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**Book Club One**

"The way we produce food is failing us," says Zitouni Dada, deputy director of the UN FAO's climate and environment division, causing greenhouse gases to gradually climb up into dangerous territories. Hannah Ritchie, an Our World in Data researcher adds that eating locally is actually "one of the most misguided pieces of evidence," but in reality, only 10 percent of greenhouse gases are released through transportation. The majority of greenhouse gases comes from the types of food being consumed, instead of what everyone assumes it comes from, which is transportation. Tim Groser, an ambassador to New Zealand adds that "production is not the problem" and rather that it is "The sustainability of production." A logical extension to conclude the sustainablitity arguement would simply be to increase efficeincy of agronomy would be to use less chemicals, or feed the animals better, essentially, creating more organic food rather than processed. As FAO's Dada states, a simple fix would be to "produce more efficiently," and although Dada makes a good point, producers need to delve even further to solve this dilema. Food production accounts for a large sum of greenhouse gases being emitted, and being as one needs it to survive, as said by Tim Groser, "There's no incentive structure." To extenuate this quote, climate change and the buildup of greenhouse gases cannot be changed by the individual, due to the fact that there is no incentive, corroborating the idea that a larger power, such as government should join the fight in saving the planet. As Shayla Love states, the world requires "larger structural systemic changes in how we source our energy." Overall, these arguments are irrefutable and compelling, due to the fact that climate change sets a goal, or ultimatum on the world, if issues like this aren't fixed, the world gradually begins to spoil. Oceans are estimated to be rising at least ten inches in the next thirty years, causing destruction that may seem small, but will surely add up in the end.

**Book Club Two**

These articles are arguing against the consumption of local food sources with the use of a relevant topic to prove it such as the problems with Climate Change, making it a compelling argument that readers will be able to connect to.

This article focuses on the aspects of how Food production effects climate change with the usage of recent believable facts from a variety of trustworthy sources to make their point, creating a sense of credibility within the article. In article 1, the author cites Ted Groser,a former chair of the World Trade Organization agriculture negotiations process, showing how creible the info is.

The author has authority to speak on the issue because he is an investigative journalist and has written and researched on this topic before thus proving his qualificaton to speak on this issue.

He also counters the roundtable in saying it is contradictory in its efforts to be more eco-friendly. The author asks "how would top beef exporters reduce their climate harm while maintaining income for those nations and their farmers?" along with other questions investigating the reliability of these government promises.

The article illustrates how much the environment and climate change has been effected in recent and past years with the use of statistics to add to the perspective of time we are in. Article 2 also adds another perspective since buying items locally it is ingrained in society that it is better but its not the case. Buying local is not better at all.

**Book Club Three**

Between the two articles there is plenty to think about when it comes to compelling and valid arguments in regard to locally sourced foods and agricultural contributions to global emissions.

In article 1 the author utilizes authorizing in order to show credibility and importance in the quote. He used a quote to explain that food and agriculture represent the single greatest producer of GHG emissions, then he followed it up by stating that the quote comes directly from a former chair of the WTO. Someone with that type of history is most likely well versed in global trading trends and how the trading and transportation of agriculural goods effects the global emmisions. By quoting someone like that he makes the article more compelling and credible. Later in the article he states that "if food wastage were a country, it would be the third largest emitting country in the world". This quote contributes to the argument of global emmissions by comparing country emmissions to the combined emmisions coming directly from food and agriculture related proccesses. This quote is compelling because it uses numerical evidence which contributes to its credibility, along with the fact it appeals to ethos by comparing nations emmisions to agricultural emissions which naturally means the impact must be massive enough to be compared to entire countries.

In the second article the author argues that eating locally grown and raised foods has minimal impact of emmisions stemming from food & agriculture. In paragrapgh 3 the author uses illustrating to better prove their point, they claimed that transportation from food transportation was neglibgible and that eating locally is very misguided advice. They tied in with that claim, testimony from a data researcher to illustrate and credifiy the claim. This is compelling because it adds and extra layer of detail and ratifies the claim.

Overall the use of specific evidence tools and credible evidence allowed the authors to be succesful in compelling the audience and conveying their main arguments.

**Book Club Four**

A compelling argument from the second article was that eating locally isn't actually good for the environment as a the University of Oxford previously said. Another study found that you can make a bigger impact on reducing emissions by not buying animal products at all. The common misconception that transportation is the biggest cause of emissions is not true as previously thought. The article said that it actually comes from land use change and the farming process. This was also said in the first article about how eating local is better for the enviroment. The article was compelling because it was contradiction to Oxford's study by a report from Our World In Data. They analyzed the process of getting the food from the farm to our plate and found that transportation wasn't the biggesthe problem. The first article said that food and agriculture are the biggest producers of greenhouse gasses and that "livestock production alone spews 14.5 percent of all the world's greenhouse gas emissions." They argued how the goverment could regulate the waste agriculture emmits to the atmosphere while continuing to make it a profitable industry. This argument was backed by facts, statistics and qoutes from experts such as people from UN Food and Agriculture Organization or the USDA Economic Research Center. Both arguments had implications and limitations that the author tried to work around which made the argument stronger as it showed that the author thought about

**Book Club Five**

The compelling arguments that agree that eating locally sourced food is better environmentally are the ideas that long-distance shipping creates a need for more fuel, local food is healthier, and because agriculture methods are taking a toll on the world's health, eating locally will have better long-term impacts on the environment as a whole.

The compelling arguments that are against the idea that eating locally sourced food is better environmentally are that the benefits for eating locally sourced foods are very misleading. The problem is not buying your food non local, its buying big emission foods in general.

These arguments are compelling because

**Book Club six**

Both of the articles don't necessarily think that eating locally is bad, but they don't think that it is the solution. Eating locally to cut down on transportation doesn't telp all that much. Where you are getting youre food doesn't really matter as " transport makes up less than 10 percent of the greenhouse gas emissions." Most of the greenhouse gas emissions come from the production process and the animals themselves rather than the transportation process.With all of that aside, is the argument really compelling? Not really. The facts and data sets unrealistic expectations such as taking meat out of our diets even though meat is an important part of your daily meals. Not only that, but the cows used to produce beef products are also used for milk production. By removing the pollution from cows (by getting rid of cows), you’re getting rid of meat and dairy (both of which are extremely important). People use these products in their everyday lives, and taking them away isnt going to help solve pollution. Instead, the pollution will just shift over to other countries.This causes the arguement to not be factually accurate or compelling.