

EurSafe News

VOLUME 23 NO. 4 DECEMBER 2021

Dear EurSafe members,



The year 2021 is drawing to a close and I hope that despite the many challenges we still face professionally and personally in the wake of the ongoing pandemic, this newsletter finds you healthy and well. All the more I wish you a quiet and peaceful holiday season with family and friends, and that you can still savour this special time of the year – wherever and whenever possible.



This last issue of the EurSafe News focuses on the topic of Empirical and Experimental Ethics. During the 2021 EurSafe online congress in Fribourg, the idea came up to dedicate a newsletter to this highly interesting and increasingly flourishing research field. The following three contributions provide different perspectives as well as approaches addressing the question of how empirical facts can contribute to ethical debates.

In the first contribution, *'How empirical ethics can guide real world practice'*, Rasmus Bjerregaard Mikkelsen undertakes a methodological reflection on the role of empirical ethics and the question of how ethicists can provide concrete evaluations of interdisciplinary projects or practice. In doing so, he points to the necessity to consider a normative starting point on the one hand, and an understanding of the practical structure within values/principles must be expressed. He argues that only the consideration of both elements can provide a sound ethical analysis of a problem that can be implemented in a practical context. Based on his discussion of the two constituent elements, he concludes that even though contextualization of ethical problems becomes more difficult, he sees the combination of normative and empirical ethics as more useful to ensure that normative presumptions are visible in the empirical as well as ethical analysis.

Johanna Jauernig's contribution, *'Experimental ethics and agricultural issues'*, connects to Mikkelsen's argument by addressing that topics of applied ethics like agricultural and food ethics are highly complex and embedded in functional systems within a certain practice. She argues that empirical investigations about these functional systems are necessary in order to come up with

CONTENTS

How empirical ethics can guide real world practice Rasmus Bjerregaard Mikkelsen | 3

Experimental ethics and agricultural issues Johanna Jauernig | 6

Experimental veterinary and animal ethics Kirsten Persson | 9

Between and between?! Svenja Springer | 12

Reflections on interdisciplinary work | 12

Considerations for an Ethic of One Health Joost van Herten | 15

Games and Ethics Christian Dürnberger | 18

Awards Samuel Camenzind and Jes Harfeld | 20

In remembrance of Bernard E. Rollin | 21

EurSafe Executive Committee | 24

Special Issue on 'Empirical Animal and Veterinary Medical Ethics' | 25

Conference on Veterinary Expertise in 2022 | 26

Conferences, symposia and workshops | 27

a proper diagnosis or treatment suggestion. In addition, she refers to important aspects of moral psychology that, in combination with experimental economics, can help to successfully contribute to debates within the field of agricultural ethics as well as to practical challenges of e.g., sustainable food systems that are subject to constant structural changes.

In the third contribution, *'Experimental veterinary and animal ethics'*, Kirsten Persson introduces three contexts of application for thought experiments as methodological enhancement in both teaching and research in the field of animal and veterinary ethics. First, she presents and discusses the benefits of thought experiments in teaching and how fictional scenarios can facilitate reflection on students' attitudes towards ethical aspects in their professional future life. In a second step, Persson highlights how these thought experiments cannot only lead to fruitful discussions about real life dilemmas (veterinary) students are faced with, but also how thought experiments can be used to assess students' learning outcomes while studying. The author also discusses to what extent empirical and especially experimental ethics research can inform research within the field of animal ethics.

An important aspect that is reflected in methodological as well as practical considerations in research projects aiming to combine social science research methods and ethical reflections and/or evaluations, is the aspect of interdisciplinarity. In a short commentary entitled *'Betwixt and between!?'*, I share some reflections on interdisciplinary work and the concern about possible disciplinary 'identity crisis' when working in highly interdisciplinary research projects.

Besides the topic of Empirical and Experimental Ethics and related issues, we are continuing the presentation of PhD projects among our EurSafe members. It is my pleasure not only to present Joost van Herten's contribution *'Considerations for an Ethic of One Health: Towards a socially responsible zoonotic disease control'*, in which he outlines his PhD thesis, but also to congratulate him for his successful defence, which took place at the end of November this year.

In case some of you are still looking for a Christmas present, this newsletter contains a book review written by Christian Dürnberger. In his review, he introduces the book *'Games and Ethics. Theoretical and Empirical Approaches to Ethical Questions in Digital Game Cultures'*,

edited by Maike Groen, Nina Kiel, Angela Tillmann and André Weßel.

Further, it is my pleasure to present two prize winners among the EurSafe members. First, I would like to congratulate Samuel Camenzind, who was awarded by Internationale Gesellschaft für Nutztierhaltung/International Society of Livestock Husbandry (IGN, Germany) for his PhD thesis on Instrumentalisierung. Zu einer Grundkategorie der Ethik der Mensch-Tier-Beziehung. Second, congratulation to our colleague Jes Harfeld, who was awarded the title of Educator of the Year by the students from Techno-Anthropology at Aalborg University, Denmark.

In addition to the glad tidings, we recently received the sad news that Bernard E. Rollin passed away on 19th November this year. He was known to many of us not only as one of the most important philosophers in the field of animal and veterinary ethics, but also accompanied many of us as a good friend and important mentor. I thank Jes Harfeld for his obituary to not only honor Bernard E. Rollin's important and influential research but also to hold him as a *'real Mensch'* in grateful remembrance.

Finally, I would like to draw attention to Franck Meijboom's update on the work of the Executive Committee. Further, you will find a call for papers for a Special Issue on *'Empirical Animal and Veterinary Ethics'* in *Animals* as well as a list of upcoming events and congresses including an announcement of a conference on *'Veterinary Expertise'* that will be held in July 2022.

If you are interested in contributing to EurSafe News in the future, please feel free to contact any member of the editorial board. We are looking forward to your ideas and suggestions for further articles, book reviews, conferences, books, and symposia.

I hope you enjoy reading this Newsletter, and I wish you and your loved ones a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year 2022.

All the love and good wishes,
Svenja

Svenja Springer
Messerli Research Institute, Vienna, Austria
svenja.springer@vetmeduni.ac.at

How empirical ethics can guide real world practice

Rasmus Bjerregaard Mikkelsen

I suspect that a good portion of the readership of this newsletter have experience with participating in larger natural science or veterinary/medical research projects where they have been tasked with providing ethical evaluation of the project as a whole or individual ethically controversial elements. This is a difficult task, seeing as what is often sought is a concrete and 'objective' evaluation of the case at hand. In the following, I will argue that empirical ethics can play an important role in providing this type of evaluation, but that it cannot stand alone. Providing the sort of answer being sought here requires sufficient information about the morally relevant facts of the case under consideration as well as the ability to carry out an ethical analysis that does not necessitate that the reader accepts the theoretical starting point of the ethicist carrying out the analysis.

Essentially there are two elements that are necessary to provide the sort of concrete and practical conclusions that ethicists are being asked to deliver. To provide an ethical analysis of an ethical problem that culminates in a conclusion that can be implemented in practice, it is necessary to have both a basic normative starting point for the analysis as well as an understanding of the structure within which these values must be expressed. So, the two constituent elements of an answer to the task being set are:

- A set of values/principles
- An understanding of the structure within which these values/principles must be expressed.

