EurSafe News

European Society for Agricultural and Food Ethics

EurSafe News
Volume 11, No. 2
June 2009

Contents

Editorial

Dear EurSafe Members,

I regretfully introduce you the June issue with the sad news of the loss of Vonne Lund, our colleague who did partake the co-editing activity of the newsletter during the last three years. The editorial board sincerely shares the words of remembrance from the EurSafe President.

The topic of this issue is "Ethical merits of agricultural types", a topic that was so dear to Vonne. Sustainable development, global warming, energy production, economic development, food accessibility, animal welfare, environmental concerns demand urgent and effective measures. Different views populate the ethical and political discussion on which agriculture is best suited to face the challenges of the

future. The current debate is dominated by the presence of alternative conflicting options. No agreement can be found between advocates of different agricultural models. A clear example of how inconceivable the positions are in the agricultural sector is given by the strong fight actually going on in Europe (at the national level) on the adoption/implementation of coexistence rules for GM/organic agriculture.
It is becoming clear that the role of agriculture in the future of the world is more and more crucial and that unfortunately neither organic agriculture nor conventional modern farming, at present, represents a solution for all the environmental, productivity as well as equity issues, as *Zimdhal* discusses in his contribution.
Certainly, new types of agriculture have to emerge. In a debated book, last year Ronald and Adamchak argued that organic farming should embrace genetic modification because this technology has the power to decrease human input and improve environmental conditions. Hereafter *Paarlberg* argues that technical innovation is strongly improving all the perceived negative effects of modern conventional agriculture. But he also advocates new rules to improve animal welfare in conventional farming, taking therefore inspiration from the organic farming approach.
Can organic farming values be extended to a large-scale distribution of food? Clarke gives a nice example on how the concept of organic and local farming can be implemented at an “industrial scale” while maintaining (and spreading) its traditional values.

So, is it still conceivable to choose one “right” model for agriculture or we should move towards new mixed agricultural models to be better equipped for facing future challenges? And moreover, is it possible to do that by appealing to a defined set of predefined norms or we should better see how values adapt to the changing practices of agriculture? These questions will probably be central in the debate on the future of food production and have to be put at the center of a pragmatic analysis of agricultural practices.

Finally, as usual, in the following pages you will find information on interesting conferences and funding calls.
The EurSafe News' September issue will be edited by Stef Aerts. The theme will be ”Thursday Veggieday. The ethical merits of vegetarianism promotion”. All contributions, thematic or other, should be sent to Stef.Aerts@kahosl.be before August 15, 2009.

Matias Pasquali, issue editor
CRP Gabriel Lippmann, Belvaux, Luxembourg

Thematic Section – 'Ethical merits of agricultural types'

Ethical Merits of Agricultural Types – A Few Thoughts

Robert L. Zimdahl

No society should assume its agricultural abundance is assured. All food production systems cannot create abundance at will. When the foundational values of any food production system, independent of its ability to produce abundance, allow ignoring protection of the land, maintenance of water quality, and biodiversity, its values and its sustainability ought to be questioned. Many in agriculture think sustainability can be achieved by modification of the present, developed world's successful system. Achieving sustainability is thought of as a scientific problem. However, because agriculture is the largest and most widespread human interaction with the environment, achieving sustainability will have social and ecological effects that cannot be ignored.

In the Western world we know that the post World War II shift to intensive farming systems with modern chemical and energy intensive technology led to major increases in plant and animal production. Capital, energy, and chemically intensive farming systems increased the scale of production, minimized labor, and maximized use of technology. These allowed Western nations to fulfill more adequately than any societies have the most important human task: finding a way to extract from the ecosystem enough resources to maintain life.

Countries that employ intensive agricultural systems have met the needs and many of the wants of their citizens; but, in the view of many, they have made unsustainable demands on the ecosystem, which was less valued. This success story supports belief in the universal applicability of intensive farming systems. Normatively, many agriculturalists propose that all societies ought to adopt Western agricultural methods, institutions and the associated values, because they embody the best, most rational, and most modern, thinking. Belief in the universality of Western values and culture suffers from three problems: it is false, it is immoral, and it is dangerous.

