

On Buying Local

KATHERINE SPRIGGS



AMERICANS TODAY can eat pears in the spring in Minnesota, oranges in the summer in Montana, asparagus in the fall in Maine, and cranberries in the winter in Florida. In fact, we can eat pretty much any kind of produce anywhere at any time of the year. But what is the cost of this convenience? In this essay, I will explore some answers to this question and argue that we should give up a little bit of convenience in favor of buying local.

“Buying local” means that consumers choose to buy food that has been grown, raised, or produced as close to their homes as possible (“Buy Local”). Buying local is an important part of the response to many environmental issues we face today (fig. 1). It encourages the development of small farms, which are often more environmentally sustainable than large farms, and thus strengthens local markets and supports small rural economies. By demonstrating a commitment to buying local, Americans could set an example for global environmentalism.

In 2010, the international community is facing many environmental challenges, including global warming, pollution, and dwindling fossil fuel resources. Global warming is attributed to the release of greenhouse gases such as carbon dioxide and methane, most commonly emitted in the burning of fossil fuels. It is such a pressing problem that scientists estimate that in the year 2030,

KATHERINE SPRIGGS wrote this essay for a writing course she took in her first year at Stanford University.



Fig. 1. Shopping at a farmers' market is one good way to support small farms and strengthen the local economy. Timothy Mulholland. *Dane County Farmers' Market on the Square, Madison, Wisconsin. 2008, Alamy.*

there will be no glaciers left in Glacier National Park (“Global Warming Statistics”). The United States is especially guilty of contributing to the problem, producing about a quarter of all global greenhouse gas emissions, and playing a large part in pollution and shrinking world oil supplies as well (“Record Increase”). According to a CNN article published in 2000, the United States manufactures more than 1.5 billion pounds of chemical pesticides a year that can pollute our water, soil, and air (Baum). Agriculture is particularly interconnected with all of these issues. Almost three-fourths of the pesticides produced in the United States are used in agriculture (Baum). Most produce is shipped many miles before it is sold to consumers, and shipping our food long distances is costly in both the amount of fossil fuel it uses and the greenhouse gases it produces.

A family friend and farmer taught me firsthand about the effects of buying local. Since I was four years old, I have spent every summer on a 150-acre farm in rural Wisconsin, where my family has rented our 75 tillable acres to

a farmer who lives nearby. Mr. Lermio comes from a family that has farmed the area for generations. I remember him sitting on our porch at dusk wearing his blue striped overalls and dirty white T-shirt, telling my parents about all of the changes in the area since he was a kid. “Things sure are different around here,” he’d say. He told us that all the farms in that region used to milk about 30 head of cattle each. Now he and the other farmers were selling their herds to industrial-scale farms milking 4,000 head each. The shift came when milk started being processed on a large scale rather than at small local cheese factories. Milk is now shipped to just a few large factories where it is either bottled or processed into cheese or other dairy products. The milk and products from these factories are then shipped all across the country. “You see,” Mr. Lermio would tell us, “it’s just not worth shipping the milk from my 20 cows all the way to Gays Mills. You just can’t have a small herd anymore.” Farming crops is also different now. Machinery is expensive and hard to pay off with profits from small fields. The Lermio family has been buying and renting fields all around the area, using their tractors to farm hundreds of acres. Because they can no longer sell locally, Mr. Lermio and many other rural farmers have to move towards larger-scale farming to stay afloat.



Fig. 2. A small polyculture farm. *Crops Growing on a Farm*. 2013, iStock.

Buying local could help reverse the trend towards industrial-scale farming, of which the changes in Wisconsin over Mr. Lermio's lifetime are just one example. Buying local benefits small farmers by not forcing them to compete with larger farms across the country. For example, if consumers bought beef locally, beef cattle would be raised in every region and their meat would be sold locally rather than shipped from a small number of big ranches in Texas and Montana. Small farms are often polycultures—they produce many different kinds of products (fig. 2). The Lermios' original farm, for example, grew corn, hay, oats, and alfalfa. They also had milking cattle, chickens, and a few hogs. Large farms are often monocultures—they raise only one kind of crop or animal (fig. 3). The Lermio family has been moving towards becoming a monoculture; they raise only three field crops, and they don't have any animals. Buying local, as was common in the first half of the twentieth century, encourages small polyculture farms that sell a variety of products locally (McCauley).