Generating an answer to both elements is a difficult task for a traditional ethical analysis, and so a turn towards empirical ethics appears to be an obvious



choice when the ethicist finds themselves being posed a question like the one under consideration here. However, together with my colleagues, I have previously argued that empirical ethics does not perform better than other approaches in addressing the first element (results that I presented at EurSafe 2021) (Mikkelsen et al., 2021). We do not purport to have an authoritative answer to the question of how to generate the necessary normative starting point for the analysis, but in our experience, the normative outlook is in practice often defined by certain stakeholders such as funders, project leaders, or other interested parties. Similarly, consensus approaches might also represent a useful solution in practice, as long as its limitations are recognized (examples of different approaches to generating such a starting point can be found in (Davies et al., 2015)). But instead, it is in the second element, the gap

between the normative starting point and a useful conclusion in practice, that empirical ethics flourishes: it is uniquely useful in combining a set of values with information about the structure and context within which these values will be expressed, so the ethicist can produce a recommendation that can be carried out in reality.

This differs from previous calls for ethics to be 'contextualized'. Contextualization centres around allowing the ethicist to understand the context within which ethical choices are made in order to inform a deeper analysis of a given normative question (Hoffmaster, 2018). In light of the above, context becomes important not only in terms of understanding the practice within which the ethicist attempts to prescribe a moral standard, but also in informing the ethicist about what range of actions are available to 'choose from' both in light

of what is possible given the empirical factors at play as well as the normative values within which the ethicist must work. The relevant structures that are uncovered as part of the empirical approach interact with the normative starting point in a way where both elements are shaped by this interaction. Decisions about which structures are essential to uncover as part of the empirical work will be influenced by the normative starting point that one approaches the task with. Similarly, the normative starting point will be transformed and developed by expressing it within the boundaries that these structures set. Imagine empirical ethics as a sort of 'translator' between normative values and actual practice: With an empirical ethics approach, it is possible to understand how a general normative stance can be expressed as a concrete recommendation, given the structural factors at play. The relevant factors are varied and can change depending on the specific case in question, but social, cultural, political or economic factors are often relevant. For example, if one imagines that an ethicist is involved in a research project on genetic modification of production animals to increase production, an ethical analysis might find that the research and implementation of such a technology is ethically favored, since it could provide increased food security in parts of the world. But such a recommendation might be culturally unsustainable if there is no public appetite for allowing such modified animals into the production in these same parts of the world. Thus, empirical facts about the cultural factor can effectively limit the range of ethical conclusions that are available to the ethicist. Essentially, in or-

der to guide action via ethical analysis, the action that is recommended has to be able to exist within a structure that is defined in part by empirical facts about what is culturally, socially, politically, or economically feasible (along with other relevant empirical factors).

With this in mind, it is clear that empirical ethics can be uniquely useful in addressing the very specific type of task that is often presented to ethicists and which is under consideration here: to provide a 'ethical evaluation' of a practice or policy that can lead to specific and concrete recommendations that can be put into practice. Empirical ethics does not perform any better than other approaches in avoiding bias problems, but the approach can be used to uncover an important element of the answer to the problem at hand: the structures within which the recommendation must be expressed. In this way, empirical ethics can transform a normative set of values into a specific and concrete recommendation that is a useful answer to the question being posed, and it is in this gap that empirical ethics has its home.

So, empirical ethics has a central role to play when ethicists are involved in interdisciplinary work where they are asked to provide concrete evaluations of the project or practice. But it cannot stand alone. It is by the considered combination of a normative starting point with the tools of empirical ethics that well-founded recommendations can be drawn. The normative must be combined with the empirical in order to transform a moral prescription into a practical action – while remembering to make normative presumptions visible both in the empirical and the ethical analysis. In the end, this means that contextualization becomes more difficult, but also more useful.

References

- Davies, R., Ives, J. and Dunn, M. (2015). A systematic review of empirical bioethics methodologies. *BMC Medical Ethics*, 16(1). doi: [10.1186/s12910-015-0010-3](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12910-015-0010-3)
- Hoffmaster, B. (2018). From applied ethics to empirical ethics to contextual ethics. *Bioethics*, 32(2), 119-125. doi: [10.1111/bioe.12419](https://doi.org/10.1111/bioe.12419)
- Mikkelsen, R. B., Sandøe, P. and Gjerris, M. (2021). Empirical ethics is not a magic bullet for applied ethicists. *Justice and Food Security in a Changing Climate*, 381-386. doi: [10.3920/978-90-8686-915-2_59](https://doi.org/10.3920/978-90-8686-915-2_59)

Experimental ethics and agricultural issues

Johanna Jauernig



Any applied ethics should provide a meaningful analysis of current moral problems. Therefore, it needs to take into consideration both institutional arrangements and empirical boundaries of human cognition.

Issues of applied ethics like agricultural and food ethics, are embedded in functional systems, such as the food industry, the market economy as a whole, as well as the rural society. This embeddedness renders most problems highly complex. To properly diagnose and even to suggest treatment for those problems, ethics has to deal with empirical evidence about the functional systems. This is crucial to avoid the trap of good intentions leading to bad outcomes. Avoiding this trap is a prerequisite for ethics to ultimately provide implementable approaches to problems of agricultural ethics. Taking a closer look at the contingencies of the world – be it boundaries within the individual or outside of it – can also draw attention to new problems that could not have encountered from the proverbial armchair. In this short text, I will sketch out how experimental methods borrowed from economics and psychology can help achieve these goals.

Before I further argue for the use of experiments in ethics, a widespread concern has to be addressed: The concern of the *naturalistic fallacy*, i.e., the idea that an *ought* cannot be derived from an *is*. It is indeed a legitimate question, how the realm of empirical facts can be connected to the realm of the normative. A solution is provided by the thought figure of the practical syllogism, which consists of a normative as well as a positive premise and a conclusion in form of an action guiding recommendation. In other words, the conclusion tells us what to do given a certain value we want to see realized (the normative premise) and also given the contingencies under which the world places us (positive premise). That way, Joshua Greene (2014) argues, we can reach ‘interesting normative conclusions’, if we combine ‘uninteresting normative

assumptions’ (elephant poaching is bad) with ‘interesting scientific facts’ (burning confiscated ivory increases poaching due to increased demand). The interesting counter-intuitive conclusion in this example would be to sell confiscated ivory at low price. In this sense, another less known but not less important fallacy is worth noting – the *moralistic fallacy* (Davis, 1978). It occurs when moral claims interfere in the scientific enterprise thus blocking inquiry in a particular area of research. That way, an *is* is derived from an *ought*. Both these fallacies need to be avoided by any ethics that employs empirical facts and experimental evidence.

Empirical evidence has always played a role in agricultural ethics. If ethicists neglect the realities of farming and its embeddedness in a global context, they run the risk of getting stuck with traditional images of ways of farming. These ‘feel good’ images prevent acknowledging the constant structural change agriculture and food systems are undergoing and the societal challenges arising from it. To reflect upon these challenges, ethics must stay in touch with the realities of agriculture by being able to evaluate empirical findings.

Beyond considering empirical facts, I will argue here that the use of experiments can further advance the field of ethics in general and give some examples how in particular the field of agricultural ethics could profit. Controlled experiments are an important means of investigation, which originated in the natural sciences and spread to other disciplines. These disciplines have developed their own experimental methods, of which the experiments used in economics and psychology are of great importance to the field of ethics. Ethics can benefit from experimental economics and psychology in two ways:

1. Economic experiments can help scrutinize existing or suggested institutions aimed at addressing moral problems.
2. Psychological experiments can cast a light on our cognitive boundaries which might complicate moral problems.

In what follows, I will explicate and illustrate both those claim.

Economic experiments have a history of shaking up common-sensical convictions: A case in point is the four-eye principle that states that the involvement of a second individual in a process of – say an administrative approval – reduces the risk of unethical behavior, e.g., accepting a bribe. Yet experimental research found that a second pair of eyes can also work as an enabler of moral transgressions, by diffusing the moral responsibility (Dana et al., 2007). The phenomenon of moral diffusion is of great importance to ethics because it informs us about which institutional set-up might promote or prevent moral transgressions.

