

Synthesis:

In the future of agriculture, vertical farms are extremely valuable to people because they take up a lot less space than regular farming, the ubiquity at which vertical farms can be implemented, and the control that people can have over the environmental factors.

Vertical farms are a benefit to humans as they conserve space compared to regular farming. For example, in an interview by Georgia Jiang, James Altman, states that vertical farming uses much less land. He even says that 10 to 20 times the yield can be obtained per acre in vertical farming compared to open-field crops. Since more than 10 to 20 times the yield can be harvested from the same set of land, the value of vertical farms are greater than regular farming because more food can be harvested from the same set of land. Consequently, since the benefit of vertical farming is not even just a meager difference in food per acre, the amount of people it could feed would help benefit the entire world as more people could eat and food prices could be driven down because of the increased production. Therefore, due to the fact that vertical farming saves space by stacking up the produce, more people would then be able to eat and afford food. Later on, in Source F, a graphic published in a book about vertical farming shows how in 2010, there are 6.8 billion people with 80% of the total arable land on earth used for food but in 2050, there is a projected world population of 9.5 billion people. This amount of people (an added 2.7 billion) would require an area the size of Brazil (an amount we do not have). The projected growth of the human population by 2.7 billion in 2050 reveals that the population is growing rapidly, and that there needs to be a solution to fix it. Vertical farming would combat this problem by conserving space. As revealed in Source B, Vertical farming can have 10 to 20 times the yield per acre compared to open field crops which can actually fix the issue of the arable land problem because if the current 80% of arable land were to be transformed into vertical farming, the production of food would exponentially increase and even sustain humans way past 2050. Furthermore, since vertical farming can deal with the issue of food production by conserving space of food per acre, the monumental benefit it provides outweighs regular farming.

Additionally, another valuable nature of vertical farms are its ubiquity when it comes to implementation. For example, in Source A, Serverson Kim states that many countries suffer with food production when crops wither in the heat and drought. He also says that these vertical farms can be done almost anywhere. Unlike a regular farm where the climate has to be right for the produce you are growing, vertical farming does not require a specific climate when implemented, so they can be placed anywhere and grow anything. This freedom allows retailers and farmers to make vertical farms anywhere they need to regardless of if it's a desert or tundra. Therefore, since there is not a restriction when implementing these vertical farms, people can place them wherever they like and grow more food because food can be grown in places where they previously could not. For example, rice, which requires a ton of water, can be grown in the desert because vertical farming is in a greenhouse like structure and allows for crops like rice to grow. This matters because it would allow anyone to grow anything, thus providing more food to everyone. Next, Source B says that vertical farms are being built in deserts, high population urban areas, and other places that traditional open-field farming is not practical. Vertical farms allow people to place them in places where they could not otherwise be placed if they were open field farms which supports the notion that vertical farms allow for more food production (a human benefit) by how it can be placed anywhere. Consequently, if vertical farming was restricted to a specific place, people would not be able to place them everywhere like the desert or cities, so the ubiquity at which they can be placed illustrates the huge benefit it serves in increasing arable land area and increasing food production for people all around the world.

Finally, a benefit of vertical farming is how much control over the environmental factors that vertical farming provides compared to open air farming. For example, Source A says that Bowery, the largest vertical farming company in the United States, can manipulate factors like light, humidity, and temperature. All these factors are crucial limiting factors when growing plants anywhere in the world like how corn cannot grow in the desert or a cactus cannot grow in the rainforest. Therefore, the ability to control such a crucial factor piggybacks on the idea that vertical farms can be placed anywhere in the world and grow anything which can help benefit humans by dealing with the on growing population issue as described in source F and by overall helping solve world hunger. Lastly, a table in Source C

illustrates how the controllability of aerial and root zone is high in vertical farms but low or very low in open fields. The increased controllability of these vertical farms like in areas of aerial and root zones would give it an advantage in producing crops that need different needs in regards to those factors because plants that need a different factor can not be changed in an open field. Thus, a vertical farm triumphs over the open field when it comes to manipulability since you cannot change the weather in an open field but you can change all the factors (as illustrated in Source A) in a vertical farm. This matters because it all leads to increased food production and less hunger. Ultimately, for the future of agriculture, vertical farms benefit outweigh the costs to people because of less space they take up compared to open air farming, the ubiquity at which vertical farms can be implemented, and the control that people can have over the environmental factors. This all leads to increased food production and less hunger.

Rhetorical Analysis

In a commencement address by Rita Dove, the author's use of allusions, personal anecdotes, and repetition to advance the idea that she wants her audience to have a hunger, hard work, and uncertainty.

Rita Dove commences her address by making allusions to further develop her main wish. For example, Dove references Percy Shelley and uses his example of a definition of a poet as a contrast. The author's allusion to Percy Shelley sets up a connection between the wishes she wants and Shelley's statement. By utilizing Shelley's statement, Dove is rooting the situation in an established poet's words to set a precedent that her commencement address would not be about typical "life advice" and that it would be about her wishes of hunger, hard work, and uncertainty. This matters as her crowd would be even more eager to follow a more established truth in Shelley's words with Dove's. Furthermore, since her audience would have been highly educated graduate students, the reference to Shelley would have been a connection that would resonate with them and convince them to follow Dove's speech in a more detailed manner. Moving on, Dove references Lupita Nyong'o and says that she has to do homework before audition. In tandem, she connects her address with James Galway and pulls a quote from him saying that you can play a flute better if you know your scales and arpeggios. By referencing these famous people, Dove relays to the audience that becoming famous like them does not exempt you from hard work or hunger. She is rather exemplifying how hard work and becoming successful are cause and effect. Consequently, since the author references famous rich people, the author is appealing to her audience of graduate students who are already aspiring to become successful because they went to school after college, so she can further connect and inspire them.