A primary question in the quest for sustainability is what is to be sustained? It is a common claim that small farms cannot feed the world. Feeding the world is a good thing to do and therefore industrialization must be sustained. Another way to think about sustainability is to ask if the limit to food production is environmentally determined or limited only by knowledge? If it is the latter, growing agricultural knowledge may resolve the sustainability dilemma. If growth is environmentally restricted, more technology will not answer sustainability's demands.

Genetic modification permits movement of genetic material across previously insurmountable biological and physical barriers. However, the agricultural biotechnology industry has been developing and selling the same two advantages for a decade: insect and herbicide resistance. Neither of these developments, in a few major crops, has increased crop yield. Crops improved by biotechnology must also meet food producing company's demands for good taste and handling properties.

There is likely to be increased public debate because such products can be patented. That tends to concentrate ownership of resources, drive up costs, inhibit independent research, and discourage continuation of farming practices such as seed-saving that are important in developing countries.
Biotechnology's successes have focused on what agricultural research has emphasized for many years—increasing production. There has been little if any emphasis on the distributional consequences. If the benefits are spread unevenly and the harm is borne by small-scale farmers, urban and rural workers, rural communities, and the environment, the poor will suffer. This unintended and preventable consequence raises important moral questions.
In addition to legitimate moral concern about worsening social inequalities, the most common objection to biotechnology includes the questions of whether or not modified food is safe for humans to eat and whether or not crops will harm the environment. Science cannot and should not ignore competing values and interests. The scientists that produce potential changes in species ought to be influenced by fundamental societal values. Science is a tool, a technique, for creating choices. Choices may be crucial to human life or they may increase benefits for some and cause harm to others. In the past, earth-shaking catastrophes—earthquakes, floods, hurricanes, cyclones, plagues, have come from outside the human mind. Now dangers are often derived from inside the human mind—nuclear weapons, global warming, loss of species diversity and, in the minds of many, genetic engineering.
Organic agriculture purports to promote and enhance biodiversity and soil biological activity. It builds good soil and is based on minimal or no use of off-farm inputs, specifically pesticides, growth hormones, genetically modified organisms, and chemical fertilizers. It is not simple adherence to a set of production practices. It raises questions about the scale of production, links between consumers and producers, and the desirability of a food production system based on sound ecological principles. It is regarded by many of its practitioners as a good way of life. Thus, the argument becomes philosophical as well as agronomic.

Contact

Robert L. Zimdahl
Professor Emeritus, Colorado State University
e-mail: r.zimdahl@colostate.edu

The ethics of modern agriculture
Robert Paarlberg

(The contribution is an extract from a commentary published on Society (46) Issue1 2009, Springer, New York.)

To evaluate the ethics of modern agriculture we must first ask, "Compared to what alternative?" Abandoning agriculture entirely — returning to hunting and gathering — is not a viable alternative, nor is it useful to imagine everyone gardening their own food, or buying their own food directly from local farmers.
A useful comparison would be between the conventional modern agriculture of today, incorporating all of the productivity enhancements that modern science can provide, versus organic farming — that chooses not to incorporate several of those enhancements (e.g., no synthetic fertilizers, no synthetic pesticides, and no genetically engineered crops).
When evaluating the ethics of modern conventional versus organic farming, we must also draw distinctions between how these differing practices have effected three different objects of value: people, domesticated farm animals, and the natural environment.