On a methodological level, economic experiments are distinguished by methodological rigor. The following two aspects may serve as an illustration: 1) With the help of controlled experiments, we can investigate human decisions by testing causal connections to specific situational triggers. Establishing causal connections is a unique property of experimental research, because the analysis of real-world data sets is most of the time restricted to the investigation of correlations. 2) Experimental research transcends the collection of stated preferences via surveys. Instead, in economic experiments, monetary incentives are used to bring participants’ *revealed* preferences to light by putting their money where their mouth is (Herwig and Ortmann, 2001). That way, the incentives counteract the social desirability bias, which is an issue with many straight-forward surveys. Furthermore, incentives mitigate people’s inclination to preserve a favorable self-image – an inclination that is especially heightened the moral domain.

With regard to agricultural and food issues, experimental economics research can help illuminate ethically relevant phenomena such as the infamous consumer-citizens gap: the gap between what citizens demand from food production (animal welfare, bee-friendly agriculture, and climate conscious production, to name but a few) and what those citizens in the role of consumers are willing to pay to compensate for those extra services. Experimental investigations can help us to better understand the situational factors at play, as well as the cognitive mechanisms behind the consumer-citizen gap such as *moral balancing* and *moral licensing*.

Furthermore, we can experimentally test institutional arrangements to narrow this consumer-citizen gap.

Ethical analyses can also benefit from findings from the field of moral psychology, which specifically explores the cognitive mechanisms behind moral attitudes. This interrelation between the cognitive and moral domain can be further explored with the help of experiments to address specific ethical questions.

Moral psychology is based on the assumption that morality has evolved as a capacity to deal with social dilemmas that have arisen in the social groups of our ancestors. Therefore, our deeply engrained moral convictions are not necessarily adapted to the reality of modern, anonymous, large-scale societies, which can cause moral malfunction and societal friction. This friction can only be mitigated if we understand where our specific moral intuitions are coming from, how a specific mental system is triggered and how we can transcend our moral intuitions and engage in deliberative reasoning instead. Only with the help of these insights can we as ethicists distinguish functional from dysfunctional morality and thus address societal problems in an effective way.

Societies are currently undergoing structural change brought about by the introduction of digital technologies in almost all areas of life. In agriculture and food systems, these technologies have

the potential to address challenges such as global food security and adequate nutrition, or greenhouse gas reduction. Yet they are also a disruptive force and pose risks – not only with regard to the technological applications themselves, but also to social cohesion of norms. Experimental ethics needs to investigate where our evolved moral norms raise justified doubts and where they might overshoot the target and, thus, prevent technologies from realizing their welfare-enhancing potential. A case in point is genetic engineering (GE), which – applied to crop plants – may contribute to viable solutions to the above-mentioned challenges of the global food system. While there is ample evidence for consumer skepticism toward GE foods, much less is known about what drives this skepticism and whether it can be mitigated. Experimental ethics can investigate which mental models drive moral intuitions on GE attitudes and test settings in which a more deliberative thinking and thus the willingness to engage in open policy discourse can be promoted.

Agricultural and food ethics is expected to contribute to the challenges of sustainable food systems within modern agriculture that is undergoing structural change. In that regard, it is the unique property of ethics to ask questions that drill down to the heart of the problem. This is best accomplished with both a micro perspective that looks at the individual as a moral agent, and also a macro perspective that illuminates the interdependencies of institutional arrangements in the global world. The empirical approaches from experimental economics and moral psychology can help accomplishing this goal. In sum, agricultural ethics that (also) uses experiments considers the contingencies of the modern world by critically evaluating intentions and consequences, opens theory building to counter-intuitive findings, and is implementation-oriented and, thus, capable of testing and evaluating existing agricultural policies.

paper

References

- Dana, J., Weber, R.A. and Kuang, J. X. (2007). Exploiting moral wiggle room: experiments demonstrating an illusory preference for fairness. *Economic Theory*, 33(1), 67-80.
- Davis, B.B. (1978). The moralistic fallacy. *Nature*, 272, 390.
- Greene, J.D. (2014). Beyond point-and-shoot morality: Why cognitive (neuro) science matters for ethics. *Ethics*, 124(4), 695-726.
- Hertwig, R. and Ortmann, A. (2001). Experimental practices in economics: A methodological challenge for psychologists? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 24(03), 383-403.

Experimental veterinary and animal ethics

Kirsten Persson



Both academic animal ethics and applied veterinary ethics can benefit from approaches in experimental ethics as methodological enhancements in research and teaching.

Thought experiments have the potential to play a role in veterinary and animal ethics in several ways:

1. The use of thought experiments in teaching

Unlike discussions of exemplary cases taken from veterinary practice, which are quite common in veterinary teaching, thought experiments provide opportunities to focus on specific, isolated factors. Case studies have already been suggested as appropriate method for ethics teaching in veterinary medicine (Magalhães-Sant'Ana and Hanlon, 2016).

Thought experiments in a narrower sense – i.e., completely fictional scenarios designed to test hypotheses – might go even further. If, for example, the animal patient in the thought experiment is a unicorn rather than a cow or a cat, students might no longer be distracted by species-specific properties or legal frameworks. Neither is their attention drawn to former experience including complex contexts and veterinarian-patient owner relationships. Discussing cases without discussing clichés regarding patient owners ('cow farmers never want x' or 'if she is a cat-lady she will never give consent') can facilitate new perspectives on, for example, their professional attitude for a future veterinarian.

Furthermore, thought experiments allow the modification of circumstances that present difficulties or obstacles in real life. Treatment costs and periods, for example, can be set arbitrarily in fictional scenarios. Animal patients can get buttons to express their preferences, pet insurances or 'magical' medica-

Kirsten Persson
University of Veterinary
Medicine, Hannover,
Germany
kirsten.persson@tiho-
hannover.de

tion can be stipulated etc. That way, students can be challenged to re-evaluate their decision-making criteria, to become aware of cognitive biases, to question their own boundaries or principles or to take new perspectives on cases, patients, and clients. Questions targeted in such teaching settings might be: How important are financial aspects for my decisions as a veterinarian? Are there thresholds I would (not) cross? In cases of conflicting interests between patient and patient owner, which factors do I consider for my advice and decision? Is there a difference between my judgements based on legal framework and those based on moral intuitions? Am I convinced that animal patients value their lives as such or rather their quality of life?

Additionally, research results of experimental philosophy studies, like other empirical work involving relevant groups (Merle and Küper 2021, Hayama et al., 2016), can provide valuable insights for students in veterinary studies, animal ethics and even human-animal studies. Pet-owners, for example, (but also veterinarians, farmers, forest rangers...) might show a significantly different answering pattern compared to people without regular contact to animals, when it comes to ascribing suffering, intentions, or consciousness etc. to nonhuman animals in particular contexts. The need for further research in this area will be elaborated below.

Introducing (non-philosophy) students to thought experiments can thus lead to fruitful discussions and is, in the author's experience, highly appreciated and even asked for by students in teaching evaluations.

