# Article information:

The Supreme Court Just Gutted the Clean Water Act  
<https://gizmodo.com/supreme-court-guts-clean-water-act-sackett-epa-1850474838>

# Article summary:

1. The Supreme Court has ruled against the Environmental Protection Agency in a decision that significantly narrows the Clean Water Act’s protections.

2. The ruling means that isolated wetlands and intermittent and seasonal bodies of water are no longer protected under the Clean Water Act, which is a massive win for developers, mining companies, and other polluting industries.

3. The decision contradicts our current scientific and environmental understanding of how water flows overland and below ground from one point to another, generally from smaller to larger bodies of water.

# Article rating:

Appears moderately imbalanced: The article provides some useful information, but is missing several important points or pieces of evidence that would be required to present the discussed topics in a balanced and reliable way. You are encouraged to seek a more balanced perspective on the presented issues by exploring the provided research topics and looking at different information sources.

# Article analysis:

The article provides a critical analysis of the recent Supreme Court ruling against the Environmental Protection Agency, which narrows the Clean Water Act's protections. The author argues that the decision will have significant implications for wetlands and streams nationwide, as it no longer protects isolated wetlands nor intermittent and seasonal bodies of water. The ruling is likely to be a win for developers, mining companies, and other polluting industries, which will face far fewer environmental regulations.

The article highlights potential biases in the Supreme Court's decision, as all five conservative judges supported Justice Samuel Alito's majority opinion. The author suggests that the ruling favors industry and development over defending unpolluted waterways. However, the article does not provide evidence to support this claim or explore counterarguments that may justify the court's decision.

The article also notes missing points of consideration in the court's ruling, such as its contradiction with current scientific and environmental understanding of how water flows overland and below ground from one point to another. The author argues that all water is connected and small or impermanent waterbodies still dictate the quality of what comes out of your tap. However, this argument overlooks potential risks associated with regulating all bodies of water under federal law, such as increased bureaucracy and costs for businesses.

Overall, while the article provides valuable insights into potential biases in the Supreme Court's decision and missing points of consideration, it lacks balance by not exploring counterarguments or presenting both sides equally. Additionally, some claims made are unsupported or unexplored further.

# Topics for further research:

* Arguments in favor of the Supreme Court's ruling on the Clean Water Act
* Economic impacts of the Clean Water Act on businesses
* Environmental risks associated with regulating all bodies of water under federal law
* Scientific understanding of how water flows overland and below ground
* Historical context of the Clean Water Act and its amendments
* Potential alternatives to the Clean Water Act for protecting waterways
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