For environmental purposes, the small polyculture farms that buying local encourages have many advantages over industrial-scale monoculture farms because they are more sustainable. Small farmers tend to value local natural



Fig. 3. A large monoculture farm. *Aerial Mid-Summer Farm Surrounded by Cornfields.* 2013, iStock.

resources more than industrial-scale farmers do and are therefore more conscientious in their farming methods. Small farms are also intrinsically more sustainable. As mentioned, small farms are more likely to be polycultures—to do many different things with the land—and using a field for different purposes does not exhaust the soil the way continually farming one crop does. Rotating crops or using a field alternately for pasture and for crops keeps the land “healthy.” On small farms, sometimes a farmer will pasture his cattle in the previous year’s cornfield; the cattle eat some of the stubble left from last year’s crop and fertilize the field. The land isn’t wasted or exhausted from continuous production. I’ve even seen one organic farmer set up his pigpen so that the pigs plow his blueberry field just by walking up around their pen. This kind of dual usage wouldn’t be found on a large monoculture farm. Most big farms use their fields exclusively either for crops or for pasture. Modern fertilizers, herbicides, and pesticides allow farmers to harvest crops from even unhealthy land, but this is a highly unsustainable model. Farming chemicals can pollute groundwater and destroy natural ecosystems.

Not only are small farms a more sustainable, eco-friendly model than big commercial farms, but buying local has other advantages as well. Buying local, for example, would reduce the high cost of fuel and energy used to transport food across the world and would bring long-term benefits as well. It is currently estimated that most produce in the United States is shipped about fifteen-hundred miles before it is sold—it travels about the distance from Nebraska to New York (“Why Buy Local?”). Eighty percent of all strawberries grown in the United States are from California (“Strawberry Fruit Facts”). They are shipped from California all around the country even though strawberries can be grown in Wisconsin, New York, Tennessee, and most other parts of the United States. No matter how efficient our shipping systems, shipping food thousands of miles is expensive—in dollars, in oil, and in the carbon dioxide it produces (fig. 4). One of the main reasons that produce is shipped long distances is that fruits and vegetables don’t grow everywhere all year around. Even though strawberries grow in a lot of places during the early summer, they grow only in Florida in the winter, or in California from spring to fall (Rieger). Americans have become accustomed to being able to buy almost any kind of produce at any time of the year. A true commitment to buying local would accommodate local season and climate. Not everything will grow everywhere, but the goal of buying local should be to eliminate all unnecessary shipping by buying things from as close to home as possible and eating as many things in season as possible.



Fig 4. Interstate trucking is expensive financially and ecologically. *Interstate Traffic with Trucks*. 2012, iStock.

Some argue that buying local can actually have negative environmental effects; and their arguments add important qualifiers to supporting small local farms. Alex Avery, the director of research and education at the Center for Global Food Issues, has said that we should “buy food from the world region where it grows best” (qtd. in MacDonald). His implication is that it would be more wasteful to try to grow pineapples in the Northeast than to have them shipped from the Caribbean. He makes a good point: trying to grow all kinds of food all over the world would be a waste of time and energy. Buying local should instead focus on buying *as much as possible* from nearby farmers. It has also been argued that buying locally will be detrimental to the environment because small farms are not as efficient in their use of resources as large farms. This is a common misconception and actually depends on how economists measure efficiency. Small farms are less efficient than large farms in the total output of one crop per acre, but they are more efficient in total output of all crops per acre (McCauley). When buying locally, the consumer should try to buy from these more efficient polyculture farms. Skeptics of buying local also say that focusing food cultivation in the United States will be worse for the environment because farmers here use more industrial equipment than farmers in the third world (MacDonald). According to the Progressive Policy Institute, however, only thirteen percent of the American diet is imported

("98.7 Percent"). This is a surprisingly small percentage, especially considering that seafood is one of the top imports. It should also be considered that as countries around the world become wealthier, they will industrialize, so exploiting manual labor in the third world would only be a temporary solution (MacDonald). The environmental benefits now, and in the long run, of buying local outweigh any such immediate disadvantages.

Critics have also pointed to negative global effects of buying local, but buying local could have positive global effects too. Speaking with the *Christian Science Monitor*, John Clark, author of *Worlds Apart: Civil Society and the Battle for Ethical Globalization*, argues that buying local hurts poor workers in third world countries. He cites the fact that an estimated fifty thousand children in Bangladesh lost their jobs in the garment industry because of the 1996 Western boycott of clothing made in third world sweatshops (qtd. in MacDonald). It cannot be denied that if everyone buys locally, repercussions on the global market seem unavoidable. Nonetheless, if the people of the United States demonstrated their commitment to buying local, it could open up new conversations about environmentalism. Our government lags far behind the European Union in environmental legislation. Through selective shopping, the people of the United States could demonstrate to the world our commitment to environmentalism.