2. Establishing thought experiments in learning outcome assessments

As ethics is not an examination subject in veterinary medicine, learning outcomes need to be assessed in other ways. A compilation of thought experiments pinpointing at pivotal aims of ethics teaching such as the students' abilities to, e.g., identify stakeholders, ethical issues, and conflicts can present a meaningful tool for that purpose. Highlighting core questions in veterinary, biomedical and animal ethics about the beginning and

end of life, cost-benefit-analysis, pet owner compliance, the anthropological difference, quality of life assessment or allocations of scarce resources, to mention only some, carefully designed thought experiments present opportunities to demonstrate well-founded attitudes, arguments, and decision-making competencies. An exploratory study using a prototype of that kind of tool (unpublished) promises the possibility of a novel way for ethics teachers to receive feedback, including the potential to carve out the students' most dominant ethical values and approaches. Furthermore, the development of ethical competencies can be observed in longitudinal studies making use of those tools at the beginning and the end of the students' ethics education, and even beyond education. Comparing the students' answers in thought experiments to those of practising veterinarians might reveal the influence of mostly theoretical knowledge vs. practical experience.

3. Experimental philosophy in animal ethics research

Arguments regarding the moral standing of nonhuman animals have a long tradition in philosophy. A common approach in this matter is referring to the anthropological difference. After all, what is judged to fundamentally distinguish humans from other animals is often the basis for arguing that it is morally imperative or at least permissible to consider and treat humans differently from non-human animals. Particularly when discussing so called marginal cases, experimental philosophy can make an important contribution to the elaboration of moral intuitions. Other empirical data such as questionnaires or interviews are often obtained from participants who are personally involved in cases, e.g., as patients, parents, or other relatives of patients. Sharing personal experience and judging a fictional situation are quite different approaches and, accordingly, allow for different research questions. Pointing towards the commonalities and differences between humans and nonhuman animals can be considered a definition (of moral standing) by demarcation.

As a different approach to the moral standing of animals, philosophers have suggested lists of criteria that serve as necessary conditions for moral

consideration of sorts (such as being sentient, having interests, capabilities, agency, consciousness etc.) (Zuolo, 2016). In contrast to the first approach, this can be described as a definition by compilation. Nevertheless, the human moral standing and, consequently, human capacities and properties, could serve as a benchmark in both approaches. It is an ongoing dispute within the debate on speciesism in how far this should be the case (Zuolo, 2016). Experimentally testing for criteria that motivate people's moral judgements and decisions concerning nonhuman animals might help, firstly and descriptively, to better understand the mechanisms of human morality (Goodwin, 2015), but also secondly and normatively, to reveal misconceptions of animal properties, cognitive dissonances, and corresponding

coping mechanisms (Persson et al., 2019), and contradictions to normative concepts in animal ethics. The latter need to be handled with care as experimental ethics should not fall prone to isought fallacies. However, it can be considered an important task for experimental philosophers to carve out links between people's moral intuitions and sources of ethics traditions (Sytsma and Machery, 2012).

Moreover, intuitions about different human-animal relationships can be explored through fictional scenarios. Further research is needed on more differentiated hypotheses within the field of questions such as: Is it crucial which functional role (pet, farm animal, wild animal...) an individual fills or is the taxon (dog, pig, spider) decisive? Is evolutionary proximity to humans (mammal vs. insect) an important criterion for moral judgements? Do people feel a stronger moral obligation towards known/dependent/vulnerable animals than towards others? Are differences found between groups of people regarding these questions?

An animal ethics approach informed by results of empirical and especially experimental ethics research can leave behind outdated ethical judgements on 'the animals', highlight targeted arguments regarding cognitive dissonances and smoothly connect with the larger societal discourse on non-human animals.

The three-application context for thought experiments in animal and veterinary ethics presented here demonstrate the potential of creative and flexible methods to approach a broad range of research questions that still need to be explored.

References

- Goodwin, G.P. (2015). Experimental approaches to moral standing. *Philosophy Compass*, 10(12), 914-926.
- Hayama, S., Chang, L., Gumus, K., King, G.R. and Ernst, T. (2016). Neural correlates for perception of companion animal photographs. *Neuropsychologia*, 85, 278-286.
- Magalhães-Sant'Ana, M. and Hanlon, A.J. (2016). Straight from the horse's mouth: using vignettes to support student learning in veterinary ethics. *Journal of veterinary medical education*, 43(3), 321-330.
- Merle, R. and Küper, A. (2021). Desire for information and alternative therapies of pet owners is associated with empathy and partnership-building of veterinarians. *Journal of Small Animal Practice*, 62(9), 775-787.
- Persson, K., Appel, R. and Shaw, D. (2019). A Wicked Fairy in the Woods-how would People alter their Animal Product Consumption if they were affected by the Consequences of their Choices? *Food Ethics*, 4(1), 1-20.
- Sytsma, J. and Machery, E. (2012). The two sources of moral standing. *Review of Philosophy and Psychology*, 3(3), 303-324.
- Zuolo, F. (2016). Individuals, Species and Equality. A Critique of McMahan's Intrinsic Potential Account. *The Journal of Value Inquiry*, 50(3), 573-592.

Betwixt and between?!

Reflections on interdisciplinary work

Svenja Springer



Highly motivated, I studied veterinary medicine in order to be able to say one day: I am a veterinarian. After graduation, my path led me into the interdisciplinary research field of empirically informed veterinary ethics.

Today – equally highly motivated and enthusiastic – I am doing research in this field. Using social science methods, I collaborate with researchers from philosophy, sociology, and veterinary medicine to investigate ethical conflicts and challenges that emerge in veterinary practice. Recently, I was asked about my ‘job title’: are you an animal ethicist? Or are you a veterinarian? A clear answer – in the sense of belonging to one discipline – was difficult for me. Thus, I found myself confronted with the questions: Am I in a disciplinary ‘identity crisis’? Or, is my problem with the clear assignment to a discipline much more a ‘symptom’ of interdisciplinary work?

Interdisciplinarity - Potentials, Challenges and Limitations

In the academic world, the term interdisciplinarity is on everyone’s lips. Mostly with positive connotations and downright *en vogue*, it encompasses a way of working that addresses complex problem areas by bringing together several disciplines and seeking comprehensive approaches to solving them. Karl Popper was already of the opinion that it is not the individual disciplines that are researched, but rather their problems that are the focus of research. He stressed that ‘we study not disciplines, but problems. Often problems transcend the boundaries of a particular discipline’ (Popper, 2000, 97). In



recent decades, interdisciplinary work has become institutionalized not only in the form of journals but also in several research institutions dedicated to theoretical, practical, and methodological interdisciplinarity. The establishment of these research institutions thereby breaks down the traditional faculty distinctions of technical, natural, social sciences, and humanities (Jungert et al., 2013, VI). Even though interdisciplinarity is frequently used in today’s science debates and has become a key competence, the definition of the term – especially when distinguished from para-, multi-, trans-, and cross-disciplinarity remains fuzzy.

Essential aspects of the concept of interdisciplinarity were elaborated by Dürnberger and Sedmak (2004) in the context of an interview study with 31 scientists. On the basis of their data, they define interdisciplinarity as a ‘form of scientific cooperation in which experts, on the basis of mutual recognition and mutual trust, work on a problem in a coordinated manner within the framework of scientific organizational conditions and in accordance with available resources [and] in principle on an equal footing in teams [...]’ (Dürnberger and Sedmak, 2004, 6 [translated by the author]). Based on this definition, the requirements of interdisciplinary work become apparent. The most important aspect lies in the willingness to cooperate interdisciplinarily, which requires in particular time, steadfastness in one’s own discipline, appreciation of other disciplines, transparent

communication strategies as well as scientific criteria.