People

Using a utilitarian calculus, the productivity enhancements that characterize modern agriculture have been good for farmers and non-farmers alike.
What of the organic alternative to modern agriculture? Organic farming rejects some but not all of the techniques that transformed conventional agriculture in the 20th Century. Today organic farming rejects as well the latest synthetic creation of modern biological science: genetically engineered crops. Are these prohibitions an ethical gain for the material welfare of people?
The income of some farmers can increase following organic certification, but not many. This is why in the United States only four-tenths of 1% of cropland is farmed organically. In Europe only 4% of agricultural land is under organic production, despite EU policies that have delivered cash payments ($559 million in 2001) to farmers willing to convert to organic. Conversions to organic remain the exception rather than the rule in both the United States and Europe because organic methods for replacing soil nutrients, controlling weeds, and protecting against insects are more costly, driving up the price of organic products in the market and keeping the commercial market for organically grown crops relatively small.
Organically grown foods become affordable from a utilitarian perspective only after the income of consumers has increased enough to make food costs a non-salient concern. Without the high productivity and industrial affluence that was originally made possible in both North America and Europe in the 20th Century by a broad uptake of conventional agriculture, consumers would be even less willing than they are today to pay the premiums for organic. It is industrial and post-industrial affluence that stimulates organic farming, rather than the other way around.
If there were a clear consumer health or nutrition benefit from consuming

organically grown foods, the higher cost might be more than justified. Yet there is little convincing evidence of such benefits.
If organic farming were imposed on Africa, chemical fertilizer applications would have to move in the other direction and fall to zero. Telling poor and underfed Africans to go to zero use of chemical fertilizers, and to imitate the laborintensive composting strategies favored by a tiny minority of farmers in rich countries, is ethically dubious.

Environment

All agriculture is damaging to the natural environment, without exception. The uptake of modern farming techniques has also brought landscape protection benefits in the developing world. In 1964, India had been producing 12 million tons of wheat on 14 million hectares of land, but then — thanks to the high yields of the Green Revolution — India was able by 1993 to increase its wheat production nearly four-fold while increasing its cropped area by only 60%. To produce this much wheat before the Green Revolution had increased yields, would have required bringing much more land under the plow. In effect, the Green Revolution allowed India to meet its rapidly growing food needs without having to plow an additional 36 million hectares of cropland.
On the other hand, modern agriculture does entail much heavier chemical use—both fertilizers and pesticides—with damaging consequences to the natural environment. Yet there is a strong argument for reducing this damage by moving even farther down the path of modernization in farming, rather than by reverting to pre-modern approaches.
Compared to modern farming, would a switch to organic farming result in less damage to the natural environment? In landscape terms, the answer is no. Because organically grown field crops have a lower yield per acre, and because they must be fertilized with systems that require more land for animal pasture or for cover crops (to be plowed under as "green manure") organic farming has a larger footprint on the land per unit of production than conventional farming. For example, in Europe the yield in organic systems compared to conventional is 68% lower for cereals and 73% lower for potatoes. Consequently, if Europe tried to feed itself organically it would need an additional 28 million hectares of cropland, equal to all the remaining forest cover of France, Germany, Denmark, and Britain combined. The prohibition in organic farming against use of synthetic herbicides also can have adverse environmental impacts, as it tends to block the modern use of no-till farming practices, rated as superior to organic farming along all environmental criteria.
A strict adoption of organic farming also makes environmentally sustainable agriculture more difficult because it rules out the use of genetically engineered crops.
Regarding environmental benefits, the advantage of GMO crops is their ability to thrive with reduced sprayings of toxic chemicals, and in some cases reduced soil tillage. GMOs even help cut greenhouse gas emissions by reducing the burning of diesel fuel, thanks to lower mechanical tillage requirements and a less frequent need for field applications of herbicides and insecticides.

Animal Welfare

In the United States, farm animals are explicitly excluded from most animal welfare legislation. The result has been an ethical nightmare which sees thousands of farm animals – poultry, pigs, and cattle — now treated essentially like farm crops.
This means animals are kept confined throughout most or all of their lives inside "concentrated animal feeding operations" (CAFOs) where their existence is reduced entirely to a single commercial function, such as weight gain prior to slaughter, or continuous egg and milk production.
It has become a crime in most wealthy countries to impose comparable stresses on domesticated companion animals, yet this same ethical standard is not extended to farm animals, some of which — including pigs — show greater intelligence than many household pets.

