

As far as a consumer can see ...

The last 4 out of more than eighty suggestions in a worldwide discussion on the website of WorldWatch Institute



Which is more important for environmental sustainability: buying locally-produced food or buying organic food?

[Worldwatch Poll: What do you think?](#)

Submitted by Worldwatch Institute on July 25, 2006 - 10:16am.

In a [web chat](#) regarding his recent *World Watch* magazine article, "[Can Organic Farming Feed Us All?](#)," Senior Researcher Brian Halweil was asked, "Does it make sense for me to buy organic tomatoes from Chile when I could buy non-organic tomatoes from the farmer thirty minutes from my house?" Halweil responded that one of the advantages of buying from the local farmer is that you have an opportunity to know exactly how the food is raised and to influence how it is grown.

[Local vs organic](#)

Submitted by Trilochan on July 29, 2006 - 2:31am.

I prefer local food as this will solve most of the existing problems all across , preferably my country India.

Local food cultivation and procurement will ease the strain over resource and bring independence and equity, especially the fossil fuels use as the cost in transportation will minimise.

Growing local food brings the local inputs especially the manures which can be raised locally as in bio- composting and other valuable alternatives.

This will bring local development into picture which can be replicated elsewhere and is the seed of sustainable development.

[Agriculture in the 21st century](#)

Submitted by info@vrijeconsumenten.nl on July 30, 2006 - 4:24pm.

It's all about the quality of (our) life in the first place! Isn't it? So I should say choose 1. biodynamic 2. bio 3. other and if possible locally grown. But much more interesting is perhaps when we look at the developments in general! In a not so far future - I think - we can talk again about "agriculture" when the different working directions have integrated. Then we can call it efficient-organic-dynamic or 3D agriculture to indicate that earth, environment and

cosmos are all three important. But why not call it again AGRICULTURE? Because we will see that the agriculture of the past based on old knowledge will be re-thought, re-discovered and/or really newly discovered into agriculture based on 21st century new knowledge! When also knowledge itself isn't divided anymore in natural and spiritual sciences, but (for the scientists: via Goethe's fenomenology) integrated into KNOWledge! Because all modern consumers want to know exactly, repeat: exactly what they choose. Also everything about the "inner" quality of products!

Peter Daub
vrijeconsumenten.nl

[21 st agriculture](#)

Submitted by Trilochan on August 2, 2006 - 3:31am.

Hi Peter,

Your comment was interesting, but frankly i could not get the crux. you may be talking interesting!
Please let me know..
gremind@gmail.com..
thanx,

Trilochan

[Agriculture in the 21st century \(2\)](#)

Submitted by info@vrijeconsumenten.nl on August 2, 2006 - 5:48am.

Hi Trilochan!

If we watch history of agriculture we see farmers in early times get their knowledge by own research, later by priests or pharao's, and since the 15th century via natural sciences. That's how a one-dimensional agriculture could emerge in the 19th and 20th century and the materialistic side of science in general. But also a farewell to old beliefs and old religions and becoming a free human being ourselves! When I see all things right? So now we can research ourselves how everything works in cosmos and on this little island called Earth, material and spiritual. We are in the 21st century now, so we are now in the CENTURY OF MATURITY. At least starting to take responsibility for our own research, arguments and dialogue, and decisions. As individuals, citizins and as consumers. And I am also trying as a consumer. I am also looking around how things work, what best decisions I can make, and why I decide this or that. But I think you will agree that we all have to discover things by ourselves, one by one?

PS: When I talked to farmers about these things they confirmed it in a direct and enthousiastic way. One farmer on a visitors day said to me: "Looking 3D (earth-environment-cosmos)is an eye-opener! You schould have told me that earlier today so that I didn't have to explain so much!" But every eye-opener is only a starting point for looking further. Up to 360 degrees and beyond. I think!

Kind greetings and thanx for your question!

Peter Daub
vrijeconsumenten.nl

[organic question](#)

Submitted by Trilochan on August 3, 2006 - 8:57am.