The motives for interdisciplinarity can be external to science (e.g., politics and society) or internal to science (e.g., limits of disciplinary theories and methods) (Jungert, 2013), whereby the benefit lies not only in the cooperation in the development of comprehensive solutions, but results should also flow back into the individual disciplines and be communicated (Dürnberger and Sedmak, 2004). In addition to expert knowledge from various disciplines involved in an interdisciplinary project, social competencies are required to successfully contribute to and work in an interdisciplinary research team. Although the success of interdisciplinary work is directly dependent on the people involved and the social interaction, this aspect is rarely addressed in the literature. Willingness to cooperate, curiosity and interest in new/foreign things, the ability to adopt different perspectives, and sincerity are to be mentioned as core competencies that form the basis and basic prerequisite of successful interdisciplinary work (Dürnberger and Sedmak, 2004).

In addition to advocacy for interdisciplinarity, critical voices can also be found in the debate surrounding the topic that focus on questions of necessity, feasibility, and the limitations of interdisciplinary work. Vollmer (2013) distinguishes four important problem areas: first, the high de-

Svenja Springer

Messerli Research Institute,
Vienna, Austria
svenja.springer@vetmeduni.ac.at

*This article is based on a blog entry published online at Swiss Portal for Philosophy**

References

- Dürnberger, M. and Sedmak, C. (2004). *Erfahrungen mit Interdisziplinarität*. Working Papers theories & commitments. Online access: www.uni-salzburg.at/fileadmin/multimedia/Zentrum_fuer_Ethik_und_Armutsforschung/documents/Working_Papers/Theories_And_Commitments/D%C3%BCrnerbergerUA-Interdisziplinarit%C3%A4t.pdf.
- Jungert, M. (2013). Was zwischen wem und warum eigentlich? Grundsätzliche Fragen zur Interdisziplinarität. In: Jungert, M., Romfeld, E., Sukopp, T. Voigt, U. (eds.): *Interdisziplinarität - Theorie, Praxis, Probleme*. Darmstadt: WBG (Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft), pp. 1-12.
- Jungert, M., Romfeld, E., Sukopp, T. Voigt, U. (2013). *Interdisziplinarität - Theorie, Praxis, Probleme*. Darmstadt: WBG (Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft).
- Popper, K. (2000; 1963). *Vermutungen und Wiederlegungen. Das Wachstum der wissenschaftlichen Erkenntnis*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Vollmer, G. (2013). Interdisziplinarität - unerlässlich, aber leider unmöglich? In: Jungert, M., Romfeld, E., Sukopp, T. Voigt, U. (eds.): *Interdisziplinarität - Theorie, Praxis, Probleme*. Darmstadt: WBG (Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft), pp. 61-7.
- *Springer, S. (2021). Zwischen den Stühlen stehen? Gedanken und Erfahrungen zum interdisziplinären Arbeiten. Available online: www.philosophie.ch/artikel/2021/2021-02-01-springer.

gree of knowledge required; second, the need for simplifications, which in turn can lead to distortions; third, the problem of difficulty in identifying and resolving misunderstandings; and fourth, the problem of self-overestimation by one or several of the people involved. Based on their interview results, Dürnberger and Sedmak (2004) also identify difficulties that arise in particular from the lack of quality standards, scientific criteria, and forums that provide a suitable infrastructure for interdisciplinary work. Due to the brevity of this paper, I will not go into detail about the individual problem areas here. Nevertheless, there is no question that

the critical viewpoints provide an important basis for further reflection on interdisciplinarity – not only for its critics, but also for researchers working interdisciplinarily.

What is the disciplinary 'identity crisis' all about?

Undoubtedly, disciplinary knowledge of those involved represents an important starting point to successfully work in interdisciplinary environments. But one should also reflect on the question regarding expert knowledge from another perspective, one that closely parallels the increasing establishment of interdisciplinary work. It is not uncommon for young scientists to expand their knowledge and skills in more than one discipline after completing their studies. Interdisciplinary research projects lead to 'interdisciplinary socialization' and consequently young scholars are imprinted with different disciplinary mindsets and cultures from the very beginning.

After seven years of interdisciplinary research activity in the field of empirical veterinary ethics, I can admittedly say: I am a researcher. However, I feel that I am sometimes 'betwixt and between' in regard to a clear assignment to a discipline: ethical theories, veterinary medical understanding, and a confident use of social science methods are required in this field.

There is no doubt that belonging to a discipline provides orientation, which strengthens the scientific self-conception. However, in the near future, I think that more scientists will be increasingly socialized into the academic world in an interdisciplinary way, which frequently leads to self-critical questions regarding their (inter)disciplinary identity and academic existence. Questions about disciplinary identity can be exhausting. But these questions are important, and therefore more time and space should be provided in the future for reflection on overly rigid disciplinary boundaries. In my view, this in turn promotes and strengthens interdisciplinary work.

phd project

Joost van Herten

Wageningen University and
Research, The Netherlands
j.van.herten@knmvd.nl

Considerations for an Ethic of One Health

Towards a socially responsible zoonotic disease control

Joost van Herten



The COVID-19 pandemic once again confirmed that zoonotic diseases are a serious threat to humanity. These infectious diseases, transmitted from animals to humans, have the power to cause a global health crisis. Over time the risk on these outbreaks

has increased. Some of the main drivers are global population growth, urbanization, worldwide transport, increased demand for animal protein, unsustainable agriculture, and climate change. This development has fueled a renewed interest in the relation between human, animal and environmental health. This was framed in the concept of One Health: the integrative effort of multiple disciplines working locally, nationally, and globally to attain optimal health for people, animals, and the environment. At present, One Health is the worldwide standard to combat zoonotic diseases. In an ideal world such a strategy should lead to a better health for humans, animals and our environment.

However, in practice it is not self-evident that a One Health approach in zoonotic disease control is actually in the interest of animals or the environment. From a holistic One Health perspective it can be difficult to accept the culling of healthy animals to protect public health. The same goes for long term



confinement of free-range poultry, whose housing systems are often not suitable for this purpose, to prevent avian influenza outbreaks. Or antimicrobial reduction policies that lead to higher disease incidence and mortality in animals. These ethical considerations formed the start of thesis.

The aim of my research is to clarify the ethical assumptions of a One Health approach in zoonotic disease control, to explore how these can be coherently understood and justified and to indicate what this implies for policymaking. The outcome of my research contributes to the development of an ethic of One Health and will hopefully lead to a more socially acceptable zoonotic disease control. This project is related to the interdisciplinary Wageningen UR strategic research theme 'Global One Health'.

From my conceptual analysis, it follows that there is no universal interpretation of the One Health concept nor of a One Health approach in zoonotic disease control. Nevertheless, One Health has produced several successes in zoonotic disease control, surveillance and research. Due to its ambiguity, the One Health concept

functions as a boundary object: by leaving room for interpretation to fit different purposes it facilitates cooperation. In many cases this results in the promotion of health of humans, animals and the environment. However, there are also situations in which this mutual benefit of a One Health approach is not that evident. For instance, when healthy animals are culled to protect public health. To address these moral dilemmas, it is important to develop an ethical framework. Such an ethic of One Health starts with acknowledging the moral status of animals and the indirect moral obligations we have towards ecosystems. Furthermore, it is necessary that we find an appropriate definition of health, which encompasses all three components of One Health.

As part of my thesis, I did an empirical study on normative presuppositions of health professionals involved in zoonotic disease control policies in the Netherlands. This study reveals that in theory these professionals adhere to a holistic view of the One Health concept. However, in practice an anthropocentric approach was dominant. The study

identified public health as a trumping moral value, which reveals an inherent field of tension with the core of One Health thinking. Furthermore, a lack of ethical expertise in control systems for zoonotic diseases can lead to misconception of ethical principles, like the precautionary principle. I discuss that within a One Health strategy, that requires us to balance public health benefits against the health interests of animals and the environment, unrestricted use of the precautionary principle can lead to moral dilemmas. It must at least be clear that there is a harm and some scientific evidence for a cause-and-effect relation. Furthermore, precautionary measures should be effective, consistent, proportional and not counterproductive. An assessment of their effect should be integrated in the standard decision-models of public health authorities. Moreover, to ensure societal support these considerations should be transparent and open for dialogue.