Conclusion

On a per-unit-of-production basis modern agriculture is superior to organic farming in its treatment of people and the agricultural landscape. Regarding chemical pollution of the environment, modern agriculture is not superior to organic farming, but pollution trends in modern farming are at least down rather than up per-unit-of-production, thanks to recent moves toward precision farming and thanks as well, in some countries, to the adoption of genetically engineered crops that require fewer chemicals.
Animal welfare is the most important aspect to be improved in modern agriculture: constructing regulatory standards that take animal welfare explicitly into account seems the only way to enhance the ethical treatment of farm animals.

Contact

Robert Paarlberg
Betty Freyhof Johnson Professor of Political Science at Wellesley College, USA
e-mail: rpaarlberg@wellesley.edu

The ethics of organic agriculture
Nick Clarke, Paul Cloke, Clive Barnett, Alice Malpass

Debates about the ethics of organic agriculture tend to involve two distant positions. At one end, commentators perceive in organic agriculture: a natural and wholesome alternative to the health risks represented by chemically-induced foodstuffs; and a local and caring alternative to the food miles and distanciated social relations associated with conventional food commodity chains. At the other end, commentators question: whether local food regimes are inherently just in their labour or environmental relations; whether ecological sustainability and social justice are easily combined in regulatory frameworks that often emphasise the former over the latter; whether local food regimes are equally available to all groups of consumers; and whether organic food networks can avoid co-option by large agro-food firms

interested in the organic price premium and reliant on international marketing, fossil fuel consumption, and value-added processing.

In this article, based on a full-length paper in *Journal of Rural Studies* (Volume 24), we offer some alternative points of focus for debates about the ethics of organic agriculture. We do this by populating the space between supposedly authentic, ethical, small-scale, and counter-cultural agriculture and supposedly mainstream, less-than-ethical, industrial, and corporate agriculture. The article draws on a case study of Riverford Organic Vegetables, a firm based in Devon, England, that grows organic vegetables and delivers them in boxes to people across much of southern and central England. This case study was one part of a broader research project on 'The subjects and spaces of ethical consumption', which ran from 2003 to 2006 and involved discussion groups with residents of Bristol, England, and six case studies of organisations, discourses, and devices operating in the field of ethical consumption. The project was funded under the Cultures of Consumption programme of the Economic and Social Research Council with the Arts and Humanities Research Council. Thanks are due to these funding bodies and to the owners and staff of Riverford, none of whom bear responsibility for the views or any errors of fact contained herein.

Riverford received organic status from the Soil Association in 1986 and launched the box scheme in 1992. The stated purpose behind the box scheme was to avoid the 'villains' of British agro-food – not the large producer firms that dominate many accounts of organic agriculture (particularly from California), but the British supermarkets with their market dominance, discount prices, short-term contracts, and lack of concern for food miles. During the 1990s, the scheme grew rapidly so that, in 2001, Riverford began selling franchises for box delivery across southern England. The strategy was to occupy 'the middle ground' of the market, placing the business somewhere between small, local, farm-based box schemes of variable quality, and large, national, marketing-based box schemes that import produce, deliver by courier, and charge high prices to cover these costs. The strategy, then, was to expand-without-expanding; to sell and promote organic food (and, therefore, to participate in the 'mainstreaming' of organic food) without becoming a national scheme in which the original farm becomes marginalised. The business model imagines a national network of box schemes sharing market research and information technology with each other (since economies of scale exist more in these areas and less in production and packaging) but centred around different farms and delivery areas, each with their own distinct character. The long-term plan is to advance the Riverford brand across England while simultaneously retreating back into Devon and the surrounding region as producer and distributor. This is in order to minimise food miles and retain a certain level of proximity between farm and market. In summary, the space of Riverford is neither the small, local, counter-cultural farm nor the large, transnational, corporate firm. Rather, simultaneously, it is the national network (the scale at which market research and information technology

operate), the regional distribution system (the scale at which distribution operates), and the local farm (the scale at which production operates). This geography of organic agriculture is more complex than can be accommodated by the dominant positions in the debates described at the top of this article.