Additionally, Rita Dove develops her address by instilling personal anecdotes. For example, the author gives an personal anecdote of when she was a teacher and where her student listed things she wish she could of heard. With this vivid story, Rita underscores the ideology of hunger she wants her audience to have because she is humanizing the cold abstract idea of "I wish you Hunger" into a story that involves a college student and herself. This would offer a relatable connection to the idea of "I wish you Hunger" compared to a cold abstract data that is not personal. Therefore, due to the fact that the author utilizes a personal anecdote, Dove wants her audience to feel the passion that the student in the story felt and how herself felt so they can relate and implement it. Next, Dove tells a story of when she was named the Poet Laureate of the US she wrote a letter to Clinton about spotlighting the arts and when joining the whitehouse dinner in honoring the arts and humanities. The impactful personal story of Dove using her hardwork to complete monumental tasks, highlights the importance to her audience of hardwork. Since her audience would know her as extremely successful because she was a poet laureate, people would be more inclined to connect with her anecdote and see it as a story of truth that hardwork is a great trait to keep in mind. Furthermore, since she actually graduated from the University of Virginia herself, the students in that same school would be more inclined to listen to her personal story and know that hard work can lead to success because if someone had become successful in the near same position as they were in, the students would believe even more.

Finally, Dove finishes her speech by utilizing repetition. For example, the author repeats the phrase 150% multiple times. Through this repetition of 150%, the author is able to highlight the importance of the idea of giving 150% because repetition illustrates the importance of paired ideas. Since she repeats the example of her giving 150%, the audience would be more inclined to believe that giving 150% has led Dove to success and thus could help the students into what they see as success. Lastly, the author repeats the phrasing of "I wish" throughout the address.

With this repetition, the author is portraying the importance of these ideologies of hardwork, uncertainty, and hunger as a paired idea that can all individually lead to successful outcome but when come together can become a huge driving force. Furthermore, due to the fact that the phrasing of “I wish” is repeated throughout the address, the audience would know the importance of it because it is repeated.

Ultimately, in the commencement address by Rita Dove, the author's utilization of allusions, personal anecdotes, and repetition to advance the idea that she wants her audience to be bold by having uncertainty, hardwork, and hunger.

Argument

Curbelo's claim about how ineffective it is when trying to scare your opponent when collaborating is true in cases where the scare leads to no positive outcome and resentment, but not supported when the overall outcome of the scare is a positive one.

Curbelos states that when you need to convince someone that they need to change their thinking on an issue, trying to scare them is not effective and that is fully supported when scaring them results in no benefit for the person. For example, in the current Iran war between the United States and Iran, Iran killed many protestors who in public to instill fear. Iran did this so people would change their thinking on the issue of protesting against the Iranian government. However this led to deep resentment. Iran's goal in exterminating the protestors was to instill fear in the other protestors so they would think again about protesting, which led to even more riots and protests. Therefore, since Iran tried to convince people not to protest by instilling violence to scare people, people actually were not convinced of stopping protests but continueing them even longer. This matters because the Iranian people now have a new sense of resentment towards the Iranian regime, because they tried to use “fear” to change the people's thinking, which overall caused a even more negative atmosphere of violence and hatred throughout Iran. Next, when I was working over last summer, I worked as a server at my parents hibachi and sushi restaurant. I was the lead server and I had to train a group of new servers. I first yelled at them and got mad every single time they made a mistake, and in reaction, my trainees did not improve. However, after receiving complaints from everyone and receiving dirty looks, I changed my mindset from one of violence to support. I helped reiterate everything and helped throughly explain each training step and the next thig I knew, my workers worked very well with me and worked efficiently. When I first used the method of “fear” when training my coworkers, there was no improvement, and just resentment. The workers did not want to get involved in my “training regime” because they did hated my method. Therefore, due to the fact that when I switched to a friendly method there was so much more improvement and no hatred, the duality of scaring vs. supporting is emphasized with the positivity of the friendly method.

Finally, in issues when the overall outcome of the scare is one that benefits the person, Curbelos' claim is refuted. For example, my friend was struggling immensely with his AP Chem Unit 8 test and he said he was done and just going to receive a C. When I went to help him to try to get him to study more, I used the power of fear and I told him that getting a C would get him rejected from a scholarship he was dying to get from his dream school. This notion immediately made him lock back in, and in the next moment, he had the highest grade in the class. With my use of fear to motivate my friend, the notion that scaring my friend did not lead to success, and rather resentment is debunked because my friend was able to change his mind on his chem test. This change of mind led to him eventually getting the scholarship because he had all A's, and he did not resent me but rather lauded me. Consequently, if I were to have not scared him and said it was all fine, he would not have ended up with the happiness he had at the momet of receiving the scholarship. Furthermore, my friend could possibly have resentmed me for not motivating him or helping him out which further bolsters the claim that using fear can be affective and actually sow happiness in some cases. Lastly, when a kid does an action like talking back to a teacher or throwing a pencil across the room, they get a detention or ISS. In more severe cases, they get expelled or suspended. However, studies show from a New York times Article that students who get detentions or punishments do not get more punishments because they usually now know the consequences. Since kids are sustained to the fear of receiving a detention or expulsion, they are more likely to behave after such incident. This matters because this is a positive outcome and not using fear would not lead to the same outcome because kids are more able to connect a negative experience with something they should not do again. With this connection, the world would become a better place because kids who were originally doing bad deeds

like talking back or throwing things, would now be fearful of doing such action again. Ultimately, while trying to scare someone into changing their thinking of an issue can work when the scare leads to a positive outcome, it does not work when the scare leads to no positive outcome and increased resentment.