance. This incompatibility is not accidental. It flows directly from the foundational assumptions embedded in legal systems over centuries of development in contexts where harm was visible, immediate, traceable, and reversible. Environmental harm at scale possesses none of these characteristics, and the resulting mismatch is deep and systemic.⁵

The first dimension of this incompatibility is the evidentiary problem. Legal systems require evidence of harm to justify intervention. But the defining characteristic of serious environmental harm is that, by the time evidence becomes irrefutable, prevention is no longer possible. Climate tipping points, once crossed, cannot be uncrossed by judicial order. Species rendered extinct cannot be restored by legislative act. The ocean, once acidified beyond critical thresholds, does not respond to a court injunction. Waiting for certainty is, in the environmental context, tantamount to choosing not to prevent.⁶

The second dimension is the standing and causation problem. Courts require plaintiffs to demonstrate injury-in-fact — a concrete, particularized, actual or imminent harm — and to establish that the defendant's conduct caused that harm. Yet preventive environmental law necessarily involves seeking to prevent harms that have not yet occurred. Causation, meanwhile, is fundamentally collective: climate change results from the aggregate of billions of decisions across centuries, and no single emitter can be identified as the unilateral cause of any specific harm. Traditional legal tools designed to trace discrete acts to discrete harms are inadequate for diffuse, cumulative, multigenerational damage.⁷

The third dimension is the democratic and valuation problem. Preventive environmental regulation requires present generations to bear costs for the benefit of future generations who cannot vote, cannot lobby, and cannot participate in the political processes that determine their fate. Cost-benefit analysis compounds this by applying discount rates that make even catastrophic long-run harms appear trivially small in present-value terms. Democratic systems are structurally inclined to underweight the interests of those not yet born, and the analytical frameworks they use reinforce rather than correct that bias.⁸

3. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

1. To analyze the structural tensions between traditional legal doctrine and preventive environmental regulation.

2. To survey and evaluate the regulatory and institutional innovations that have emerged in response to the preventive paradox.
3. To examine climate litigation as a judicial mechanism for compelling preventive environmental action.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This paper employs a qualitative, doctrinal-analytical methodology situated within the broader tradition of socio-legal scholarship, drawing on three complementary approaches that collectively address the legal, comparative, and interdisciplinary dimensions of the preventive environmental law paradox.

Doctrinal Analysis forms the primary methodology — a systematic examination of legal rules, principles, cases, and statutes governing preventive environmental regulation. The paper analyzes judicial decisions from multiple jurisdictions, including *Juliana v. United States*, *Milieudefensie v. Royal Dutch Shell*, *Urgenda Foundation v. State of the Netherlands*, and *West Virginia v. EPA*, to trace how courts have grappled with the temporal paradox in concrete legal contexts.¹² Statutory frameworks including the National Environmental Policy Act, the Clean Air Act, the Paris Agreement, and Ecuador's constitutional rights of nature provisions are examined to understand how legislative bodies have institutionalized preventive obligations and where those efforts have succeeded or fallen short.¹³

Comparative Legal Analysis draws on legal developments across the United States, the European Union, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Colombia, Wales, and international frameworks to identify patterns in how different legal systems have responded to shared structural challenges. Comparative analysis serves two purposes: first, it illuminates the range of possible legal responses, demonstrating that constraints limiting preventive regulation in one system are not universal; and second, it identifies common structural constraints that appear across diverse systems, suggesting that some obstacles to preventive environmental law require correspondingly structural solutions.¹⁴

Interdisciplinary Engagement integrates insights from economics, political philosophy, and behavioral science to address dimensions of the preventive paradox that legal doctrine alone cannot illuminate. From economics, the paper draws on debates about discount rates, the social cost of carbon, and the limits of cost-benefit analysis as applied to long-run environmental harm.¹⁵ From political philosophy, it engages with theories of intergenerational justice developed by Rawls and Weiss.¹⁶ From behavioral economics, it draws on findings about temporal discounting and present bias, analyzing how cognitive tendencies toward undervaluing future harms shape collective political choices in ways that systematically undermine preventive regulation.¹⁷