Arguments that decentralizing food production will be bad for the national economy also ignore the positive effects small farms have on local economies. John Tschirhart, a professor of environmental economics at the University of Wyoming, argues that buying locally would be bad for our national economy because food that we buy locally can often be produced more cheaply somewhere else in the United States (qtd. in Arias Terry). This seems debatable since most of the locally grown things we buy in grocery stores today aren't much more expensive, if at all, than their counterparts from far away. In New York City, apples from upstate New York are often cheaper than the industrial, waxed Granny Smiths from Washington State or Chile; buying locally should indeed save shipping costs. Nonetheless, it is true that locally grown food can often be slightly more expensive than "industrially grown" food. Probably one of the biggest factors in the difference in price is labor cost. Labor is cheap in third world countries, and large U.S. farms are notorious for hiring immigrant laborers. It is hard to justify the exploitation of such artificially cheap labor. While the case for the economic disadvantages of buying local is dubious, buying local has clear positive economic effects in local communities. Local farms hire local workers and bring profits to small rural communities. One study

of pig farmers in Virginia showed that, compared to corporate-owned farms, small farms created ten percent more permanent local jobs, a twenty percent higher increase in local retail sales, and a thirty-seven percent higher increase in local per capita income (McCauley).

Buying locally grown and produced food has clear environmental, social, and economic advantages. On the surface it seems that buying local could constitute a big personal sacrifice. It may be slightly more expensive, and it wouldn't allow us to buy any kind of produce at any time of the year, a change that would no doubt take getting used to. But perhaps these limitations would actually make food more enjoyable. If strawberries were sold only in the summer, they would be more special and we might even enjoy them more. Food that is naturally grown in season is fresher and also tends to taste better. Fresh summer strawberries are sweeter than their woody winter counterparts. Buying local is an easy step that everyone can take towards "greener" living.

Works Cited

- Arias Terry, Ana. "Buying Local vs. Buying Cheap." *Conscious Choice: The Journal of Ecology and Natural Living*, Jan. 2007, www.alternet.org/story/342/buying_local_vs._buying_cheap. Accessed 27 Apr. 2011.
- Baum, Michele Dula. "U.S. Government Issues Standards on Organic Food." *CNN*, 20 Dec. 2000, www.cnn.com/FOOD/specials/2000/organic.main/story.html. Accessed 25 Apr. 2011.
- "Buy Local." *Sustainable Table*. Grace Communications Foundation, Jan. 2007, www.sustainabletable.org. Accessed 27 Apr. 2011.
- "Global Warming Statistics." *Effects of Global Warming*, 2007, www.effectofglobalwarming.com/global-warming-statistics.html.
- MacDonald, G. Jeffrey. "Is Buying Local Always Best?" *Christian Science Monitor*, 24 July 2006, www.csmonitor.com/2006/0724/p13s02-lifo.html.
- McCauley, Marika Alena. "Small Farms: The Optimum Sustainable Agriculture Model." *Oxfam America*, 2007, oxfamamerica.org/whatwedo/where_we_work/united_states/news_publications/food_farm/art2570.html. Accessed 27 Apr. 2011.
- "98.7 Percent of Imported Food Never Inspected." *Progressive Policy Institute*, 7 Sept. 2007, www.ppionline.org/ppi_ci.cfm?knlgAreaID=85&subseclD=108&contentID. Accessed 25 Apr. 2011.

- “Record Increase in U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reported.” *Environment News Service*, 18 Apr. 2006, ens-newsire.com/ens/apr2006/2006-04-18-02.asp.
- Rieger, Mark. “Strawberry—*Fragaria X ananassa*.” *Mark’s Fruit Crops*, 2006, fruit-crops.com/strawberry-fragaria-x-ananassa.
- “Strawberry Fruit Facts Page.” *Grown in California*, Gourmet Shopping Network, grownincalifornia.com/fruit-facts/strawberry-facts.html. Accessed 25 Apr. 2011.
- “Why Buy Local?” *LocalHarvest*, localharvest.org/buylocal.jsp. Accessed 23 Apr. 2011.

Thinking about the Text

1. It’s clear that this is a topic that matters to Katherine Spriggs. Has she convinced you that it matters—and if so, how? How does Spriggs establish the importance of her topic?
2. What **COUNTERARGUMENTS** or positions other than her own does Spriggs consider—and how does she respond in each case?
3. Choose a section of Spriggs’s essay that you find especially effective or ineffective. Referring to the genre features listed on page 158, describe what makes this part of her argument persuasive—or not.
4. Spriggs includes several photos in her essay. How do they contribute to her argument?
5. Consider your own response to Spriggs’s position. Write an essay in response to one of the issues she raises. State your **POSITION** explicitly, and be sure to consider arguments other than your own.