The same can be said of the ethics involved in organic agriculture at Riverford. The case study suggests that:

1. *The ethics of organic agriculture are sometimes rather ordinary*, in that they have more to do with caring for the family or about value, health, and taste than with grand designs for, say, environmental sustainability. When the owners and staff of Riverford talk about the firm's origins, achievements, future and so on, they talk about providing good food (quality food, tasty food) and doing that well (at affordable prices, by honest means).
2. *The ethics of organic agriculture can be diverse*, since involvement by owners and staff is guided by multiple contemporaneous goals, and ordered by passions (desire, fear), moral sentiments (work hard, be honest, trust people), knowledge (conventions, habits), and disciplines (especially accountancy). The owners and staff of Riverford talk about their commitment to quality food, developing their careers, meeting growth targets, their passion for health, their concern about the environmental effects of conventional agriculture, making a living and so on. That such ethics can be diverse is important because it threatens network stability. How can involvement with organic agriculture constitute one moment in so many different practices – from making a living to pursuing a passion for health? At Riverford, this threat to network durability is confronted with devices for managing diversity (e.g. staff committee meetings and company newsletters) – devices which seek to assure those involved and maintain their commitment.
3. *The ethics of organic agriculture can be graspable*, as when ethical action is achieved not by exhorting people to follow right principles or calculate good consequences, but by delivering a box of vegetables to their door, the materiality of which speaks to consumers and spectators of nature, health, taste and so on. This is important because universal prescriptions are highly abstract, say little about motivation, and neglect the background of resources and opportunities against which individuals act. Practical devices like boxes of organic vegetables can work with motivations and intervene in this background of resources and opportunities without making overwhelming demands on people. In this way, they represent practical pathways to ethical action.

Contact

Nick Clarke
School of Geography
University of Southampton
Highfield
Southampton SO17 1BJ
United Kingdom
n.clarke@soton.ac.uk

Tribute

Vonne Lund (4 July 1955 – 3 June 2009)

It is with a heavy heart that the EurSafe Board announces the loss of a valued and active member, Vonne Lund.

Vonne was born in Gothenburg, Sweden She received her PhD from the Swedish University for Agricultural Sciences in 2002. Her thesis was entitled "Ethics and Animal Welfare in Organic Animal Husbandry: An Interdisciplinary Approach", and this work later won the Research Award of the Internationale Gesellschaft für Nutztierhaltung for best PhD dissertation (2003). More recently she worked in Oslo, Norway, at the Veterinary Institute were she carved out a notable research career. In fact, Vonne was one of the first researchers in Scandinavia to take up organic animal husbandry in a university context.

She was actively engaged in EurSafe, most recently presenting an invited keynote lecture during the Vienna Congress in 2007. Vonne was also the main initiator of the Nordic Network for Agricultural and Food Ethics (NordSafe).

For over 10 years she ran a small farm in Sweden with sheep, poultry and beef cattle. On a more personal note, I want to add that I had the pleasure of working with Vonne in a number of contexts and settings. Her optimism, scholarship and her dedicated interest in animal ethics was always engaging. Her appreciation of the animal world never lessened her engagement in the human world; Vonne was a very social person with a wonderful sense of humour, laughing with and taking an interest in other people.

Vonne passed away six months after being diagnosed with an incurable cancer, a diagnosis that she fought almost constantly with relentless optimism. Vonne, we do miss you!

Matthias Kaiser

President of EurSafe

News Section

Invitation General Assembly EurSafe in Nottingham & presentation of candidates for the Executive Committee

Dear Members of EurSafe,

As Executive Committee, we are happy to invite you to the EurSafe General Assembly (GA). The GA will be held on Saturday, 4 July 2009 as part of the Nottingham Conference. The agenda for the General Assembly will include a

report from the Treasurer and the Cash Audit Committee and the election of two new members of the Executive Committee.