5. DOCTRINAL ANALYSIS: THE CORE PARADOXES

A. The Burden of Proof and the Precautionary Principle

Traditional legal epistemology is backward-looking. The evidentiary standards legal systems have developed — proof beyond reasonable doubt in criminal law, preponderance of evidence in civil litigation — are calibrated to assessment of past events, not probabilistic forecasts of future ones. Preventive

environmental law requires a fundamentally different epistemological posture. It must act on probabilities, on models, on scientific consensus about trajectories rather than documented outcomes. And it must act before evidence becomes overwhelming, because once it does, prevention may no longer be possible.¹⁸

The precautionary principle represents the most significant doctrinal response to this dilemma. Articulated in Principle 15 of the 1992 Rio Declaration, it holds that where there are threats of serious or irreversible damage, lack of full scientific certainty shall not be used as a reason for postponing cost-effective preventive measures.¹⁹ In essence, it inverts the default: rather than requiring proof that an activity will cause harm before it can be regulated, it permits — and in strong formulations requires — restriction of activities unless and until they can be shown to be safe. This inversion is jurisprudentially radical. It shifts the burden of proof from regulators to regulated parties, authorizes action on the basis of risk rather than demonstrated harm, and directly challenges the embedded legal intuition that restriction of liberty requires strong justification.²⁰

B. Standing, Causation, and the Limits of Traditional Doctrine

The standing paradox is among the most acute structural obstacles facing preventive environmental litigation. Article III of the U.S. Constitution, as interpreted by the Supreme Court, requires plaintiffs to demonstrate injury-in-fact, causation, and redressability — all three of which strain against preventive claims.²¹ The injury has not yet materialized; the causation chain runs through billions of actors and decades of accumulated decisions; and the remedy — compelled governmental action to alter climate trajectories — tests the outer boundaries of judicial power.

Juliana v. United States brought these tensions into sharp relief. Young plaintiffs argued that the federal government's systematic promotion of fossil fuel development violated their constitutional rights to life, liberty, and a climate system capable of sustaining human civilization. The District Court held that a fundamental right to a stable climate could be inferred from constitutional precedent. The Ninth Circuit reversed on standing grounds, holding that the remedy sought exceeded what courts are constitutionally empowered to provide — illustrating the structural bind at the heart of preventive environmental law: recognized harm, inadequate remedy, and a judicial architecture that cannot bridge the gap.²²

On causation, the traditional "but for" test presupposes a direct relationship between a discrete act and a discrete harm — a presupposition that fails comprehensively when applied to systemic environmental damage. Courts and scholars have proposed modifications including market share liability, probabilistic causation, and enterprise liability, each representing a doctrinal adaptation to collective causation. None has achieved broad judicial acceptance in the climate context, leaving a fundamental gap between the theory of environmental responsibility and the legal tools available to enforce it.²³

C. The Valuation Challenge and Discount Rate Controversy

Cost-benefit analysis requires that future harms be assigned present monetary values. Standard discount rates — typically between three and seven percent in U.S. regulatory practice — make harms occurring fifty or a hundred years from now appear trivially small in present-value terms, systematically recommending inaction on long-run environmental risks. The Stern Review challenged this methodology directly, arguing that standard discount rates reflect ethically indefensible assumptions about the relative worth of present and future persons and that the appropriate social discount rate for climate analysis should

approach zero.²⁴ The ensuing debate between Stern and economists such as Nordhaus revealed that what appear to be technical choices about discount rates are in fact moral choices about intergenerational ethics — choices embedded in regulatory analysis without acknowledging their normative character, quietly determining whose interests count and across what time horizon.²⁵

