

→ **Group 3:** “Can the historical concepts for quality be transferred into modern science?”



Results presented by **Florian Leiber:**

The question needs to be changed because *conventional* agriculture resulted from conventional

science (which seems more or less equivalent to “modern science”). Organic science has to be developed after the organic practice has been installed. The right question could be: Do we have a science which corresponds to the paradigmatic background of organic agriculture? How can “modern” science be modified to understand the historical concepts of quality?

To answer that researchers have to look on the philosophical, historical background of any science. The philosophical background of any science determines the questions, methodology and interpretations of the results.

The science for organic agriculture should be an “organistic life-science” which is able to elucidate the little word “more” in the phrase “the whole is more than the sum of its parts”. Analytics are not to be criticised, but organic research has to solve additionally the problem “how to get the organ back into the organism”. To a high degree, this seems to be a matter of *thinking*. That means researchers have to educate themselves and be aware of the fact that the connection between parts and whole lies in synthetic thinking and the way of interpreting the results. But this, again, requires to integrating reflection on philosophical backgrounds and worldviews in the research. The development can only be faced and solved with the change in looking more deeply into what life science might be.

The working-group 3 suggested having another FQH-meeting with the aim of discussing that point with examples from scientific studies in agriculture, nutrition and health.

Conclusion: Bringing the organ back into the organism by developing and educating our thinking as necessarily integrative part of research.