Energy & Food: Disasters & Hope

by Trina Paulus

The connections are everywhere... they move backand-forth: Genetically Engineered (GE) corn for ethanol. Is this a "food" or "energy" issue question?

Let me get this straight. We seek to cut down our dependence on oil by planting one of the most nutrient robbing, nutrient consuming plants... a crop that uses huge quantities of fossil fuel in fertilizer and pesticides: it ends up using 70% more oil than it supplants! http://www.organicconsumers.org/articles/article_17166.cfm

We use land that could otherwise grow food to feed people — food prices go higher... and more people starve with less land to grow food.

We set up a competition: drive cars or eat!
We let corporations take the very building blocks of life: genes from our common heritage, make a slight change in the laboratory and transform it into "private property" by patenting. As a result, any good that might come from it will no longer be part of the common good: it is now patented private property.

To add further insult to this absurd situation: the unrestrainable pollen, blown by uncontrollable

winds, and contaminates every susceptible plant it lands on, with these engineered traits.

So, we spread the genes of nonedible corn to contaminate edible corn... use up the precious nutrients in our soil and require pesticides and fertilizers made from oil in order to "save oil."

How crazy can one species be?! Imagine an extraterrestrial seeking to invade the earth, sending out scouts to check out this planet to find weak spots to invade: I bet they would report back saying "Just wait, it won't be long. These creatures are killing themselves by destroying their support systems. Few of them seem able to grasp the concept of "the whole." It's so screwed up down there: If we just wait a bit, they'll die off, and we can walk right in.

"These idiots worship something they call 'the bottom line.' Instead of the really precious stuff: clean air, water, fertile soil, and cooperative relations called love... they're mostly involved with something called 'money.' And most peculiar of all, those that have the most money, seem never to have enough."

Put this way I would hope you'd say: you got to be kidding!

If that isn't nutty or scary enough:

Unfortunately I'm not kidding, so now let's look at what radioactivity does to the food. It's all over the northern hemisphere right now with the new source of the contamination coming from Japan. It's in the air, soil and water: it floats in the clouds all around the earth. It falls on the grass, cows eat the grass, radioactivity concentrates in the milk... and then in the people who drink the milk. Since it is invisible, it is hard to prove that radioactivity has caused sickness, especially cancer. This stuff poisoning the earth can make people sicken quickly, or it can manifest over decades: illnesses that are the product of the preoccupation with a dangerous technology that is unnecessary.

"Stop," you say, "but we need the energy."
I say, "We have renewable, safe energy: we have sun, wind, the warmth of the earth called geothermal,

small-scale hydropower in streams, and ocean waves." It's a common heritage: we can all use it, and we won't use it up. But we MUST act NOW: we need to develop renewable, clean energy technology with the same fervor as if we were at war. We can do this — by utilizing everyone's talents to simplify their lifestyles, so we need less energy to start with. And take away all the subsidies



Trina inside the butterfly tent photo by José German

and tax breaks from dangerous, limited fossil fuels, and put them into renewables.

Radiation exposure debate rages inside EPA

A plan to radically hike post-accident radiation in food & water has sparked hot dissent:

http://www.peer.org/news/news_id.php?row_id=1325

"We all deserve to know why some in the agency want to legitimize exposing the public to radiation at levels vastly higher than what EPA officially considers dangerous." For example, under the

newly-revised PAGs, <u>drinking just one glass of water considered "safe" by the EPA could subject you to the lifetime limit of radiation.</u>

http://www.peer.org/news/news_id.php?row_id=1325

Learn more :http://www.naturalnews.com/ 031963_radiation_exposure.html#ixzz1KgJX1dMm

The "bridge fuel" or another disaster?

I hear a lot of talk about natural gas (another fossil fuel), which burns more cleanly than coal or oil. But, like oil, the easily-accessible gas is gone, so they are using a new technique, "fracking," to get the remaining gas from a shale near you. This is where they drill down, then sideways and use explosives to shatter the rock, using proprietary combinations of chemicals, exempted from environmental regulations. (so we don't even know what poisons are being used). I just discovered that fracking is responsible for radiation and chemical contamination of water and soil and people in the areas where it is being done. http://www.stuarthsmith.com/food-chain-breach-radioactive-sludge-used-for-fertilizer-on-farms

Simple is the solution

So, dear friends, try to put it all together: all these apparently complex problems with all these apparently complex solutions... see that in every case, the violation of nature for the sake of some short-term gain begets environmental disaster... The answer is: a return to understanding natural processes and adjusting our own growth and gain to reside within the common good.

Look at permaculture, the basic philosophy of which is to create a permanent culture of sustainability, respecting the web of life in the cycle of life. Permaculture embraces the wisdom from around the world much as the agroecological approach to farming which is proven to be more effective for food production then the claims of the industrial agriculture and genetic engineering, and is absent all the detrimental aspects of each.