6. REGULATORY INNOVATIONS: FINDINGS

A. Carbon Pricing and Market Mechanisms

Carbon pricing schemes represent perhaps the most economically coherent legislative response to the temporal paradox of environmental harm. By assigning a present monetary cost to future environmental damage, they force present actors to internalize costs they would otherwise externalize onto future generations and make the consequences of current emissions decisions visible in real-time market transactions.²⁶ The European Union Emissions Trading System, the world's largest such mechanism, demonstrates both the promise and the political difficulty of market-based preventive regulation. Initially undermined by overallocation of permits that drove carbon prices too low to incentivize meaningful behavioral change, the system was progressively reformed through tighter caps, the introduction of a market stability reserve, and the phasing out of free allowances — illustrating the broader pattern that preventive environmental regulation tends to begin inadequately and improve only as evidence of inadequacy accumulates.²⁷

B. Environmental Impact Assessment

Environmental Impact Assessment embeds preventive logic into governmental decision-making by requiring consideration of future environmental consequences before major projects are approved. The National Environmental Policy Act, enacted in 1969, was among the first legislative instruments to require federal agencies to systematically analyze the environmental consequences of proposed actions, including long-term, cumulative, and indirect effects.²⁸ Its significance lies not primarily in its substantive requirements but in its procedural architecture: by forcing consideration of future consequences at the planning stage, before commitments are made and interests entrenched, it creates an institutional opportunity for prevention that post-hoc legal remedies cannot replicate.²⁹

C. Rights of Nature and Legal Personhood

Among the most conceptually radical innovations in contemporary environmental law is the extension of legal personhood to natural entities — rivers, forests, and ecosystems — enabling them to hold rights and be represented in legal proceedings independently of any human injury. Ecuador's 2008 constitution, the first to recognize the rights of nature as such, grants Pachamama the right to exist, be maintained, and regenerate its vital cycles. New Zealand's 2017 legislation granting legal personhood to the Whanganui River established human guardians to represent its legal interests.³⁰ Colombia's Supreme Court, ruling in 2018, recognized the Colombian Amazon as a subject of rights and ordered the government to halt deforestation — directly linking legal personhood to preventive environmental obligation.³¹

D. Climate Litigation as Preventive Mechanism

The explosion of climate litigation — over 2,000 cases filed globally as of 2023 — represents a significant attempt to use judicial mechanisms to compel preventive action that legislative and executive institutions have been unable or unwilling to take.³² *Urgenda Foundation v. State of the Netherlands*, decided by the Dutch Supreme Court in 2019, held that the Netherlands was legally required under human rights law to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by at least 25% by the end of 2020, grounding the obligation in the state's duty to protect its citizens from foreseeable climate risks.³³ *Milieudefensie v. Royal Dutch Shell*, decided by a Dutch district court in 2021, extended this logic to corporate actors, ordering Shell to reduce its global carbon emissions by 45% by 2030 relative to 2019 levels — the most significant judicial imposition of a preventive emissions obligation on a private corporation in legal history.³⁴

E. The Democratic Deficit and Institutional Responses

The democratic deficit created by intergenerational environmental governance has prompted institutional innovation designed to give future interests some political voice. Wales's Well-being of Future Generations Act 2015 established a Future Generations Commissioner empowered to review governmental decisions that fail to account adequately for long-term sustainability.³⁵ Finland's Committee for the Future, a permanent parliamentary committee assessing long-term policy consequences, represents a legislative mechanism for incorporating future-oriented analysis into democratic deliberation. These institutional experiments vary in their powers and demonstrated effectiveness, but their proliferation signals a growing recognition that institutional design must be reimagined if democratic governance is to take intergenerational obligation seriously.³⁶

7. THE FEDERALISM FRACTURE AND INTERNATIONAL COORDINATION FAILURE

Preventive environmental law faces a geographic mismatch that compounds its temporal paradox: environmental harm operates at planetary scale while legal authority remains stubbornly national and sub-national. No single jurisdiction can prevent climate change unilaterally. No domestic court can order the global emissions reductions that scientific evidence indicates are necessary.³⁷