During the last year, two members of the current Executive Committee had to resign for personal reasons. As Executive Committee of EurSafe, we selected two candidates for election to the Executive Committee among the members, to be confirmed at the next General Assembly.

In an unanimous proposal the Executive Committee (art 8.1) suggests as candidates for membership of the Executive Committee:

- Kristin Hagen (Germany, Europäische Akademie zur Erforschung von Folgen wissenschaftlichtechnischer Entwicklungen, Bad Neuenahr-Ahrweiler)
- Anna Olsson (Portugal, Institute for molecular and cell biology, Porto)

Below you may find some background information on the two candidates. We hope you support this nomination. However, in case you disagree with the choice of the Executive Committee, the statutes provide you the opportunity to propose alternative candidates to the secretary (Franck Meijboom, f.l.b.meijboom@uu.nl) until Tuesday 30 June 12:00pm hours (CET). Candidates need to be supported by 10 ordinary members.

Kind regards,

Matthias Kaiser, president
Franck Meijboom, secretary

****

Excerpt from the STATUTES
Article 8
1.The Executive Committee shall consist of at least four (4) persons. Appointments shall be made by the General Meeting from among the members. The number of Executive Committee members shall be determined by the General Meeting. In the event of a vacancy, the Executive Committee may make a nomination, without prejudice to the authority of the General Meeting to appoint someone else.
2. Candidates for the Executive Committee may be nominated by the Executive Committee, as well as on the proposal of at least ten ordinary members.
****

Candidates for Membership of the Executive Committee

Kristin Hagen
Europäische Akademie zur Erforschung von Folgen wissenschaftlich-technischer Entwicklungen Bad Neuenahr-Ahrweiler GmbH, Germany

My background is in biology, philosophy and agriculture, which I studied at the University of Tromsø, and my postgraduate studies were with Don Broom at the University of Cambridge, where my PhD thesis was entitled „The expression of emotions and learning in cattle“.
As a researcher in applied ethology I went on to work on the evaluation of

health and behaviour of cows in automatic milking systems (with Susanne Waiblinger at the University of Veterinary Medicine in Vienna) and did some research on heart rate variability and acoustic communication in cows.
For one year, I returned to the North of Norway as a primary school teacher in a tiny fishing village called Bergsfjord.
Currently, I'm a scientist at the Europäische Akademie zur Erforschung von Folgen wissenschaftlich-technischer Entwicklungen Bad Neuenahr-Ahrweiler GmbH (www.ea-aw.de) in Germany, where I have contributed to the project "Pharming. Genetically modified plants and animals as future production sites of pharmaceuticals?" and am currently organising the conference „Concepts of Animal Welfare".
My expertise is in applied ethology and animal welfare science, and I'm currently moving more to the theoretical aspects and to the interface of these sciences with ethics and philosophy of science. My interest is broader than the animal issue though, seeing this in the context of ethical issues in agriculture and food supply more generally. I can thus identify with EurSafe's aims of promoting academic education, research and debate in this area and wish to contribute to these with my board membership.

Anna Olsson
IBMC – Institute for Molecular and Cell Biology, University of Porto, Portugal

When graduating as an animal scientist in 1994, I considered three different options: international development work, organic animal husbandry or ethology/animal welfare. Over the course of two years, I tried each of them and rapidly arrived where I still am: in academic research into animal welfare. Following this line somewhat unexpectedly put me in contact with philosophy and ethics; the consequence of which is that I'm now standing for a position in the Executive Committee of EurSafe.
My PhD was on laying hen behaviour and welfare, concluded in 2001, and since then I have been working with laboratory animals in Portugal. Here I coordinate the Laboratory Animal Science group at one of the largest biology/biomedical research institute in Portugal, the only research group in the country fully devoted to research into animal welfare, behaviour and ethics. Since 2003 I'm also a member of the Danish Centre for Bioethics and Risk Assessment.
Although a full-time researcher, I regularly participate in graduate training. I coordinate a course in laboratory animal science as well as an ethics module in two doctoral programs, and also teach animal ethics at international PhD courses. I regularly write about animal welfare and ethics for the research blog of the Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, and participate in EurSafe conferences since 2004.
The unique expertise I can contribute to the council is of two kinds: Firstly, I cover the field of animal ethics / welfare ranging from farming to biomedical research and with an ethics as well as a science perspective. Secondly, I have insight in the public debate on EurSafe issues in two quite different parts of Europe.

