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I would like to address the question of whether it is *“morally desirable to make such divisions”* (p.147) in terms of generations and argue yes, it is morally desirable to act and think in generations despite face value objections such as the idea that *“Individuals do not come into and out of existence as temporally discrete classes”* (p.145) because it can structure talk of ethics with the future. After all, it would counter the *belief that we cannot appeal to the wider context of reciprocal, mutually beneficial interaction* (p.37).

So, why is it that current political theories and structures have been developed to lack concern for future generations and the environment. Take for example your own hypothetical pure scenario in which you yourself state *“we expect each group to oversupply front-loaded goods and undersupply back-loaded goods”* (p.153).

This leads us onto the fundamental question, why leave us with inadequate political systems that fail to promote responsible political action and policy development? The absence of *effective centralized cross-national governance (p.24) and reliable enforcement mechanisms for global regulation (p.29)* that you yourself rightfully identify in chapter one.

Why limit imagination to only two types of goods, front loaded and backloaded, and not reversible goods. In which the consequences can be reversed? After all, it has been more than a decade since you published “A perfect moral storm”, *we need to renegotiate the way of thinking surrounding the analysis of politics and design of policies (Behr, 2019, p.2)* in global governance (and wider national structures) to address climate change. In effect, *actualizing a conceptual consideration of responsible politics, reversibility* (Behr, 2019, p.2).

To provide some context, reversibility is the belief that we should act only in such a way that its consequences are reversible (or at least not irreversible) (Behr, 2019, p.1). Thinking in generations would help facilitate such a way of thinking would it not *by restoring focus on overall long-term interests of a particular group (p.147),* addressing *the lack of structures and ways of thinking that facilitate concern for future generations, environment, global poor (p.439).* Plus,appeal to the current paradigm of self-interested behaviour by making consequences reversible for the here and now?

This lack of imagination underpins the perfect storm, facilitating inertia and institutional inadequacy. Leaving us in a scenario in which no actor or player has an incentive to move towards a cooperative solution. The present systems of states, which results in discourses of climate as a source of conflict (buck passing, the fragmentation of agency between states, and who is/was responsible) which sees nations adopting a view of prioritizing their own borders. Why constrain us with the lack of imagination of your generation?