I present two possible conceptions of the precautionary principle. First, it is noticeable that

because of the unpredictable nature of zoonotic diseases, public health authorities focus on the idea of 'precaution as preparedness'. This reactive response leads to difficult trade-offs between human and animal health. I therefore argue that this policy should always be accompanied by a second policy: 'precaution as prevention'. Addressing the underlying drivers of zoonotic diseases is a necessary condition to justify disease control measures that harm animals and ecosystems on the basis of the precautionary principle.

I also elaborate the responsibilities of veterinarians within the One Health framework. Veterinarians are professionally responsible for the health and welfare of the animals under their care. Moreover, society expects veterinarians to safeguard food safety and public health. These societal expectations are sometimes overdemanding. A holistic perspective on One Health offers veterinarians a way out of the dichotomy between public and animal health, that is at the basis of many moral dilemmas in zoonotic disease control. This is explained with the 'encapsulated health' argument: the best way to safeguard human health is to promote the health of animals and the environment.

Finally, I conclude that before we decide to implement certain disease control measures, an ethic of One Health requires that we choose those interventions that have the least impact on the health of animals and ecosystems, while still effective enough to stop the disease. My research indicates that the contemporary conception of One Health is necessary but insufficient to address moral dilemmas related to emerging zoonotic diseases. A holistic interpretation of the One Health concept confronts us with underlying value conflicts but will ultimately promote human health more than the current anthropocentric conception.

Considerations for an ethic of One Health

Towards a socially responsible zoonotic disease control



Joost van Hertem

Games and Ethics

Theoretical and Empirical Approaches to Ethical Questions in Digital Game Cultures

Christian Dürnberger



The editors and authors

The anthology was edited by Maïke Groen, Nina Kiel, Angela Tillmann, and André Weßel. Maïke Groen is a scientific researcher for the DLR Project Management Agency, focussing on media pedagogy. Nina Kiel is a

game journalist, researcher, and developer. Angela Tillmann is a professor of cultural and media pedagogy at TH Köln – University of Applied Sciences. André Weßel is a research associate in the area of media pedagogy at TH Köln – University of Applied Sciences.

Contributors of the anthology: Nikola Biller-Andorno, Markus Christen, Anne Dippel, Tobias Eichinger, Ahmed Elmenzy, Alexander Filipovi, Sonia Fizek, Sonja Gabriel, Maïke Groen, Arno Görge, Robin Janzik, Jennifer Jenson, Johannes Katsarov, Nina Kiel, Julian Lamers, Thorsten Quandt, Felix Reer, David Schmocker, Karen Schrier, Miguel Sicart, Stefan H. Simond, Angela Tillmann, Lars-Ole Wehden, André Weßel, Jeffrey Wimmer.

Objective and results of the book

The basic premise of the book is that an increasing number of people is spending more and more time playing video games. In other words: Computer games are no longer a niche phenomenon, but part of mainstream culture. This also makes these games a topic of ethics, as this anthology shows – including a variety of perspectives in contrast to earlier years when the corre-

sponding debates centred almost exclusively on the effects of first-person shooters.

The book attempts to combine theoretical, practical and empirical insights; and this not only regarding the content of the games or the potential effects of games (exemplary keyword: gaming addiction), but also, for example, discussing ethical questions in the context of the production processes of games (exemplary keyword: lack of female involvement). This illustrates the broad approach of the book. The compilation of contributions not only shows the breadth of the subject, but also, as Lamers and Filipovi note in their article, ‘that an applied ethics of computer gaming has not yet been convincingly and systematically formed. There is still a lot of work to be done in this area, which depends above all on interdisciplinarity.’ The book makes an important contribution to the further development of the still young discipline.

The potential of games in the context of teaching ethics is shown not least by Schier’s contribution, arguing that games may support complex learning, encourage participants to take on the role of another, and help users to understand that their decisions do have specific consequences – all important aspects when it comes to ethical reflection.

Most striking

The book does not only inspire theoretical, societal and political discourses, but also dares to take a concrete, empirical look at games, as the following examples show: Katsarov et al. present the conception of a ‘serious moral game’ called ‘uMed: Your choice’; a game that is intended to train the ‘moral sensitivity’ of medical students. Gabriel discusses the role of game design in serious games, bringing the example of ‘Path out’, an ‘autobiographical adventure game’ in which the player takes on the role of a Syrian refugee. Kiel explores the potential of games to close gaps in sex education, presenting the results of a comprehensive analysis of 34 sex education games.

It is not least these empirical views on concrete games that are extremely worth reading and that also give non-gamers a good insight into the status quo of game development when it comes to values and ethics.

Reasons (not) to read the book

If you are looking for a systematically elaborated ethics of computer games, the book will maybe disappoint you. But the book cannot be blamed for that: The study of these questions is still young; and an anthology always brings together different perspectives and disciplines.

However, the reasons to read the book are weighty: Indeed, it is astonishing how little academic ethics still deals with the phenomenon of ‘computer games’; and how few attempts there are to use such games in ethics classes. The book not only provides theoretical considerations, but also empirical analyses and presentations of concrete already existing or planned games that make you want to play – and in the best case inspire further developments.



Games and Ethics. Theoretical and Empirical Approaches to Ethical Questions in Digital Game Cultures

Edited by: Maïke Groen, Nina Kiel, Angela Tillmann, André Weßel

Springer VS 2020, 256 pages
E-Book: € 46,00; ISBN 978-3-658-28175-5
Softcover: € 70,00; ISBN 978-3-658-28174-8

Samuel Camenzind

IGN Forschungspreis 2021



In volume 22 of the EurSafe News (Oct. 2020), it was announced, that Samuel Camenzind's PhD-thesis has been published as a monograph titled *Instrumentalisierung. Zu einer Grundkategorie der Ethik der Mensch-Tier-Beziehung* by the publisher Brill/mentis. We are pleased to give you an update in this regard.

Samuel's book is among the award winners of the Forschungspreis 2021 from the Internationale Gesellschaft für Nutztierhaltung/International Society of Livestock Husbandry (IGN, Germany). With its prize the 1978 founded society intends to promote young scientists. Besides awarding outstanding scientific achievements that serve the further development of species-appropriate animal husbandry, the IGN also considers ethical and philosophical studies, which examine the human-animal relationship from perspective of the humanities.

Jes Harfeld

Educator of the Year Award



Associate Professor Jes Lynning Harfeld was awarded the title of Educator of the Year by the students from Techno-Anthropology at Aalborg University, Denmark. Jes was initially nominated due to his creativity, as he has managed to crack the code on how to conduct online lectures, and keeping the students engaged and included. The students applauded his passion for technology and ethics, and his ability to make his passion shine through and infect the students.

Beside flowers and wine, the award included a € 3.300 honorarium.

In remembrance of Bernard E. Rollin

February 18, 1943 - November 19, 2021

Distinguished Professor Bernard E. Rollin, Colorado State University, died on November 19th in Fort Collins. He was 78 years old.



Bernie was from Brooklyn, a borough of New York City, and received his PhD from the Columbia University, working on epistemology and semiotics under the guidance of, among others, Arthur C. Danto. He moved to Colorado State University (CSU) in Fort Collins in 1969 and would spend the next fifty years working at and to some extent defining the philosophy department there.