Job Announcement

Apply today and you could be….

An Irrigation Project Officer at the Thyolo District Agriculture Office in Malawi..

You'll be providing technical engineering input to a ridge irrigation project and supervise trials of new ram pumps. You'll train colleagues in the Thyolo District to ensure that there is adequate technical knowledge to support the trials and implement and maintain these small-scale hydraulic ram pumps once they are built.

Your role will include: assessing training needs of your local colleagues and working with farmers to ensure proper maintenance of the pumps.

What skills will you need?
You'll be educated to degree level in civil, water or agricultural engineering. You'll need 5 years' field experience, preferably in small-scale irrigation and skills gained will include; gravity fed systems, river and stream diversion, small earth dams and other rainwater harvesting techniques.

For more details contact:

Hannah Gilman
International Recruitment Officer
Voluntary Service Overseas
317 Putney Bridge Road, London, SW15 2PN
tel: 020 8780 7665
www.vso.org.uk
hannah.gilman@vso.org.uk

Conferences and Symposia

Summer 2009

June 23-26, 2009
International Conference: Shaping Europe in a Globalized World? Protest Movements and the Rise of a Transnational civil Society
Zurich, Switzerland
www.protest-research.eu

August 19-22, 2009
23rd European Conference of Philosophy of Medicine and Healthcare: Sources and Perspectives of Bioethics
Tübingen, Germany
http://www.espmh.cm-uj.krakow.pl/

Autumn 2009

September 14-18, 2009
International ISHS-ProMusa Symposium:
Global Perspectives on Asian Challenges
Guan Dong, China
http://www.promusa.org/symposium_2009/home.html

28 September - 2 October 2009
ESF-LiU Conference:
Philosophy for Science in Use
Scandic Linköping Väst, Linköping Sweden
http://www.esf.org/conferences/09272

October 2009
URBAN International Conference:
Poverty in Medium and Small Cities of Developing Countries
Lumbumbashi, DRC (To be confirmed)
http://www.biw.kuleuven.be/personeel/documenten/Urban2009.doc

November 12-14, 2009
The Integration of Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development in the Context of Climate Change, the Energy Crisis and Food Insecurity
Faculty of Law, Economics & Social Sciences of Agadir, Morocco
http://2009-international-conference.synthasite.com

November 6-7, 2009
10th EMBO/EMBL Science & Society Conference
Food, sustainability and plant science - a global challenge
EMBL Heidelberg, Germany
http://www.embo.org/policy-and-society/science-society/conferences/2009.html

13-15 November, 2009
Fourth International Conference on Applied Ethics
Hokkaido University, Sapporo, Japan.
http://ethics.let.hokudai.ac.jp/en/events.html

Winter 2009/2010

1-5 February, 2010
"FOOD FOR THOUGHT"
Universitat de Barcelona, Spain
http://www.ub.es/dpfilsa/food2010.html

Summer 2010

28-31 July, 2010
10th World Congress of Bioethics:
"Bioethics in a Globalised World"
The Division of Ethics of Science and Technology Sector for Social and Human Sciences UNESCO
Suntec Singapore International Convention and Exhibition Centre, Singapore
http://www.bioethics-singapore.org/wcb2010/

Funding

***Cooperation Calls*:**
Energy Second Generation Biofuels - EU Brazil Coordinated Call
Identifier: FP7-ENERGY-2009-BRAZIL
Deadline: 19 June 2009 at 17:00:00 (Brussels local time) This deadline has been postponed; a new deadline will be announced by CORDIS at least 45 days before expiration.
http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/dc/index.cfm?fuseaction=UserSite.CooperationDetailsCallPage&call_id=192