In the United States, the oscillation between the Obama administration's Clean Power Plan, the Trump administration's Affordable Clean Energy Rule, and subsequent regulatory reversals illustrates the structural vulnerability of federal environmental regulation to political change.³⁸ The Supreme Court's 2022 decision in *West Virginia v. EPA*, applying the major questions doctrine to constrain EPA's authority over economy-wide emissions reductions, further limited federal regulatory capacity precisely when expanded prevention was most urgently needed.³⁹

Internationally, the Paris Agreement reflects the limits of what voluntary cooperation can achieve. Its nationally determined contributions architecture leaves emissions reduction targets entirely to each country's discretion, with no binding enforcement mechanism and no legal consequence for inadequate ambition or non-compliance.⁴⁰ The result is a framework that acknowledges the global nature of the problem while leaving its solution to national political processes that face the same structural obstacles — concentrated present costs, diffuse future benefits, underrepresented future generations — that beset domestic preventive regulation.

8. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

This paper's analysis yields five principal findings that collectively describe the state and trajectory of preventive environmental law.

Finding One: The temporal paradox is structural, not merely doctrinal. The difficulties that preventive environmental law faces in standing, causation, burden of proof, and valuation reflect genuine tensions between the architecture of legal systems designed to adjudicate past conduct and the requirements of preventing future harm at planetary scale. Doctrinal reform can ameliorate these tensions but cannot dissolve them.⁴¹

Finding Two: The precautionary principle is necessary but insufficient. It appropriately reorients the burden of justification in contexts of serious environmental risk, but its application remains contested, its scope undefined, and its relationship to cost-benefit analysis unresolved. Courts and regulators require more developed frameworks for operationalizing precautionary reasoning — frameworks that preserve proportionality while not demanding certainty as a condition of action.⁴²

Finding Three: Climate litigation is a significant but structurally limited force. The *Urgenda* and *Shell* decisions demonstrate that courts can impose meaningful preventive obligations on state and corporate actors, deriving them from general legal duties rather than specific environmental statutes. But litigation is reactive, case-specific, and dependent on receptive jurisdictions. It can supplement legislative and executive action; it cannot substitute for it.⁴³

Finding Four: Intergenerational institutional innovation is promising but underpowered. Institutions like Wales's Future Generations Commissioner represent genuine attempts to give legal weight to future interests, but they operate within political systems where present interests remain dominant and their recommendations are advisory rather than binding. Effective intergenerational governance ultimately requires constitutional entrenchment of future-oriented obligations or genuinely empowered institutions with authority to constrain present-oriented decision-making.⁴⁴

Finding Five: The enforcement gap remains the most practically significant obstacle. Even well-designed preventive environmental laws tend to be underenforced — through underfunded agencies, captured regulatory processes, inadequate penalties, and compliance schedules that permit continued damage while nominally working toward prevention. Strengthening enforcement through increased agency resources, enhanced corporate liability, and robust whistleblower protections may yield more immediate preventive benefit than further doctrinal innovation.⁴⁵

9. CONCLUSION

The paradox of preventive environmental law cannot be resolved — only managed. Legal systems evolved to judge the past must now shape the future. Frameworks built for individual accountability must address collective responsibility across generations. Standards designed for certainty must operate amid probability. The appropriate response to this irreducible tension is not paralysis but imagination — a willingness to adapt legal doctrine, redesign institutions, and reconfigure the relationship between present democratic majorities and the future generations whose world they are legislating. The weather of

tomorrow is being determined by the laws enacted today. Whether those laws prove adequate to the moment they are attempting to shape is among the most consequential legal questions of our time.

