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Course project

Topic: Bottled water consumption is an unsafe choice due to its implications on the environment.

Abstract

Bottled water has become a commodity over the years. Its consumption is common on a daily basis due to factors such as taste, odour, convenience, water quality, and the belief that it is safer than tap water, and this is due to the campaigns of the bottled water industry that urges people to purchase and consume bottled water. Therefore, it is a reality that despite the massive waste of non-renewable resources such as crude oil used to produce and transport the plastic bottles as unfortunately, the final destination is for the plastic to become garbage; such plastic and raw materials seriously degrade and contaminate the environment. Even with such consequences, the continuous purchase of bottled water does not seem to diminish. Today due to the growing demands of bottled water, one must examine the consequences of buying bottled water on the environment. This paper aims to discourage the purchase of bottled water by examining the harmful effects of the plastic bottles on the environment as well as pollution on the planet. It also attempts to call on people to realize that it is wasteful to spend money on the purchase of bottled water based on false beliefs.

Thesis statement: Due to the growing demands of bottled water, one must examine the consequences of buying bottled water on our environment.

Argument

Increased dependence of people on water bottle causes environmental problems including water waste, pollution, and climate change. Massive consumption of bottled water is unsafe for the environment and depicts the need for curtailing consumption. The main claim regarding bottled water reflects the concerns regarding fossil fuels used for the production of plastic bottles. Used plastic bottles contribute to environmental degradation due to the release of 2.5 million tons of carbon dioxide (Díez, Antigüedad, Agirre, & Rico, 2018). Consumption of bottled water also wastes valuable recourses as it wastes huge amounts of water. As the demands for bottled water constantly rose, depicting the need for reexamining consumption choice based on environmental concerns. The argument claims that “weak international institutions, uneven regulations, uncoordinated policies, and business-oriented solutions are failing to rein in marine plastic pollution” (Dauvergne, 2018). Because the bottled water consumption has increased the reliance of society on plastic it poses future challenges for environmental sustainability. Due to the increased consumption of bottled water, the depencen of society on plastic has also increased that require fossil fuel. It is thus important to consider the practical implications of switching to the bottled water.

Massive consumption of fossil fuels supports the argument of environmental adversities related to bottled water. America remains one of the biggest consumers of bottled water as the collective consumption constitutes 8 billion gallons of water (Parag & Roberts, 2009). Fossil fuels deteriorate the environment due to the release of toxic gases such as carbon dioxide. It is claimed that “although in most European countries, there is clean, safe and reliable drinking water, the bottled water industry has the fastest growing rate with severe consequences for the environment” (Gheorghe, Victor, & Gheorghe, 2019). The claims state that the overfilled landfills directly contributes to pollution that causes negative implications. Evidence reveals that plastic bottles release at least 38 chemicals generating long-lasting impacts. Facts also state that 38 million bottles end up in landfills becoming unmanageable waste. Carbon negative impact and deforestation are also negative implications of bottled water. Environmentalists argue that plastic bottles produce unnecessary waste while in the form of garbage they remain intact for hundreds of years.

Switching to bottled water from taps results in climatic change. Carbon dioxide generation causes temperature rise thus leading to the issues of global warming. The absence of accountability standards motivates companies to focus on profit incentives only. They ignore the negative impacts of bottles and the release of toxic chemicals. The toxic chemicals such as acetone, methyl ketone, and toluene have relevance to global warming. Fossil fuel generation also constitutes the production of greenhouse gases depicting negative impact on environmental conservation. Global warming threatens environmental sustainability and depicts the need for reducing the consumption of bottled water.

Bottled water depicts serious environmental risks due to the producing of massive plastic. Overfilled lands threaten environmental conservation as society dumps over 8 million plastic bottles made from oils and fossil fuels. Facts state that increased consumption of water bottles increased the production of plastic waste by four times. There is a need for "increased transparency at the enforcement stage, better science communication, public display of trust in tap water by officials, and labelling on bottled water about its environmental impacts” (Parag & Roberts, 2009). It is difficult for societies to manage huge landfills overcrowded with plastic litre. The strategies of companies to use recycling are also inadequate and involve loopholes. Evidence supports the claims of negative impacts suggesting that companies caused more damages to the landfills by taking no actions against waste management. Inappropriate waste management threatens environmental sustainability and preservation.

During manufacturing and filling the companies waste millions amount of water that threatens the conservation of natural resources. The world already faces threats of limited water availability as many countries still lack access to clean water. Bottled water further increases the risks of water depletion thus affecting the environment and its preservation. The argument claims that are producing 60 million plastic bottles involve massive energy. Most of the plastic is indecomposable that means reusing them is not possible. “At the same time, the difficulty of governing plastic has been rising as production accelerates, consumption globalizes, pollution sources diversify, and international trade obscures responsibility” (Dauvergne, 2018). Practical implications of bottled water are even worse due to its dependence on oil for creating plastics. Creating plastics for bottled waters involve the inefficient use of resources reflecting the exploitation of resources. The world already faces risks of oil depletion due to increased consumption of oils and massive growth experienced each year. The argument claims that reliance on bottled water will consume more oil that threatens the environment and society. It “suggests that some institutional and procedural changes are needed to restore trust, such as proactive public involvement in the problem analysis procedures” (Parag & Roberts, 2009). The argument claims that bottled water threatens oil reserves reflecting waste of natural resources. Switching from tap waters to water bottle will result in depletion of oil reserves.

The counter-argument claims that bottled water is safer when it uses recycled plastics. Reusing plastics provides a solution to manage the issue of overcrowded landfills. It allows companies to make efficient use of resources. The argument claims that recycling eliminates the issues related to waste of natural resources and increased use of fossil fuels. Reusing plastic consume less energy and fossil fuels thus saving the environment from the threats of toxic emissions. Using bottled water is safer consumption choice if the companies adopt safe manufacturing techniques. It further claims that not all companies generate negative externalities and they follow standards of Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) sufficient for environmental protection. Curtailing consumption of bottled water does not eliminate environmental risks including carbon impact and global warming. Other sectors of the industry rely enormously on fossil fuel for energy demands thus posing greater risks of climate change. Evidence indicates that the water depletion will affect water resources and fail to fulfil the demands of future generations. Bottled water is an effective strategy to save the unnecessary waste of waters from the tap (Chapa Martínez, Hinojosa Reyes, Hernández Ramírez, Ruiz Ruiz, Maya Treviño, & Mar 2016).

People using bottled water needs to rethink about the environmental consequences associated with their consumption choice. It is logical to refute the counter-argument due to the weaker claims regarding recycling. Despite the concepts of recycling introduced by some water companies the amount of litter in landfills increases every year. Facts indicate that recycling did not eliminate the problems of landfills, pollution and greenhouse gasses emission. The main argument is stronger as it includes sufficient evidence that supports the claims of environmental adversities associated with bottled water's consumption. Depletion of water and oil resources also strengthens the main argument and helps in refutation of the counter-argument. The comparison reveals that bottled water poses greater environmental risks than benefits depicting the need for eliminating its consumption.

Conclusion

The debate on the bottled water consumption and its impacts on environment revolve around two main arguments. The central argument portrays the environmental risks associated with increased consumption of bottled water. The adverse environmental implications involve carbon emission due to the use of fossil fuels and oils for plastic manufacturing. Growing wasteland due to the dumping of millions of plastic bottles in landfills contributes to environmental degradation due to climate change and global warming. The counter-argument identifies bottled water as a safer consumption that eliminates the risks of water resource depletion and recycling provides a solution for managing plastic waste. The supporting claims and evidence lead to the refutation of counter-argument.
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