***People Calls*:**
Marie Curie Reintegration Grants (RG)
Identifier: FP7-PEOPLE-2009-RG
Deadline: 31 December 2009 at 17:00:00 (Brussels local time)
Cut-Off dates: 08 October 2009 at 17:00:00 - 02 April 2009 at 17:00:00
http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/dc/index.cfm?fuseaction=UserSite.PeopleDetailsCallPage&call_id=168

Marie Curie Intra-European Fellowships for Career Development (IEF)
Identifier: FP7-PEOPLE-2009-IEF
Deadline: 18 August 2009 at 17:00:00 (Brussels local time)
http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/dc/index.cfm?fuseaction=UserSite.PeopleDetailsCallPage&call_id=198

Marie Curie International Incoming Fellowships (IIF)
Identifier: FP7-PEOPLE-2009-IIF
Deadline: 18 August 2009 at 17:00:00 (Brussels local time)
http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/dc/index.cfm?fuseaction=UserSite.PeopleDetailsCallPage&call_id=199

Marie Curie International Outgoing Fellowships for Career Development (IOF)
Identifier: FP7-PEOPLE-2009-IOF
Deadline: 18 August 2009 at 17:00:00 (Brussels local time)
http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/dc/index.cfm?fuseaction=UserSite.PeopleDetailsCallPage&call_id=200

Marie Curie Industry-Academia Partnerships and Pathways (IAPP)
Identifier: FP7-PEOPLE-2009-IAPP
Deadline: 27 July 2009 at 17:00:00 (Brussels local time)
http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/dc/index.cfm?fuseaction=UserSite.PeopleDetailsCallPage&call_id=201

Contact

Executive secretariat
Paul den Besten, Royal Netherlands Society of Agricultural Sciences, P.O. Box 79, NL-6700 AB Wageningen, The Netherlands, paul.denbesten@wur.nl

EurSafe Membership Administration
Bureau De Beek, Parkweg 27, NL-2585 JH The Hague, The Netherlands, tel. (+31) (0)70 4162943, fax (+31) (0)70 4162959, info@eursafe.ledenadmin.nl

Executive committee
President: Matthias Kaiser, National Committee for Research Ethics in Science and Technology, Norway, matthias.kaiser@etikkom.no
Secretary: Franck L.B. Meijboom, Utrecht University, the Netherlands, F.L.B.Meijboom@uu.nl
Treasurer: Jos Metz, Wageningen University, The Netherlands, jos.metz@wur.nl
Vice-president: Kate Millar, University of Nottingham, United Kingdom, kate.millar@nottingham.ac.uk

Members
Johan De Tavernier, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium, johan.detavernier@theo.kuleuven.be
Helena Röcklinsberg, Lund University, Sweden, helena.rocklinsberg@teol.lu.se
Susanne Waiblinger, University of Veterinary Medicine Vienna, Austria, susanne.waiblinger@vu-wien.ac.at

Website
www.eursafe.org

EurSafe News
Chief-editor: Stefan Aerts, Katholieke Hogeschool Sint-Niklaas, Belgium, stef.aerts@kahosl.be
Conference & courses editor: Sandy Tomkins, Nottingham University, United Kingdom, sandy.tomkins@nottingham.ac.uk
Publications editor: Assya Pascalev, Howard University, United States, director@bioethics.net
Funding calls editor: Tassos Michalopoulos, Wageningen University, The Netherlands, a.michalopoulos@tudelft.nl
Matias Pasquali
CRP Gabriel Lippmann, Belvaux, Luxembourg.
matias.pasquali@gmail.com, pasquali@lippmann.lu

Editors and themes for next issues
Issue-editor September 2009: Stef Aerts, "Thursday Veggieday. The ethical merits of vegetarianism promotion"

Deadline for the next issue: August 15, 2009

You are kindly invited to send any relevant contributions, conference calls, publication reviews, etc. to the editors.