

Organic & Conventional Agriculture Compared (20 May, 2007) – part of requested submission to IAASTD

Prof. **Stuart B. Hill**, Foundation Chair of Social Ecology, Western Sydney University (s.hill@westernsydney.edu.au)

CRITERIA OF COMPARISON	‘ORGANIC’ & ECOLOGY-INFORMED FOOD SYSTEMS	CONVENTIONAL FOOD SYSTEMS
Relationship with Nature (biodiversity, habitats, ecological processes etc)	To be respected, worked with (as whole, integrated & interrelated systems), & supported	Selection, control & ownership of ‘parts’ that are (primarily) regarded as being valuable economically
Primary Goals/Roles in Society (actual versus professed focus)	Nourishment & support of human wellbeing (& avoidance of toxic impacts) Restoration, build-up, conservation & maintenance (sustainability) of: agroecosystems (especially soil), rest of nature, gene-pool, & knowledge & skills of farmers - for present & future generations	Productivity/yield Profit/money ‘Political’ power (local to global) Other professed goals invariably compromised by one or more of the above ones – hence the numerous impacts & disbenefits for people & environments
Other Priorities & Concerns	Intra- & trans-generational equity & social justice Meaningful & fulfilling work & lifestyles	Growth Market share Control (much of this having [largely sub-conscious] psychological, compensatory & substitutive functions)
Primary Inputs	Knowledge (especially ecology) & skills (especially agroecosystem design and management) Diverse bio-ecological inputs, serving multiple beneficial roles & functions	Imported/purchased seed & stock (increasingly hybrid, from narrowing gene-pools & genetically engineered), synthetic fertilizers, pesticides (including herbicides & anti-microbials) & growth stimulants Technologies, & design & management to achieve control & maximise productivity
Technological Supports	Elegant, contextually & ecosystem-matched, supportive, human-scale appropriate technologies; used in support of primary goals & values: solar, renewable, repairable, improvable (etc) Designed & used to support & maintain wellbeing-enabling ecosystem processes Full range of alternative technologies available for when needed	Large, powerful, expensive, decontextual, fossil-fuel dependent, often disruptive & impacting technologies Designed to force change & control, without reference to their effects on benign ecosystem processes Partly (largely subconsciously) purchased & used for their compensatory (power symbolism), psychological roles Few alternatives when faced with failures

Agroecosystem Design	Complex in bio-ecology, space & time: mixed farms, multi-species, multiple cropping & polyculture agroecosystems, with inclusion of concern for adjacent areas & non-commercial species	Bare-soil, row-crop monocultures & simple rotations, from a narrowing gene-pool
Pests (including weeds & diseases)	Regarded first as indicators of agroecosystem maldesign & mismanagement (& therefore requiring response in these areas) Systems designed to be 'healthy' & pest-proof, with controls used as interim & emergency measures, & selected & used in ways that minimise negative impacts, as specific as possible & based on natural processes & materials (where possible produced on-farm or locally)	Regarded as 'enemies' to be eliminated & controlled, economically, with purchased synthetic so-called pesticides (actually 'biocides', because of their innate non-specificity: cannot design specific poisons against economic entities) – increasingly from companies that also supply the seed (as a 'package', eg, glyphosate-resistant seed)
Sustainability	Over time, becoming increasingly ecologically sustainable, with gains & improvements in knowledge & skills, & in quality of the resource base & enablement of ecosystem functioning	Over time becoming increasingly unsustainable, with declining quality of resource base, including losses of biodiversity & gene-pool, soil fertility & structure, increases in pests, weeds & diseases (particularly those resistant to pesticides, herbicides & antibiotics) & increasing dependence on inputs that are non-renewable & that have harmful side-effects & other negative characteristics
Future Prospects	Will spread & improve over time in effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability & resilience, & in achieving its prioritised goals & support of our 'higher' values Capable of being supportive of our ongoing psychosocial evolution as a species	Will recede & decline over time & become less effective, less efficient, & more unsustainable and vulnerable, as its disbenefits are internalised & its resource base is used up (& becomes more & more expensive), & as our species evolves psychosocially towards lifestyles & institutions based on 'higher' values (than monetary ones), and so increasingly rejects such narrowly conceived approaches

Emeritus Professor Stuart B. Hill, Foundation Chair of Social Ecology, School of Education (includes previous School of Social Ecology and Lifelong Learning), **Western Sydney University** (Kingswood Campus), Locked Bag 1797, PENRITH, NSW 2751, AUSTRALIA
Location: Bld. I, Rm. 1-22, Kingswood Campus; Tel: +61(0)2-4736-0799; Fax: -0400; Email: s.hill@westernsydney.edu.au

Latest books: Ecological Pioneers: A Social History of Australian Ecological Thought and Action (with Dr Martin Mulligan; Cambridge UP, 2001), **Learning for Sustainable Living: Psychology of Ecological Transformation** (with Dr Werner Sattmann-Frese; Lulu, 2008) and **Social Ecology: Applying Ecological Understanding to our Lives and our Planet** (with Dr David Wright and Dr Catherine Camden-Pratt; Hawthorn, 2011). Many of my pre-1993 publications may be found at: www.eap.mcgill.ca

Founding Co-Editor, Journal of Organic Systems: www.organic-systems.org

Latest PPTs: www.stuartbhill.com & <http://www.scribd.com/doc/55937783>

Latest YouTubes: www.wakeupsydney.com.au/Interviews/The-SandboxSyndrome.aspx; <http://youtu.be/mzY1eZLwOdk> & <https://vimeo.com/123569201>