

## Viewpoint: ‘Pesticide choice should be about what works and what doesn’t’ — Challenging claims that organics are superior because they use ‘natural’ chemicals

Witness organics. Despite little evidence of its supposed merits, devotees will steadfastly defend their “team.” It’s widely touted in marketing materials to be safer, healthier, and more wholesome than that horrid “chemical-obsessed ag”!

In the purity sweepstakes, default assumptions make the brand. Why? Ask the fans. You’re nearly guaranteed to get the same answer: pesticide free (false), but *if* they’re used, they’re infinitely safer. They just have to be, because they’re naturally derived ([usually, but not always](#)).

Here’s where the bandwagon takes insidious root. Organics gets dressed up in this pleasing aesthetic, but it’s an otherwise shallow factual façade.

Follow the latest news and policy debates on sustainable agriculture, biomedicine, and other ‘disruptive’ innovations. Subscribe to our newsletter.

[SIGN UP](#)

A pesticide is a pesticide, nature doesn’t discriminate, nor do pests — nor should we. The intent is the same — manage the pest, and do it safely. Where older “legacy” chemistries exist, they should be phased out in favor of up and comers with more favorable attributes.

Pesticide choice shouldn’t be about rivalry and allegiance. It’s about what works and what doesn’t. It’s advisable to hold a mock draft and build your own fantasy team of free agents, those best aligned with your values. Let’s dispense with the organic/conventional pesticide rivalry and acknowledge that they’re an essential tool, whatever the system.

[\*\*This is an excerpt. Read the original post here.\*\*](#)