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Agricultural impacts

The article highlights that our meat consumption has significant impacts on the environment. Per capita consumption of meat has increased due to the socioeconomic variables that pose risks for the environment. Kuznets-style inverted-U curve explains the per capita consumption in 150 countries. The evidence suggests that the consumption of meat in these countries is large enough which poses future challenges for the environment sustainability. The central claim made in the article is that high-income countries are consuming more meat compared to the low income countries. It is thus important to spread awareness about the negative implications of eating large amounts of meat. Environmentalists have proved that consumption of meat is linked to global warming and suggested that the society must transform to vegetarian. This is an effective solution for eliminating the threats of environment degradation. This reflects collective and individual level responsibility for understanding the devastating impacts of meat consumption on the planet (Cole & McCoskey, 2013).

Cole and McCoskey in their article stresses on the need for taking notice of the climate change. By determining the factors of global warming it is possible to remove these threats. Evidence suggests that with population explosion malnourishment has also increased. Around 3 billion people are malnourished. While overconsumption of meat is prevalent in the developed and rich countries. It is assumed that on reaching the threshold income the consumption of meat will decelerate. Income inequality has been the reason for the wider gap between the wealthy and poor consumption of meat. This claim states that wealthy or high-income groups are more responsible for the global warming because they have access to meat. There is significant relationship between income and meat consumption.

Frank (2008) revealed a different relationship between income and meat consumption. It was found that people who have more incomes have developed emotional relationship with their animal. Agriculture is the central force which drives the environment because it engage production, distribution and consumption of meat. Compared to the rich, the poor are unable to develop any emotional bonding with the animals and are more likely to eat meat. This leads to a confusing argument because most of the meat in the world is consumed in the form of fast food. The research and evidence reveals that fast food such as McDonald’s and KFC is cheaper than healthy organic food. Michael Pollan has explained the entire process in his book. According to his research it costs more to a poor or low-income families if they start consuming vegetables or organic food. The cost of fast food is low because meat is provided to the companies on subsidized rates.

Cole and McCoskey have criticized the role of society in protection of environment. Most of the damage is done to the environment due to the involvement of human beings in harmful practices. According to them people can control their harmful activities such as excessive consumption of meat. They can simply transform to a vegetarian society by cutting their meat consumption. Meat and specifically fast food is made from fossil fuels which is linked to the generation of toxic gases and high ecological footprint.

There is need for addressing the issue of climate change and encouraging everyone to take initiative of cutting their ecological footprint by reducing meat consumption. People can simply quit meat and start eating organic food which is good for health and the environment. Without engaging the people of the society it is not possible to remove the threats of environmental sustainability. Animals raised for meeting the demands of humans also leads to carbon emission. Soil erosion and degradation are also factors which leads to environmental change.
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