Food travels thousands of miles from farmers to consumers. Some people think that it would be better for our environment and economy if people consumed locally produced foods. To what extent do the advantages of this would outweigh the disadvantages?

Nowadays it is typical to consume food produced thousands of miles away, however many argue that it has a drastic effect on the environment and urge people to consume locally produced foods. This essay will argue that the advantages of this outweigh the drawbacks. It will first demonstrate how remote food production can help fight malnutrition and then suggest that increased carbon footprint of such foods as the primary disadvantage is not valid.

One of the greatest advantages of remotely produced food that is providing consumers with a wider variety of possible goods, allowing them to have a healthy and balanced diet. (no verb) It is known that humans need to incorporate various types of food, including fruit, vegetables, grains, dairy products, fish and meat into their diets in order to stay healthy. Areas that can provide fields, grasslands and ocean to produce all of those locally are extremely rare, therefore importing food is necessary in the majority of places. For example, in the Far East region of Russia there are not enough pastures to produce dairy products locally, so the only way to provide them is to import them.

Those opposed to this argue that by transferring food from the cite of production to consumers huge amounts of carbon dioxide are emitted, polluting the environment. However, according to multiple studies, agriculture accounts for by far less CO2 emissions than, for instance, energy industry, and transportation of food makes (constitutes) a tiny part of transport, making those emissions relatively irrelevant.

On balance, the ability to have nutritious diet, crucial to wellbeing, provided by importing food clearly outweighs the implausible argument that it causes tremendous damage to the environment.
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