It was at CSU, a university with prominent agricultural traditions, that Bernie discovered the lack of philosophical ethics pertaining to animals in agricultural and veterinary practices. This led him to write one of the first philosophy books on animal ethics, *Animal Rights & Human Morality* (1981). With this

By Jes Lynning Harfeld
Aalborg University, Denmark
harfeld@hum.aau.dk

Photo credit: Linda Rollin



book, he established himself among the founding fathers and mothers of modern animal ethics. From the get-go he was to a certain extent in opposition to both utilitarian and Kantian inspired animal ethics. Although he thought highly of Singer's work, *Animal Liberation* (1975), recognizing it as pioneering in the field, he tended towards seeing pain and pleasure as too restricted an approach to animal welfare. Instead, his first book on animal ethics also became the birthplace of his now famous concept of 'telos' as describing the ethically relevant essential characteristics – the nature – of any given animal. An approach, he argued, that went beyond and was an improvement to the utilitarian approach.

When it came to Kant and Kantianism, Bernie was often of two minds. On the one side, he admired the original philosophy of Kant in all its complexity. On the other hand, Kant's somewhat limited and negative view on animals often made him exclaim something to the extent of: 'Ah, Kant. He was a genius ... in a dumbass kind of way!' He did not give up this attitude, even while appreciating Tom Regan's Kantian approach in *The Case for Animal Rights* (1983) two years later. Unlike both Singer and Regan, Bernie never developed a

consistent and 'grand theory' of animal ethics in what we would recognize as such today. Instead, he consistently and throughout his career focused on: 1) what fundamental types of epistemologies do we need to get any type of action guiding ethics going and 2) how do we change thought and behaviour (incl. laws) related to animal welfare and rights? The first focus is clear from the title of one of Bernie's last books. It is not called *A New Animal Ethics*, but *A New Basis for Animal Ethics* (2016) and reads as a summation of his work over the last forty years. Work that mainly focuses on accepting and understanding animal mind, the possibilities of anthropomorphism, overcoming human self-centred bias and scientific ideology and teaching ethics to students and the public. The fundamental ethical requirement argued throughout Bernie's works is that we need to shift our view of the ethical world to incorporate animals – or as Bernie wrote himself in *Animal Rights & Human Morality*: 'we are morally bound to understand the lives upon whom our actions have profound and considerable effect, for only through such understanding can come a respect for their rights.'

Bernie hosted me as a visiting scholar in 2009 while I was writing my PhD thesis. Before I left Denmark for Colorado, I did not know much about him, and I had read only very little of what he had written. But somehow his name kept coming up in all the literature that I liked. Finally, when both my co-advisor, ethologist Birte Lindstrøm Nielsen, and prominent environmental philosopher, Mark Sagoff, independently of each other recommended that I really should go visit Professor Rollin, I went. When I first wrote and asked Bernie if he would host me during my stay, I got what I later learned was a very Bernie'sk reply. First, he wrote me back almost immediately. Something that I was not used to from other professors. And second, his answer to this unknown Danish PhD student was: 'Sure, I will be happy to have you here. I am terribly busy, but I will find time to meet and talk with you.' I do many of the things I do today because of Bernie. Now as an associate professor of applied ethics, I still endeavour to understand and further develop aspects of animal philosophy that Bernie introduced me to when I was a doctoral student. I am currently working on a project where not only

his idea of animal telos, but also his concept of a moral 'gestalt shift' play major roles.

But even more than analysing and being inspired by his research, I try to emulate the way he made me feel welcome in his classroom and in our dialogues. Thousands of students have passed through Bernie's classrooms during the last half century. Not only bachelor and graduate students from philosophy, but students from agricultural sciences and veterinary sciences and many other fields. Bernie cherished teaching students more than anything else in academic life. Talking about his students at CSU in a feature video from 2016 he says: 'I can't say enough about these kids. I love them, I just love them.' And the love was reciprocated. From the online memorial writings and the many comments on social media in the recent week (in multiple languages), it is painfully clear that generations of students have lost one of the people who was pivotal to their education and often even their personal bildung – or even their career. This is certainly true for me on all counts.

Sitting in on his seminars or talks, one could not escape his passion for his students, their learning experience and for the topic at hand. As one of his former students, Associate Professor Joshua Shepherd, wrote on Twitter: 'One got the sense that one had to fight for one's views, and not just in the journals. One had to be a human, demanding that other humans take this shit seriously.' It is true that Bernie could come across somewhat abrasive to people who were not accustomed to his tone. I once asked if it was on purpose that one of his graduate seminars was called 'Philos-

Suggested readings by Bernard E. Rollin

- Animal Rights & Human Morality*, 3rd ed., Prometheus Books (the book that started it all in 1981)
- The Unheeded Cry*, Iowa State University Press (his best book, originally 1989, extended version in 1998)
- Putting the Horse before Descartes*, Temple University Press (his memoir, published in 2011)

ophy 666'. 'Yes' he said smiling, 'I could call it any 600-number I liked, and this one keeps the evangelicals away!' He then stuck his tongue out, made devil horns with his hand and laughed diabolically. At that moment, I knew we would be friends. Another time, I was disagreeing vehemently with him on something – I think it was capital punishment and I was opposed to it – he looked at me and said: 'That's because you're such a damn liberal commie!' and then he smiled that Bernie-smile and laughed, and we continued our discussion in depth. I don't think I've ever felt more welcome in a classroom.

Bernie's personal and academic generosity shaped me and continue to shape me as I try to live by his example. We had not seen each other for years, but we kept in touch and his help and encouragements throughout my career never ceased or ceased to amaze me.

Although he was a secular man, Bernie still felt a cultural and historical connection to his Jewish heritage. He seemed to see it as a personal credit to me that most of the Danish Jews were saved from the Holocaust by being sailed to Sweden during the Second World War. And he would teach me the meanings of Yiddish/German words from his upbringing in the Jewish community in New York City. One of these was the word 'Mensch' which in German translates to 'human' but in Yiddish has a very strong additional meaning. It describes the essentially good human, the person who lives up to the telos of a well lived life with others.

Bernie was a man very much still in Love with his wife of 57 years, Linda and he was ever proud of his son, Michael. He was a tireless advocate for animal rights and an eminent philosophical scholar. But above and through it all, he was a real Mensch.

EurSafe Executive Committee

Update June 2021



When you read this, we are already heading towards the end of the year... An extraordinary year with a lot of ethical challenges and questions. At face value most of them seem at the level of (public) health, responsibility and public policy.

However, the current pandemic shows also the importance of reflecting on the future of food production, our relation to other animals and the environment and climate changes.

All themes that we already touched upon during our first online conference last June and that will definitely remain on the agenda of the EurSafe 2022 conference in Edinburgh. Therefore, I encourage you all to participate in this conference and actively contribute to the program by submitting a paper or proposing special sessions. All information on submission and registration is available at www.eursafe2022.ed.ac.uk.

This autumn the Board had an online meeting in which we discussed the progress of the EurSafe 2022 and made some first steps towards the EurSafe conference in 2024, which will be our 25th Anniversary as conference organizer! Next, we discussed the financial position of EurSafe. Overall, we are a healthy society in financial terms with sufficient reserves. This entails that – as part of the Five-year strategic plan that we are working on – we will come with a proposal to keep the society in a solid financial position but also look at opportunities to invest money to strengthen our society as a living network. We hope to finish this plan early 2022 and then will share it for discussion with you as EurSafe members.

Best regards, Franck Meijboom
On behalf of the Executive Board, 1 September 2021

Special Issue on 'Empirical Animal and Veterinary Medical Ethics'

Dear Colleagues,

In the past few decades, several areas of applied ethics, notably medical ethics, have taken an empirical turn. Here, social science methods are used to generate empirical knowledge that informs ethical debates. Even though academic interest in studying human-animal relationships has been growing, until recently there has been very little empirical work in the fields of applied ethics relating to animals.