Hi,

It was interesting....., but what about the recent controversies shaped by human ingenuity and unknown effects easily explored profitably by big corporations as in Monsanto..syngenta ...and lot of others.

Do you take it as a maturity, hey m not a greenpeace activist but how sustainable is it??.Coz, when we talk of agriculture we are talking of human life depended on various diverse natural sources of edible things.Overall it is also a questions of economic, social equity.

[Agriculture in the 21st century \(3\)](#)

Submitted by info@vrijeconsumenten.nl on August 3, 2006 - 8:55pm.

Hi Trilochan!

At the moment the gentech question is indeed the biggest question for us all !!! Even NGO's and specialists also aren't satisfied yet with the answers untill now. Technically it looks interesting, but all consumers worldwide are still in doubt about the real impact on their lives and on the environment. And perhaps most about the "inner quality" when we look further. Even pragmatically thinking not only about next generations but also for myself: can I come back in a next life on earth?

PS: We are still talking about local food aren't we? Because the world is a village and some of us are experimenting with DNA en that kind of stuff..... Did you know that the spiral form is also found in waterflows, tree-forms and even de route in space of our whole solar system, direction Hercules? Science is interesting!

And of course: Science must go on! We all want to know everything so I think we should not talk about stopping the research. However much more money could be better spent to organic and biodynamic research! But as with nuclear energy and other items we have again the question: how do we use it? The moral and ethical questions come first, commercial questions second! And that's what everbody is calling for! Then, only then we can make our decisions as consumers.

For now ... we have to trust especially the quality judgement of the top-cooks (eurotoques) and the Swiss Railways who only serve biodynamic (demeter) food in restaurants and trains!

Peter Daub
vrijeconsumenten.nl

Free Consumers Association
Netherlands

Local and organic ideal

Submitted by PatersonCat on August 4, 2006 - 11:24am.

I prefer to buy locally grown organic food, if we are talking about fresh produce. When presented with organic from thousands of miles away versus local that is non-organic, I will choose the latter. Mostly because the organic food that has been transported for huge distances usually tastes "tired". Not to mention the fossil fuels spent transporting it.

But if have to choose between non-local organic and non-local non-organic, it would be the former.

Organic food is only about making money

Submitted by KimmoP on August 8, 2006 - 4:09am.

Can somebody show me a scientific study which shows that organically grown food is somehow "better"? Not even a chemist with all his / her analytical apparatus can show any difference between organic and conventional. Sorry to say this, but organic farming is only for making the consumer feel more "responsible" for environment and, thus, making premium money for the farmer and the retailer. But even the feeling of environmental responsibility is only illusion, as the environmental impact of organically grown food is higher than that of conventional food (per ton of product). In addition, the lack of use of chemical pesticides (or at least some of them) results in a higher level of pests and even human pathogens in the food, not to mention lower quality (on average) as the organic plant must put all its effort in combating pests etc.

Did you know that (at least in Europe) chemical medicines to treat sick farm animals are forbidden in organic production? Instead the use of homeopathy, "the magically shaken water", is encouraged. Veterinarians call that abandonment of a sick animal, others call it "organic".

Any differences in quality and taste between organic and conventional result from different varieties used or shorter transport distances. And those can really make a difference! So the answer is: locally grown!

Agriculture in the 21st century (4)

Submitted by info@vrijeconsumenten.nl on August 8, 2006 - 7:59am.

Hi KimmoP!

I agree with you to trust only our own judgement! I wrote a long story but it was erased again. So I write it in short now.

1. About inner quality: see demeter international WWW.DEMETER.NET under what is demeter / making quality visible.

2. About insight in growing forces of plants: see Goethe or even more direct all about projective geometry at www.nct.anth.org.uk or at mathematical programs on universities worldwide. In the physical world we think inside-out, but plants grow by outside-in mathematics. That's the "why" of the dynamics not only of sun and moon but of the influence of all planets.

3. About certification: try, taste , compare yourself. Go farming one day in a holiday, go with Goethe watching plants. Let no one convince you but yourself. We're the consumers aren't we?

Peter Daub
vrijeconsumenten.nl

Free Consumers Association
Netherlands