Footnotes

1. Richard J. Lazarus, *The Making of Environmental Law* 12–18 (Univ. of Chicago Press 2004).
2. Daniel A. Farber, *The Case for Climate Compensation: Justice for Climate Change Victims* 3–12 (Univ. of Utah Press 2008).
3. Cass R. Sunstein, *The Cost-Benefit Revolution* 7–15 (MIT Press 2018).
4. Richard J. Lazarus, *Super Wicked Problems and Climate Change: Restraining the Present to Liberate the Future*, 94 *Cornell L. Rev.* 1153, 1158–64 (2009).
5. Robert V. Percival et al., *Environmental Regulation: Law, Science, and Policy* 87–96 (8th ed., Wolters Kluwer 2018).
6. Joseph L. Sax, *Defending the Environment: A Handbook for Citizen Action* 55–70 (Alfred A. Knopf 1971).
7. David A. Grossman, *Tort-Based Climate Litigation*, in *Adjudicating Climate Change* 193, 210–18 (William C.G. Burns & Hari M. Osofsky eds., Cambridge Univ. Press 2009).
8. Edith Brown Weiss, *In Fairness to Future Generations: International Law, Common Patrimony, and Intergenerational Equity* 17–34 (Transnational Publishers 1989).
9. Holly Doremus, *The Rhetoric and Reality of Nature Protection: Toward a New Discourse*, 57 *Wash. & Lee L. Rev.* 11, 14–19 (2000); Cass R. Sunstein, *Laws of Fear: Beyond the Precautionary Principle* 13–27 (Cambridge Univ. Press 2005).
10. A. Denny Ellerman et al., *Pricing Carbon: The European Union Emissions Trading Scheme* 1–22 (Cambridge Univ. Press 2010); Christopher D. Stone, *Should Trees Have Standing? Law, Morality, and the Environment* 1–48 (3d ed., Oxford Univ. Press 2010).
11. Joana Setzer & Catherine Higham, *Global Trends in Climate Change Litigation: 2023 Snapshot* 4–12 (Grantham Research Inst., London Sch. of Econ. 2023); Jacqueline Peel & Jolene Lin, *Transnational Climate Litigation: The Contribution of the Global South*, 113 *Am. J. Int'l L.* 679, 682–94 (2019).
12. *Juliana v. United States*, 947 F.3d 1159 (9th Cir. 2020); *Milieudefensie et al. v. Royal Dutch Shell plc*, [2021] ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2021:5337 (Rb. Den Haag May 26, 2021); *Urgenda Found. v. State of the Netherlands*, [2019] ECLI:NL:HR:2019:2007 (Hoge Raad Dec. 20, 2019); *West Virginia v. EPA*, 597 U.S. 697 (2022).
13. *National Environmental Policy Act of 1969*, 42 U.S.C. §§ 4321–4370h (2018); *Paris Agreement*, Dec. 12, 2015, T.I.A.S. No. 16-1104; *Constitución Política de la República del Ecuador* arts. 71–74 (2008).
14. Brian J. Preston, *The Influence of the Paris Agreement on Climate Litigation*, 36 *J. Env'tl. L.* 1, 3–12 (2021).
15. Nicholas Stern, *The Economics of Climate Change: The Stern Review* 31–57 (Cambridge Univ. Press 2007); William Nordhaus, *A Review of the Stern Review on the Economics of Climate Change*, 45 *J. Econ. Literature* 686, 691–96 (2007).
16. John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice* 251–58 (rev. ed., Harvard Univ. Press 1999); Weiss, *supra* note 8, at 38–45.

