**Ice Mountain**

This article was about coming to solutions to the ever fluctuating economic and environmental issues. The main issue of the article was which of them we need to focus on the most. The preferable choice of action in the past was to fix them both at the same time. However, that was to no avail and we are still battling the issue. In my opinion, the debates to see which aspect we should repair first are completely unnecessary. We simply need to choose one and stick with it.

The declination of the health of the global environment became noticed in the 1990’s. To help alleviate this threat the Kyoto Protocol was enacted. This law was set in place to decrease the amount of carbon dioxide emissions in the atmosphere by 2006. This was basically deemed as a failure. Emission levels still managed to rise, and now politicians are trying to reinforce, if not, recreate the Kyoto Protocol.

The causes of increased emission are simple: Degradation of forests, disrupted nutrient cycles, and depletion of natural resources. Factories pump out products for consumer use and distribution, but along with it smokestacks become the main sources for carbon dioxide emissions. We are trying to decide whether to aid the environment first, or the economy. This isn’t a simple pick your side and stick with it type of conundrum. I feel that there are multiple lurking variables that need to be uncovered and addressed. A few of these variables include: How will the economy be affected by the mass movement towards the environment (or vice versa), what role does human interest and involvement have to do with it, can we simply fix one issue, then hop to the other? These are all things that needed to be taken in consideration. One they are implemented into a course of action, we may progress into a more stable world.