With this special issue, we aim to contribute to the development of an empirical turn in the context of animal and veterinary medical ethics. We welcome contributions including

1. reflections on the foundation of empirical animal or veterinary medical ethics;
2. discussions concerning methodologies of empirical animal or veterinary medical ethics;
3. reviews of developments within the field of empirical animal or veterinary medical ethics and
4. specific studies within the field of empirical animal or veterinary medical ethics, including in-depth and detailed reflections on advantages and limitations of the study design adopted.

Svenja Springer and Peter Sandøe (guest editors), Herwig Grimm, Sonja Hartnack, Barry Kipperman and Sabine Salloch (co-guest editors)

For further information please have a look at [the special issue](#).

SAVE THE DATE Conference on Veterinary Expertise in 2022



Academics at the University of Nottingham are delighted to announce that a conference on Veterinary Expertise will be held in July 2022. The online conference, hosted by the British Academy and funded by Wellcome Trust is entitled 'Constructing and contesting veterinary expertise: professionals, publics, and prospects' and will be convened by Professor Pru Hobson-West, Dr Alistair Anderson and Professor Kate Millar.

The aim of the event is to explore the evolution and contemporary significance of veterinary expertise, discuss how this knowledge becomes contested, and identify ethical challenges. The convenors warmly invite an audience of scholars and practitioners from all disciplines, including social science, ethics and veterinary medicine. The EurSafe community would be very welcome to join us.

The event will run for 3 half days from 5th to 7th July 2022, and booking will open in January 2022. Visit the conference [webpage](#) for more information.

Please save the date if you are interested in attending.

Conferences, symposia and workshops

14-15 JANUARY 2022

SCAE 2022: Students Conference on Animal Ethics

Online Conference
[website](#)

17-18 FEBRUARY 2022

Animal Minds

University of California, San Diego
[website](#)

7-10 MARCH 2022

Bioethics, Medical Ethics and Medical Law

Porto, Portugal
[website](#)

18-21 MAY 2022

Cultivating Connections: Exploring Entry Points into Sustainable Food Systems

Athens, Georgia
[website](#)

7-9 JUNE 2022

11th International Conference on Waste Management and Environmental and Economic Impact on Sustainable Development

Madrid, Spain
[website](#)

28 JUNE 2022

Advancing Animal Welfare Science 2022: UFAW International Conference

Edinburgh, Scotland, UK
[website](#)

28-29 JUNE 2022

UFAW International Conference, Advancing Animal Welfare Science

Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh, UK
[website](#)

29 JUNE - 2 JULY 2022

19th Annual Meeting: International Society for Environmental Ethics: Perspectives in

Environment and Time

Seili Island, Finland
[website](#)

5-7 JULY 2022

Constructing and Contesting Veterinary Expertise: Professionals, Publics, and Prospects

Online event, British Academy, University of Nottingham, UK
[website](#)

22-29 JULY 2022

Minding Animals International (MAC5): Animals and Climate Emergency Conference

University of Technology Sydney, Australia
[website](#)

AUGUST 2022

Summer School on Embodying, Implementing, and Institutionalising Animal Ethics

Merton College, Oxford, UK
[website](#)

7-10 SEPTEMBER 2022

EurSafe conference 2022: Transforming Food Systems

Edinburgh, Scotland, UK
[website](#)

22-23 OCTOBER 2022

Food Studies

Imagining the Edible: Food, Creativity, and the Arts

Marymount College, New York, USA
[website](#)

23-26 OCTOBER 2022

Utopia Animalia

Monte Verità (Ascona), Switzerland
[website](#)



Welcome to EURSAFE 2022

7-10 September, Edinburgh

We invite you to Transforming Food Systems, the 2022 conference of Eursafe, in Edinburgh, 7-10 September 2022, organised jointly by the School of Social and Political Science and the Global Academy of Agriculture and Food Security of the University of Edinburgh, and the ethical consultancy Edinethics Ltd.

Feeding the world's growing population in ways that are effective, ethical and socially just, and protect the natural systems on which all life depends, is one of the greatest challenges facing humanity. The vulnerability of our interlinked human systems to external impacts has been brought home by the COVID-19 pandemic. Climate change poses deeper longer term threats. Despite advances in technology, communications and much else, over a third of the global population remains affected by malnutrition. How can we transform our food systems locally and globally to meet these challenges?

The conference is planned to be in person. We invite papers and posters in the following topics:

1. Ethics and justice in food system transformation

2. Vulnerability of food systems
3. Ethics and data-driven innovation in agri-food systems
4. Food for the future
5. What role for livestock in transformed food systems
6. Current issues in Animal and Veterinary ethics
7. Planetary health ethics
8. Transforming food waste
9. Ethical issues in marine and aquaculture
10. Food from the wild
11. Any other issues withing EurSafe's scope of interest

The deadline for submission of abstracts is 15 December 2021.

Confirmed plenary speakers include Professor Lotte Holm (Copenhagen) on cultural aspects of food and Bruce Whitelaw (Roslin Institute) on animal genome editing.

For more details, information about registration, see www.eursafe2022.ed.ac.uk

contact

President

Kate Millar

Centre for Applied Bioethics,
University of Nottingham, United
Kingdom
kate.millar@nottingham.ac.uk

Teea Kortetmäki

University of Jyväskylä, Finland
teea.kortetmaki@jyu.fi

Website

www.eursafe.org

Secretary

Bernice Bovenkerk

Philosophy Group, Wageningen
University, the Netherlands
bernice.bovenkerk@wur.nl

EurSafe News

Chief-editor

Simon Meisch

University of Tuebingen, Germany
simon.meisch@uni-tuebingen.de

Treasurer

Dirk de Hen

the Netherlands
dgdehen@gmail.com

Editorial Board

Raymond Anthony

University of Alaska Anchorage, US
ranthon1@uaa.alaska.edu

Mariska van Asselt

Aeres University of Applied Sciences
Dronten, the Netherlands
m.van.asselt@aeres.nl

Bernice Bovenkerk

Wageningen University, the
Netherlands
bernice.bovenkerk@wur.nl

Vice-president

Franck L.B. Meijboom

Ethics Institute, Utrecht University,
the Netherlands
f.l.b.meijboom@uu.nl

Samuel Camenzind

Messerli Research Institute, Austria
samuel.camenzind@vetmeduni.ac.at

Members

Per Sandin

Swedish University of Agricultural
Sciences
per.sandin@slu.se

Jes Harfeld

Aalborg University, Denmark
jlh@learning.aau.dk

Diana Dumitras

University of Agricultural Science and
Veterinary Medicine
Cluj-Napoca
ddumitras@usamvcluj.ro

Zoë Robaey

Wageningen University, the
Netherlands
zoe.robaey@wur.nl

Leire Escajedo

University of the Basque Country,
Spain
leire.escajedo@ehu.es

Svenja Springer

Messerli Research Institute, Austria
svenja.springer@vetmeduni.ac.at

Herwig Grimm

Messerli Research Institute
University of Veterinary Medicine
Vienna
herwig.grimm@vetmeduni.ac.at

Layout

Luc Dinnissen

studio ds
Nijmegen, the Netherlands
www.studiods.nl

Ariane Willemsen

Federal Ethics Committee on Non-Hu-
man Biotechnology,
Switzerland
ariane.willemsen@bafu.admin.ch

Simon Meisch

University of Tuebingen, Germany
simon.meisch@uni-tuebingen.de