17. Richard H. Thaler & Cass R. Sunstein, *Nudge: Improving Decisions About Health, Wealth, and Happiness* 32–37 (Yale Univ. Press 2008).
18. Daniel J. Gifford, *The Interplay of Science, Law, and Policy in Environmental and Food Regulation*, 44 *Drake L. Rev.* 53, 62–74 (1995).
19. Rio Declaration on Environment and Development, princ. 15, June 14, 1992, 31 *I.L.M.* 874.
20. Sunstein, *Laws of Fear*, *supra* note 9, at 35–53; Jonathan B. Wiener & Michael D. Rogers, *Comparing Precaution in the United States and Europe*, 5 *J. Risk Res.* 317, 318–28 (2002).
21. *Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555, 560–61 (1992); *Massachusetts v. EPA*, 549 U.S. 497, 517–26 (2007).
22. *Juliana v. United States*, 947 F.3d 1159, 1168–75 (9th Cir. 2020); Mary Christina Wood, *Nature's Trust: Environmental Law for a New Ecological Age* 141–65 (Cambridge Univ. Press 2014).
23. Grossman, *supra* note 7, at 210–18; *Sindell v. Abbott Labs.*, 26 Cal. 3d 588, 610–12 (1980).
24. Stern, *supra* note 15, at 35–57.
25. Nordhaus, *supra* note 15, at 691–96; Frank Ackerman & Lisa Heinzerling, *Priceless: On Knowing the Price of Everything and the Value of Nothing* 153–72 (The New Press 2004).
26. Gilbert E. Metcalf & David Weisbach, *The Design of a Carbon Tax*, 33 *Harv. Envtl. L. Rev.* 499, 502–14 (2009).
27. Ellerman et al., *supra* note 10, at 1–22.
28. National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, 42 U.S.C. § 4332(2)(C) (2018); *Calvert Cliffs' Coordinating Comm., Inc. v. U.S. Atomic Energy Comm'n*, 449 F.2d 1109, 1112–14 (D.C. Cir. 1971).
29. Nicholas C. Yost, *NEPA's Promise — Partially Fulfilled*, 20 *Envtl. L.* 533, 535–42 (1990).
30. Constitución Política de la República del Ecuador arts. 71–74 (2008); *Te Awa Tupua (Whanganui River Claims Settlement) Act 2017 (N.Z.)* § 14; Stone, *supra* note 10, at 1–48.
31. Corte Suprema de Justicia [C.S.J.] [Supreme Court], Sala de Casación Civil, Apr. 5, 2018, STC4360-2018 (Colom.).
32. Setzer & Higham, *supra* note 11, at 4–12.
33. *Urgenda Found. v. State of the Netherlands*, [2019] ECLI:NL:HR:2019:2007 (Hoge Raad Dec. 20, 2019).
34. *Milieudefensie et al. v. Royal Dutch Shell plc*, [2021] ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2021:5337, para. 4.4.1 (Rb. Den Haag May 26, 2021).
35. *Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015*, § 18 (UK).
36. Markus Patberg, *Constituent Power Beyond the State: A Democratic Theory of Constitutional Pluralism* 112–28 (Edinburgh Univ. Press 2021).
37. Daniel Bodansky, *The Art and Craft of International Environmental Law* 9–21 (Harvard Univ. Press 2010).
38. *Clean Power Plan*, 80 Fed. Reg. 64,662 (Oct. 23, 2015); *Affordable Clean Energy Rule*, 84 Fed. Reg. 32,520 (July 8, 2019).
39. *West Virginia v. EPA*, 597 U.S. 697, 735–43 (2022).
40. Paris Agreement, Dec. 12, 2015, T.I.A.S. No. 16-1104, arts. 4, 13, 15; Daniel Bodansky, *The Paris Climate Change Agreement: A New Hope?*, 110 *Am. J. Int'l L.* 288, 303–11 (2016).
41. Lazarus, *supra* note 1, at 12–18.
42. Wiener & Rogers, *supra* note 20, at 318–28.



43. Peel & Lin, *supra* note 11, at 682–94.
44. Weiss, *supra* note 8, at 17–34; Alexandre Kiss & Dinah Shelton, *International Environmental Law* 43–52 (3d ed., Transnational Publishers 2004).
45. David M. Uhlmann, *After the Spill Is Gone: The Gulf of Mexico, Environmental Crime, and the Criminal Law*, 109 *Mich. L. Rev.* 1413, 1415–28 (2011).